



REPORT

Rome, Italy
12 Oct. 2012

Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures October, 2012



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	4
2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	4
3.	Housekeeping	4
4.	Report of last meeting and action points	4
	Objective A. Protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread	6
5.	Updates on CPM work programme	6
5.1	Information exchange.....	6
5.1.1	Review of the IPPC Information Exchange Programme.....	6
	Objective B. Protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests	6
5.2	Cooperation Agreement MoU.....	6
5.3	Partnership.....	6
	OBJECTIVE C. Facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically based phytosanitary measures.....	6
5.4	ePhyto.....	6
5.5	IRSS	7
5.5.1	Review of request for additional work (Concept notes).....	7
	Objective D. Develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish a, b and c.	7
5.6	Capacity Development	7
5.6.1	Technical consultation among RPPOs	9
	Objective X. Effective collaboration with members and stakeholders	10
5.7	Staffing Update	10
5.8	Review of financial documents	10
5.8.1	Report of Financial Committee meeting	10
5.9	Implementation of Communication Strategy	10
5.10	Amendment of CPM rules of procedure	11
5.10.1	Election of chair and vice-chair	11
5.11	Rules of procedure for CPM Bureau.....	11
5.12	Progress on FAO Reform and Article XIV body review	12
5.13	CPM-8 (2013)	13
	Objective Y. Efficient and effective administration.....	14
5.14	Update	14
5.14.1	Identifying the barriers to report writing and circulation	14
5.14.2	Liaison activities related to other organizations (e.g. SPS, STDF, CBD, etc.) including need to revisit Memoranda of Understanding or develop new ones	15
5.15	Resource mobilization.....	15
5.15.1	Marketing of the Online Comment System to Codex and OIE.....	15
6.	Bureau participation	16
6.1	Calendar 2012-2013	16

6.2 Bureau communications between meetings16

7. Other business.....16

8. Close of meeting.....17

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....18

APPENDIX 2: Participants list21

APPENDIX 3: Action list from the October 2012 Bureau meeting.....23

APPENDIX 4: Revised draft Rules of Procedure for the CPM Bureau.....25

APPENDIX 5: Report of the IPPC Financial Committee meeting, October 201227

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Chair of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) opened the meeting.
- [2] The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Organization (IPPC) welcomed the members of the Bureau, wishing them a productive meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The Agenda distributed at the meeting was adopted ([Appendix 1](#)), noting that, under item 7, the following points would be discussed: the next Bureau update; the process for new members of IPPC and the possible need for some introductory training; and the need for an implementation plan for the strategic framework.

3. Housekeeping

- [4] The Secretariat presented the Participants list ([Appendix 2](#)) and noted that there was no detailed Documents list because most input to this meeting had been included in the inputs to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting (that finished 11 October), hence oral presentations would principally be given.

4. Report of last meeting and action points

- [5] The Chair updated members on the progress of the individual action points listed in Appendix 8 of the 2012 June Bureau report. A number of points had been completed and some were on this meeting's agenda (a list of action points coming from this meeting can be found in [Appendix 3](#) of this report).
- [6] Regarding Bureau operational processes, as was mentioned in the SPG meeting, it had been suggested that each member of the Bureau takes certain interest in specific areas and work more closely with the Secretariat in that area. Because Ms Lois Ransom (Australia) was no longer a Bureau member, some changes to the list of responsibilities were needed.
- [7] With regard to the International Cocoa Organization (ICCO), the Secretariat noted that after some research it had been assessed that it would not be worth pursuing collaboration because there were insufficient common areas for which to establish a working relationship.
- [8] The activity of Bureau members encouraging nominations for CPM subsidiary bodies being promptly submitted was mentioned as ongoing.
- [9] With respect to the funding request for the CPM-8 (2013) cocktail, it was noted that industry organizations involved in the draft standard for *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers* (2008-001) expressed interest in hosting an event (off-site) during CPM-8 (2013) to raise awareness about the draft standard. In the absence of other contributions, it could be explored if they would also be willing to host the cocktail. One Bureau member wondered if industry sponsorship would create a potential conflict of interest. However, it was noted that it is in the interest of the IPPC Secretariat to increase engagement with industry because industry is key to the successful implementation by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) of certain standards, notably the sea containers standard. The role the Bureau members should play in advocating for their specific regions' fulfilment of their reporting obligations was stressed. The Technical Consultation among regional plant protection organizations (TC-RPPO) recommended actions to improve reporting by contracting parties (CPs) by focusing on a specific obligation every 1-2 years and suggested that next year they could focus on the obligation for pest reporting. This would be further discussed under agenda item 5.6.1.
- [10] It was noted that the possibility of Online Comment System (OCS) cost sharing with other standard-setting bodies is still being explored, as is the possibility of charging fees. This would be further discussed under agenda item 5.15.

- [11] The Secretariat updated the Bureau on the calls for experts to the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), noting that no suitable candidate for the French language could be recommended. This issue links to the discussion held in the SPG on the need for engaging and motivating members in the standard setting process¹.
- [12] With regard to the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), the combined study into implementation of ISPM 17:2002 (*Pest reporting*) and ISPM 19:2003 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*) should be launched in May or June 2013. The usefulness of Diagnostic protocols (DP) was discussed at the TC-RPPO. It was decided that a short questionnaire would be distributed to countries the results of which should be presented to CPM-9 (2014). Informal questions have been made at regional workshops (RWS) and this information will be provided to the Standards Committee (SC) in November 2012.
- [13] It was noted that the Secretariat presented two projects for funding consideration by the Standards and Trade Development Facility (SDTF). Funding consideration was going to be made for one of the two projects in the forthcoming SDTF meeting.
- [14] Activities on the possibility of an International Year of Plant Health in 2017 are ongoing. It was mentioned that a country commented to the Secretariat at the RWS for the Caribbean that the title should be more focussed generally on *plant protection* rather than on *plant health*.
- [15] Regarding a new IPPC logo, a competition should be launched within the next year, depending on staff resources.
- [16] The Secretariat noted that a call for speakers for the CPM-8 (2013) side session on Probit-9 would be made soon. There was concern that a late call could inhibit potential experts' attendance because they would not be able to make travel arrangements in time.
- [17] Regarding ministerial messages for CPM-8 (2013), the Secretariat noted that some contact had been made with the Italian Ministry for Agriculture, inviting them to open session. In addition, this new contact could be used to host the cocktail. Further discussion included inviting a senior level management speaker from FAO to speak about the link between the IPPC and food security.
- [18] The Secretariat explained the newly revised funding criteria for participating at CPM meetings and other associated meetings, noting that there is now a statement of commitment for participants eligible for IPPC travel support indicating that funding is dependent on full participation.
- [19] The Bureau:
- (1) *encouraged* its members to work towards closer collaboration with the Secretariat on the interest areas assigned in the Bureau June 2012 meeting, emphasizing the preparation of documents for CPM
 - (2) *urged* its members to emphasize their role in obtaining nominations for the CPM subsidiary bodies
 - (3) *reminded* its members to encourage their regions and their RPPOs to fulfil their reporting obligations
 - (4) *noted* and *welcomed* the new positive relationship with the Italian Ministry of Agriculture
 - (5) *asked* the Secretariat to explore opportunities for speakers for the opening ceremony i.e. the Italian Minister for Agriculture and an FAO senior manager who could speak about the link between the IPPC and food security
 - (6) *encouraged* Bureau members to explore getting ministerial video speeches, as was done at CPM-7 (2012)
 - (7) *noted* that a call for speakers for Probit-9 will be made soonest

¹ SPG 2012/10

- (8) *asked* the Secretariat to confirm if the IPPC Secretariat can fund speakers for the scientific sessions
- (9) *agreed* to include information on the revised funding criteria for participants in the next Bureau update.

OBJECTIVE A. Protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread

5. Updates on CPM work programme

5.1 Information exchange

5.1.1 Review of the IPPC Information Exchange Programme

- [20] The Information Exchange Officer introduced the item noting that this had been fully discussed by the SPG². Nevertheless, the Bureau was asked to express its opinion on the Information Exchange programme.
- [21] The Bureau:
- (10) *supported* the review of the IPPC Information Exchange programme being conducted according to the plan presented to the SPG.

OBJECTIVE B. Protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests

5.2 Cooperation Agreement MoU

- [22] The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Ozone Secretariat is in its final draft stage and should be signed in November this year. The Bureau thought that the Secretariat report to the CPM-8 (2013) should include the implications for the CPM deriving from this MoU. A concern was raised about the implications for the plant protection community regarding what could be a more expedited methyl bromide exemption for quarantine use and the plant protection community should be ready to respond.
- [23] The Bureau:
- (11) *asked* the Secretariat to report to the CPM on the implications of the MoU in terms of methyl bromide exemptions for quarantine use.

5.3 Partnership

- [24] This item will be discussed under 5.14.2.

OBJECTIVE C. Facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically based phytosanitary measures

5.4 ePhyto

- [25] This issue was discussed at length during the SPG meeting³ and the Bureau noted the outcomes. It was announced that the United States of America (USA) would contribute USD 30 000 for a feasibility study for an ePhyto hub.
- [26] The Bureau:
- (12) *thanked* the USA for the contribution
 - (13) *agreed* to proceed with the ePhyto feasibility study, *noting* it should be guided by the ePhyto steering committee

² SPG 2012/18

³ SPG 2012/17

- (14) *asked* the Secretariat to confirm the dates for the ePhyto workshop to be held in Brazil in November as soon as possible.

5.5 IRSS

5.5.1 Review of request for additional work (Concept notes)

- [27] A brief update on this item was provided by the IRSS officer. Following clearance from CPM on the activity related to ISPM 13:2001 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*), the work was delivered to SBDS on time. Clearance has also been given to initiate the activity on ISPM 17:2002 and ISPM 19:2003 implementation. This effort should be launched in May or June 2013. One of the major challenges experienced by IRSS is that the questionnaires are not translated into all FAO languages. Further resources are needed for translation of the questionnaires (an additional estimated USD 150 000 per year) to ensure broad participation. Unfortunately, due to donor constraints, there is no flexibility to use the current remaining budget on translations. The donor has been asked whether they could fund these translations. Other sources of funding will be explored.
- [28] IRSS did not have any specific new activities to propose, but is open for suggestions by subsidiary bodies for additional activities by the end of next year.
- [29] The Bureau:
- (15) *noted* concerns that lack of translation could skew responses, because only English speakers can respond
- (16) *asked* the IRSS to continue exploring with the donor the possibility of getting additional funding for translations of questionnaires to ensure broad participation
- (17) *noted* that additional activities could be suggested by subsidiary bodies within the coming year.

OBJECTIVE D. Develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish a, b and c.

5.6 Capacity Development

Capacity Development Committee (Bureau members to have ensured nominations for their regions)

- [30] The Chair noted the Terms of Reference (TOR) and Rules of Procedure (ROP) for the Capacity Development Committee (CDC), adopted at CPM-7. The Bureau reviewed the CVs submitted by potential members and agreed that the nominees were all suitably qualified. Based on a selection criteria table provided by the CD officer, the Bureau discussed the suitability of the various nominees, taking into account their previous experience, their soft and hard skills and their English language skills, and final selections were made for the CDC. With regards to the selection of members, it confirmed that the criteria for a good balance between developed and developing country members had been met.
- [31] It was noted that the CDC would convene from 3 to 7 December 2012 in Rome (at the Italian Ministry for Agriculture) and the selected members will be invited to this meeting.
- [32] The Bureau:
- (18) *Selected* the following members for the CDC (listed in alphabetical order by last name):
Mr Marc C. GILKEY (United States of America, for North America)
Ms Shelia HARVEY (Jamaica, for Latin America and the Caribbean)
Ms Sally JENNINGS (New Zealand, for Pacific)
Mr Ho Haw LENG (Malaysia, for Asia)
Ms Nagat MUBARAK EL TAYEB (Sudan, for Near East)
Ms Stella ORAKA (Nigeria, for Africa)
Mr Corné VAN ALPHEN (The Netherlands, for Europe)

- (19) *Selected* the following alternate members for the CDC (listed in alphabetical order by last name):
Ms María Inés ARES (Uruguay, Replacement member for Latin America and the Caribbean)
Mr Glenn PANGANIBAN (The Phillippines, Replacement member for Asia)
Mr Joshua WAINIQOLO (Fiji Islands, Replacement member for Pacific)
- (20) *requested* nominations for alternate members from the regions that have not submitted them to do so by the end of February 2013 for consideration at the Bureau meeting in April 2013
- (21) *asked* the Bureau members to coordinate the nominations for the alternate members.

Regional workshops to review draft ISPMs

- [33] Seven RWS to review draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) were held this year and the Secretariat has subsequently evaluated them internally. The results of these discussions were presented⁴.
- [34] One issue discussed was that some of the participants in a few regions were not properly prepared and thus were not able to discuss the draft ISPMs. Another highlighted issue was that meeting arrangements should be prepared well in advance. The RWS for Africa moved the venue to a different country shortly before the start of the workshop, which resulted in the inability of several persons to attend. Furthermore, the meeting was shortened to three days and there was not enough time to review all the draft ISPMs. The member of the Bureau for the African region noted that these meetings are important and are the opportunity for the countries to meet and discuss other relevant issues.
- [35] In this context, the use of the IPPC logo on material at the RWS was discussed because the Secretariat considers that the logo should only be used when the Secretariat is involved in the content and organization of the workshop.
- [36] There was discussion regarding the issue of IPPC Secretariat involvement in the RWS. Currently, the Secretariat supports the RWS, but would prefer that the regions fund the RWS directly. When this is the case, one member suggested that the Secretariat should not interfere too strongly in the content nor build constraints on the organization of the workshop. A member noted that the RWS for Latin America and the Caribbean was fully self-funded and that the draft standards were appropriately examined and commented upon. In the case of involvement from the Secretariat, another member suggested that, in light of confusion experienced this year, the Secretariat should endeavour to ensure that communications on the content of the agenda are initiated early.
- [37] The Bureau felt that there should be some input from the Secretariat when the logo is used to ensure that quality of proposed activities or products conforms to certain Secretariat expectations, regardless whether the meeting is funded or supported by the IPPC. The use of the logo in other contexts is a different matter requiring consultation with the Secretariat before use.
- [38] The Bureau agreed that all regions should participate fully in the standard setting process, but reiterated that the RWS are the responsibility of the regions and they decide on the content of the workshop.
- [39] A positive experience in the RWS for Asia was that the participants entered comments in advance, using the OCS, to then be shared with the workshop account. This was a useful approach which needs to be encouraged among other regions, because participants were very well prepared. It was agreed that no more training on the OCS was needed and that the Secretariat has a mechanism to provide training remotely when and as needed.
- [40] A suggestion was made for an adjustment to the OCS, based on difficulties experienced by some RWS participants to understand which documents posted in the OCS would be discussed at the RWS, considering the different member consultations occurring at the same time (i.e. which commenting

⁴ Bureau 2012/Oct_07

period was relevant to which draft standard). The Secretariat explained this issue had already been identified and some modifications were planned in the OCS to make it more user-friendly.

- [41] One RWS noted that ISPM 15 remains one of the biggest concerns, specifically with regard to the registration of the mark. There was a request that the Secretariat prepare information on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for this. The Secretariat indicated that the FAO Legal Service should update existing guidance in this regard.
- [42] All RWS reports will soon be posted on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110638>).
- [43] The Bureau:
- (22) *agreed* that the use of the logo by the RWS organizers depends on sufficient involvement of the Secretariat, although responsibility for the workshops rests with the organizers
 - (23) *asked* the Secretariat to share input for the agendas with the RWS organizers well before the meeting
 - (24) *asked* the Secretariat to explore a clearer way to distinguish between the different member consultation periods in the OCS
 - (25) *asked* the Secretariat to continue to work with the FAO Legal Service on the issue of registration of the ISPM 15 mark.

5.6.1 Technical consultation among RPPOs

- [44] The Secretariat introduced the paper⁵ on the recommendations from the TC-RPPO.
- [45] The Secretariat raised concerns regarding whether the mandate of specific RPPOs is too far from the functions of RPPOs as per the IPPC framework. They will draw up criteria to assess whether RPPOs continue to meet their obligations.
- [46] Regarding the usefulness of the three DPs adopted to date, the DP for *Trogoderma granarium* is deemed useful across all regions. The observation is based on feedback from the TC-RPPO and a few of the RWS where feedback was sought. However, there was still a concern that a review of the criteria for determining priorities of DPs for development might be necessary. Furthermore, a discussion on whether drawing up a list of top ten regulated plant pests was a worthwhile activity to pursue. Agreement was not reached because there was a need for further consultation with RPPO members. Some RPPOs indicated that similar work along the line of the IPPC proposal was already being conducted. The issue will be discussed further at the 25th TC-RPPO.
- [47] The TC-RPPO presented a number of suggestions for scientific sessions for future CPM sessions. These proposals are available in the TC-RPPO report.
- [48] The Bureau expressed satisfaction for the stronger collaboration with the TC-RPPOs reflected in the report and considered it to be very positive.
- [49] The Bureau:
- (26) *noted* the recommendations from the 24th TC RPPO
 - (27) *supported* a side session or evening session at CPM-8 (2013) on information exchange implementation
 - (28) *noted* that advice from FAO legal office will be sought regarding the criteria for maintaining RPPO status
 - (29) *asked* the Standards Committee to consider the issue of prioritizing DP development
 - (30) *noted* the suggestions for scientific sessions for future CPM sessions and *noted* that these should be discussed at the Bureau meeting in April 2013.

⁵ Bureau 2012/Oct_05

OBJECTIVE X. Effective collaboration with members and stakeholders

5.7 Staffing Update

[50] Referring to a paper presented to the SPG⁶ with regards to staffing, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the USA has offered to fund an Associate Professional Officer (APO) from 2013 for one year, possibly two, to work in the area of communications.

[51] The Bureau:

(31) *thanked* the USA for the contribution of an APO in 2013

(32) *thanked* the IPPC Secretariat staff for the considerable assistance they provide to the IPPC and associated meetings.

5.8 Review of financial documents

[52] The Secretariat presented a 2013 proposed budget⁷, noting it had been developed through core team discussions. It was stressed that all numbers are approximate and that the full budget is slightly lower than the 2012 budget presented to CPM-7 (2012). As noted in the IPPC Financial Committee (FC) meeting (8 Oct. 2012), a new standardized format for budget reporting should be presented to the CPM-8 (2013) that will include aggregated figures and staff costs.

[53] It was noted that some figures on expenditures will be late and will affect the figures. It is anticipated that the FAO regular programme (RP) funds will be fully spent in 2012. Also, it was stressed that some activities, such as a number of administrative support activities, member consultation, etc., cannot be quantified in the budget because they are delivered with existing staff resources. No specific amount is indicated for these activities, but they are listed as they appear on the work programme.

[54] It was recommended to cluster the lines against specific Strategic Objectives (SOs) in order to have an easy overview of the activities and how much they will cost.

[55] The Bureau:

(33) *noted* the operational plan and budget for 2013

(34) *welcomed* the standardized format for budgeting and reporting presented

(35) *encouraged* members to seek additional contributions to the IPPC trust fund

(36) *asked* the Secretariat to cluster the budget in SOs.

5.8.1 Report of Financial Committee meeting

[56] The Chair of the FC referred to the update given to the SPG.

[57] The Bureau:

(37) *thanked* the Chair of the FC and the report writer for finalizing the draft report by this Bureau meeting.

5.9 Implementation of Communication Strategy

[58] The Information Exchange Officer gave an update on the implementation of the Communication Strategy,⁸ with reference to the discussions during the SPG meeting, and distributed new IPPC brochures to the Bureau. The advice from the SPG to revise the first section of the strategy will be incorporated.

⁶ SPG 2012/15

⁷ Unnumbered document distributed in meeting

⁸ SPG 2012/02

- [59] The Communication Plan, as presented to the SPG⁹, needs major revision and focus will be given to fewer subjects. Clarification was requested regarding the period for the plan and it was suggested to include 2014, and, for next year's report, to include also 2012 for a complete overview of past, present and future. Once the Secretariat has staff dedicated to communications, the informal Communications Group nominated by the Bureau will be re-instated.
- [60] It was noted that the USA would support the IPPC Communication Strategy by funding activities based on a project proposal provided by the Secretariat. This could be in the form of contracting a public relations company or hiring an external expert as a staff resource.
- [61] The Bureau:
- (38) *noted* the Communication Strategy and the proposed changes as agreed during the SPG
 - (39) *asked* the Secretariat to revise the Communication plan to focus on fewer subjects and to cover at least two years (2013-14)
 - (40) *thanked* the USA for their further generous contribution.

5.10 Amendment of CPM rules of procedure

5.10.1 Election of chair and vice-chair

- [62] The Bureau discussed the issue. If there is a need to appoint alternates to the Bureau members, as FAO legal had mentioned during the SPG, then the ROPs of the CPM may need to be changed.
- [63] The Bureau:
- (41) *asked* the Secretariat to seek clarification from FAO legal on which ROPs of the CPM would need to be changed based on the SPG discussions
 - (42) *agreed* to present a proposal for a CPM recommendation to complement the ROPs of the CPM.

5.11 Rules of procedure for CPM Bureau

- [64] The Chair introduced the paper¹⁰ noting the issue of the role of the Bureau when out of session and whether it can provide direction to subsidiary bodies.
- [65] The CPM rules describe the Bureau rules and functions briefly and this could be expanded. It was queried whether certain ROPs of the Bureau would affect the ROPs of the CPM and whether guidelines or recommendations could be drafted for CPM adoption. It was clarified that, in the past, the CPM had asked the Bureau to draft its ROPs, and the 2011 SPG had a strong position on this. It was therefore suggested to develop a CPM recommendation on the subject, given that several rules pertain to practical issues and, therefore, should not be ROPs. The proposal should be developed in accordance with the SPG discussions
- [66] The Bureau revised the proposed CPM Bureau ROPs ([Appendix 4](#)). It was noted that FAO legal had the view that the Bureau assists the Secretary in promoting and representing the IPPC, and had deleted any mention of direct representation of the IPPC from the draft CPM Bureau ROPs. The Bureau discussed this issue and felt that the Bureau's role is actually to represent the interests of IPPC. The wording of the ROPs was reduced in certain paragraphs to avoid the possible need for the ROPs of CPM to be changed. The fourth paragraph of Rule 3 was deleted with a note that this should be in the Statement of Commitment because the Secretariat feels strongly about this point. The first paragraph of Rule 4 relates to the ROPs for the CPM and this should to be added to the ROPs for the CPM.
- [67] With regards to the change in Rule 8, it was noted that the agenda is not public due to lobbying issues but that CPs can interact with the Bureau member of their region and request the agenda.
- [68] It was also noted for Rule 10 that, if this becomes a recommendation, this Rule it is not needed.

⁹ SPG 2012/16

¹⁰ Bureau 2012/Oct_06

[69] The Bureau:

- (43) *asked* the Secretariat to seek advice from FAO legal whether the CPM Bureau ROPs could be a CPM recommendation, to facilitate adoption and amendment
- (44) *agreed*, depending on that advice, to propose the CPM Bureau ROPs as a CPM recommendation.

5.12 Progress on FAO Reform and Article XIV body review

- [70] The Chair distributed a possible draft response¹¹ on the Art. XIV issue, copies of an FAO paper analysing the questionnaires and sought the opinion of the Bureau on whether this was advisable.
- [71] The Secretariat noted deep disappointment with the FAO paper related to the process and the analysis of the questionnaires. The Secretariat had been prevented from carrying out its own analysis because FAO legal conducted their own on behalf of all FAO, but the result was poorer than expected, both with regard to the actual questionnaire and the analysis of the responses.
- [72] The issue was discussed at length and it was noted that it is still not clear what the implications may be for an autonomous IPPC and it was suggested that clarification to this should be sought. The strategy should be dependent on the response because it was felt that fighting for autonomy could also make the IPPC a target for budget cuts.
- [73] One suggestion was that a letter could be directed at countries (national contact points), highlighting the positive outcomes and inviting the permanent representatives to the FAO to voice support for autonomy.
- [74] Concern was raised about the effect of a letter that would be sent by the CPM Chair alone. It would perhaps be more effective communicating through the FAO Financial or Programme Committees.
- [75] There was some support to express the disappointment with regard to the results and distribution of the survey, but caution was advised because the reasons behind the poor responses may be different from what could be easily understood.
- [76] The need of a long-term strategy for an increased IPPC level of autonomy was stressed as the main point of discussion and it was suggested not to spend too much effort focusing on what the Secretariat may consider are the negative outcomes of the survey. The vision of the IPPC should be clear and agreed upon. There must also be clarification on the effects of the survey on the plant protection community. In addition, it should be clear how the IPPC wishes to work with FAO and how to raise the profile of IPPC in FAO. It was suggested to invite FAO legal to CPM-8 (2013) to answer any questions CPs may have on the issue.
- [77] In this context, it was also suggested that the CPM Chair requests regular individual meetings with the Director-General (DG) of FAO to develop a relationship (as is done by Codex).
- [78] The Bureau
 - (45) *asked* the Secretariat to seek clarification on the implications of Art. XIV autonomy for the IPPC
 - (46) *encouraged* bureau members to have informal discussions with their Permanent Representatives on the issue of Art XIV autonomy
 - (47) *recommended*, as a standing event, that the CPM Chair meets with the DG of FAO at least once a year to increase the profile of IPPC within FAO
 - (48) *asked* the Secretariat to pursue setting up a meeting with the DG in December 2012
 - (49) *added* an item to the CPM-8 (2013) agenda on *Queries from CPs to FAO Legal services* and *agreed* to invite FAO legal to be present to answer any query from CPs.

¹¹ Bureau CRP 02

5.13 CPM-8 (2013)

Outstanding action items

[79] Nothing to report.

Draft agenda for CPM-8 (2013)

[80] The Bureau reviewed the CPM-7 (2012) agenda and drafted the CPM-8 (2013) agenda. It was noted that, with the revised standard setting process, there should not be issues regarding timing of adoption of standards and this item can therefore remain as item 8, and not moved earlier on the agenda as in the previous year. Also there is no longer the distinction between regular and special process. There was discussion on where to add the item on Governance and it was decided to add it after the Report by the Secretariat. Mentioning SOs under the agenda items was discussed because the items each cover many SOs and it was not clear how to present the items without duplication of items.

[81] The ISPM 15 mark was also discussed because there has recently been an indication that FAO legal is not interested in continuing to provide the support to which it agreed during CPM-7 (2012), and that it should be left with the Secretariat the responsibility to handle this matter. The Secretariat is intent on following up on this with FAO legal. Considering this, it may be opportune to discuss the matter further and keep the point on the agenda. It was suggested mentioning this development in the Secretariat Report rather than having it as a separate item on the agenda, but also to have a Question & Answer forum or side-session to which FAO legal would be invited. The issue, however, is highly complex and includes confusion about registration of the Mark, so keeping it on the agenda may stress the need for continued support and attention to the matter.

[82] It was suggested to structure the *Secretariat Report* around the SOs. After some discussion, it was decided to keep the implementation of the strategic framework as a separate item.

[83] There was a discussion on whether the Chair of the CDC should report to the CPM on its activities separately as other Subsidiary Body Chairs. The Bureau was reminded that the CDC does not have the same status as other subsidiary bodies and therefore it may not be appropriate to have this reported separately. However a report on the completed activities of the CDC should be mentioned in the Secretariat report while new, ongoing or proposed activities should be made in the capacity development report in the relevant CPM agenda. Concerning the selection of members of the CDC, this should be included in the Secretariat report.

[84] It was noted that it had been agreed during the June Bureau meeting that *Reports of Observer Organizations* should be prepared as papers only and that the activities mentioned should be specific to the IPPC. Additionally, some of the organizations may have a brief intervention. Some concern was raised, because there is a long tradition for observers to report to CPM. It was suggested that only those organizations with whom the IPPC has formal partnerships should intervene; others could present written reports. However, because it was felt that it is in the interest of the IPPC to have reports from e.g. STDF, WTO and CBD, the item was retained.

[85] It was noted that other items may be added later to the agenda, depending on the results of forthcoming meetings (such as the 2012 November SC).

[86] It was discussed whether to retain item 13 *Review of the status of plant protection in the world* because there is not currently an annual review of the status of plant protection in the world, so it could be covered in other items. In this context, it was suggested for NPPOs or RPPOs to submit success stories to the Secretariat and that these could then potentially be presented in a side-session. It was noted that the IPPC does review the status of plant protection worldwide but through a number of IPPC activities, not as a single report.

[87] The issue of poster sessions was discussed. Some of the challenges previously experienced include the lack of an appropriate space where to have the session. Considering participants pay for the cost of the session, the posters should have high visibility. It was noted that in a previous CPM the poster session

held in connection with the cocktail which had proved a great success. A suggestion was therefore made to have the session at the cocktail and then move the posters to the FAO Atrium afterwards. Further thought should go into this, because the cocktail is currently set to Thursday so moving the posters afterwards may not be an appropriate idea. If the Atrium was to be used, a high number of posters should be displayed, and in this context, the Secretariat mentioned that there could be quite a lot of IRSS material to explain their work on surveillance, review of ISPM 4, 6 and 8, etc.

[88] One option to explore was to combine the cocktail and poster session to be hosted by the Italian Ministry of Agriculture.

[89] The Bureau:

- (50) *decided* to not group the CPM-8 (2013) agenda items by SOs
- (51) *added* an item on the Strategic Framework which should be a report on implementation of the IPPC against SOs and should cover the review of status of plant protection in the world as well as IRSS
- (52) *agreed* that the item on IPPC CD completed activities should be added to the Secretariat report and that this should also contain information on the CDC
- (53) *agreed* that the IPPC CD strategies, work plan and budget should be retained as a separate item
- (54) *added* an agenda item on *Review of Information Exchange programme*
- (55) *added* a separate item for *Communication* with subsections on the *Communication Strategy* and on the *Communications work plan*
- (56) *added* the item *Liaison and partnerships* instead of *International promotion of the IPPC [...]* *organizations*
- (57) *agreed* to retain the items *IRSS* and *Scientific session* as standalone items, and that *ePhyto* should be added as a subsection under standard setting
- (58) *asked* the Secretariat to explore possibilities of collaborating with the Italian Ministry for Agriculture to host the poster session and cocktail combined, possibly also co-sponsored by industry organizations
- (59) *confirmed* the cocktail will take place on the Thursday of CPM.

OBJECTIVE Y. Efficient and effective administration

5.14 Update

5.14.1 Identifying the barriers to report writing and circulation

[90] The Chair noted that the CPM-7 (2012) report and the Bureau June 2012 report had both taken significant time to be finalized.

[91] As a suggestion on how to improve this, the Secretariat proposed that the Chair of any meeting should summarize every agenda item and relevant decisions. This facilitates the writing of the report and should ensure that there is internal agreement on the results of the topics being discussed in the meeting, thus also ensuring a quick turnaround.

[92] It was noted that in the future the CPM report should be ready in one month, considering it is adopted by CPM in plenary. The Secretariat recalled that it is not so much the report itself that takes time finalizing, but finalizing the appendixes. There was a suggestion to publish an advance copy of the report without appendixes, but no additional comment followed.

[93] The issue that documents going into meetings are often late was discussed and the Secretariat noted that the Secretariat staff has a number of engagements that often take priority over document preparation in order to ensure a functioning Secretariat, among others, administrative issues. Furthermore, it takes time and concentration to prepare quality papers. Additionally, there are several

activities that take place only shortly before meetings and sometimes papers can only be prepared in the last minute. Assistance from the members of the Bureau to prepare papers would be appreciated.

[94] The Bureau noted the Secretariat's explanations but reiterated that sufficient time is needed for the members to discuss the papers and issues within their regions.

[95] The Bureau:

(60) *supported* the notion that meetings should be conducted with the Chair of the meeting summarizing decisions after each agenda item in order to ensure agreement on the results of the discussion topics immediately after they have taken place.

(61) *asked* the Secretariat to endeavour to prepare papers well in advance, within the deadlines that were established by the Bureau¹²

(62) *noted* the Secretariat's intention to improve publishing of reports within the deadlines that were established by the Bureau.¹³

5.14.2 Liaison activities related to other organizations (e.g. SPS, STDF, CBD, etc.) including need to revisit Memoranda of Understanding or develop new ones

[96] The Bureau reviewed the 2012 October SPG discussion whether the IPPC should engage in other partnerships, such as with universities, research institutions or industry. It was proposed to explore strategically a Donors' Forum that could lead to resource mobilization, with a target for timing of the event in two to three years.

[97] The IPPC Secretariat mentioned liaison activities related to international organizations, noting that the IPPC Secretariat is very proactive and attempts to engage the Secretariats from the other organizations in building further partnerships. The IPPC Secretariat is exploring the possibility of a MoU with the SPS Secretariat. The Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the CBD secretariat will also be revised.

[98] The Bureau:

(63) *asked* the Secretariat to explore the idea of a Donors' Forum and report back to the Bureau's April 2013 meeting as well as to prepare a paper on the subject for the SPG 2013 meeting.

(64) *noted* that the Secretariat will revise the MoC with CBD

(65) *noted* that the Secretariat is actively exploring the possibility of an MoU with the SPS Secretariat

5.15 Resource mobilization

5.15.1 Marketing of the Online Comment System to Codex and OIE

The Secretariat is developing a working agreement that identifies which OCS maintenance and development costs would be shared with Codex. This agreement could also allow the Secretariat to recover the initial investments provided. This is yet to be discussed formally with Codex and will probably be done during the WTO-SPS meeting in October this year. The Secretariat also still needs to understand how to be able to maintain ownership of the development of the OCS while engaging new partners.

[99] It was asked whether there is an expectation the OCS would be provided free of charge to Codex, being an internal FAO group. The IPPC Secretariat hoped that past and future costs could be shared.

[100] One member stressed the need for a written agreement based on their own experiences.

[101] It was confirmed that the core system of the OCS will remain the same for all organizations that will benefit from it, but that the user interface will be slightly modified (i.e. logos, email links, etc.) to the organization's needs.

¹² Appendix 3 of the June 2011 Bureau meeting report

¹³ Appendix 3 of the June 2011 Bureau meeting report

[102] One member had noted that the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) commented on draft standards and asked which international organizations can comment on draft ISPMs and how they are invited. The Secretariat confirmed that international organizations can comment on draft ISPMs and that they receive an OCS password upon request.

[103] The Bureau:

(66) *welcomed* and *encouraged* the IPPC Secretariat to explore the possibility of engaging with other organizations in the further development of the OCS, with the possibility of generating additional income for the Secretariat

(67) *asked* the IPPC Secretariat to clarify which international organizations can comment on draft ISPMs and specifications in the OCS, what are the rules on giving access, and to report this information to the Bureau.

6. Bureau participation

6.1 Calendar 2012-2013

[104] The next meeting date was discussed and it was decided to have a virtual meeting, potentially using GoToMeeting software and should be a focused meeting of about three hours, because of time differences, to take place on 10 December 2012 at 1600h (Rome time), when the Chair and the member from the Asia Region will be in Rome. It was noted that the FC would convene on the morning of 10 December 2012 1100h (Rome time).

[105] The next face-to-face meeting of the Bureau will be Thursday and Friday, 4-5 April 2013, the week before CPM-8 (2013).

[106] The FC will tentatively meet on Wednesday, 3 April 2013 (previously scheduled for Sunday, 7 April 2013).

[107] It was noted that the Triennial review group would meet on Saturday, 6 April 2013.

[108] The Bureau

(68) *agreed* the next meeting will be a virtual meeting taking place on 10 December 2012 at 1600h (Rome time).

(69) *asked* the Secretariat to liaise with the members of the Bureau in time to ensure they do not have problems connecting to the virtual meeting.

(70) *noted* the Triennial Review group will meet on 6 April 2013.

(71) *noted* that the FC will tentatively meet on 3 April 2013.

6.2 Bureau communications between meetings

[109] The Chair enquired what members felt about the Bureau email communications between meetings and whether there would be a better means of communication. There was general agreement that email communication was fine.

[110] The Bureau:

(72) *encouraged* the members of the Bureau to participate actively in the email discussions between meetings.

7. Other business

[111] The chair opened for discussion the issue of induction for new IPPC members. It was noted that the Secretariat, in the past, had interacted with potential new members (although not on a regular basis) but that this had been limited to prior to their membership. It was agreed that the idea of providing an induction course was a good one but that visiting every new member country, while the best approach, was not possible as the resources are not currently available. The Secretariat suggested that a mentoring arrangement, possibly funded or supported by another contracting party and where another

CP takes on the duty of providing assistance in the form of mentoring to the new member may be a viable alternate approach. It was suggested that for purpose of quality assurance that the CP who volunteers to prepare the training materials could develop them in collaboration with the Secretariat. ., . It was noted that one of the candidates to the CDC could have some experience of this subject and it was suggested to contact the person to enquire of possible ideas.

- [112] As regards the next Bureau update, it was suggested it should include: (i) information about the revised funding criteria, (ii) encourage contacts to use available IPPC advocacy material, (iii) thank the USA for contributions and (iv) mentioning the call for speakers to scientific sessions.
- [113] The Secretariat introduced revised TORs and ROPs of the SPG noting that the comments produced during the SPG had been incorporated. The issue was discussed briefly and it was suggested to review the TORs further.
- [114] A member asked whether the IPPC Secretariat report that will be presented to the SPS committee was available, stressing that this is a very valuable paper to show NPPOs what the IPPC has been doing. The Secretariat answered that it is being finalized and will distribute it to the Bureau when available.
- [115] Ms Yim (Republic of Korea) informed the Bureau that the Republic of Korea wishes to contribute USD 10 000 for printing IPPC advocacy material, noting that the request should be made before December.
- [116] One Bureau member asked whether revision of the IPPC should be considered and, if so, what was the process. This was thought to be appropriate to discuss at the next SPG, following consideration by the June 2013 Bureau meeting.
- [117] The Bureau:
- (73) *asked* New Zealand to contact Ms Sally Jennings, newly appointed to the CDC, to explore her interest in development of the training materials, in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat, for the induction course for new members to the IPPC.
 - (74) *asked* the Chair to draft the Bureau update within two weeks and circulate it for comments from Bureau members and the Secretariat
 - (75) *asked* the Bureau members to review the revised TORs and ROPs of the SPG and submit comments to the Secretariat by the end of November 2012 to be presented to CPM-8 (2013) (the Secretariat will circulate an electronic version)
 - (76) *asked* the Secretariat to distribute the SPS paper to the Bureau when available
 - (77) *thanked* the Rep. of Korea for their contribution
 - (78) *noted* that revision of the IPPC will be discussed at the 2013 June Bureau meeting.

8. Close of meeting

- [118] The Chair, after thanking the participants for their contributions to the meeting, and the Secretariat for its support, closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1: Agenda**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Bureau Meeting**

12 October 2012

FAO, Rome, Italy

(CANADA Room - Friday Start time: 09:00)

AGENDA

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
1. Opening of the meeting	--	Yokoi
2. Adoption of the agenda	Bureau 2012/Oct_01	Ashby
To include review of SPG discussions needing Bureau opinion		
3. Housekeeping		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents List • Participants List • Local information 	Bureau 2012/Oct_02 Bureau 2012/Oct_03 Bureau 2012/Oct_04	Fedchock
4. Report of last meeting & Action points	https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded_restricted/1349458097_Report_Bureau_2012Jun_2012-10-05.pdf	Ashby
5. Updates on CPM Work Programme		
Objective A. Protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread		
5.1 Information exchange	<i>Oral</i>	Nowell
5.1.1 Review of the IPPC Information Exchange Programme	https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1349703970_SPG_2012_18_Inf_Exch_2012-10-08.pdf	Nowell
Objective B. Protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests		
5.2 Cooperation Agreement		
5.2.1 Ozone Secretariat MoU		Yokoi
5.3 Partnership Agreement		Fedchock
Objective C. Facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically based phytosanitary measures		
5.4 ePhyto (if necessary following SPG)		Nowell
5.4.1 ePhyto	https://www.ippc.int/file_uploaded/1349704916_SPG_2012_17_FeasibilityStudy_ePh.pdf	Nowell
5.5 IRSS		Sosa
5.5.1 Review of request for additional work (Concept notes)	Bureau 2012/Oct_XX	Sosa
Objective D. Develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish A, B and C.		

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
5.6 Capacity Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Development Committee (Bureau members to have ensured nominations for their regions) Regional workshops to review draft ISPMs 	Bureau 2012/Oct_07	Sosa/Gardnester
5.6.1 Technical consultation among RPPOs	Bureau 2012/Oct_05	Sosa
Objective X. Effective Collaboration with members and stakeholders		
5.7 Update: Staffing and FAO Reform	<i>Oral</i>	Fedchock
5.8 Review of 2012 Operational Plan / Budget	<i>Oral</i>	Fedchock
5.8.1 Report of Finance Committee meeting		Yim
5.9 Implementation of Communication strategy	<i>Oral</i>	Nowell
5.10 Amendment of CPM rules		Ashby
5.10.1 Election of chair and vice-chair	<i>Oral</i>	Thomson
5.11 Rules of procedure for the Bureau	Bureau 2012/Oct_06	Ashby
5.12 Progress on FAO Reform and Article XIV body review		Fedchock
5.13 CPM-8 (2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outstanding action items Draft agenda for CPM-8 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Deadlines Possible draft ISPMs Probit 9 Speakers Ministerial participation Poster sessions and side event Report and ISPMs as links 	Bureau 2012/Oct_XX	Ashby
5.14 Dates of meetings for 2012-2013		Fedchock
Objective Y. Efficient and Effective Administration		
5.15 Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying the barriers to report writing and circulation Liaison activities related to other organizations (e.g. SPS, STDF, CBD, etc.) including need to revisit Memoranda of Understanding or develop new ones (WTO?) 	<i>Oral</i>	Fedchock
5.16 Resource mobilization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.16.1 Marketing of the OCS to Codex and OIE 	<i>Oral</i>	Fedchock
6. Bureau participation:		Ashby
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> calendar 2012-2013 Bureau communications between meetings 		

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
7. Other business		Ashby
8. Next meeting		Ashby

APPENDIX 2: Participants list

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
Bureau Meeting

PARTICIPANTS LIST

12 October 2012
(FAO CANADA Room)

A (√) indicates attendance at the meeting

CPM-7 (2012) Bureau members

√	Member of the Bureau / Chair	<p>Mr Steve ASHBY Food and Environment Research Agency, DEFRA Plant Health Policy Programme Sand Hutton - York UK YO41 1LZ Tel: (+44) 0 1904 465633</p>	steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk	3 rd term / 2 years	2014	Europe/ United Kingdom
√	Member of the Bureau / Vice-Chair	<p>Mr Mohammad KATBEH BADER Director of Phytosanitary Department Ministry of Agriculture P.O. Box 11732 662, Amman JORDAN Tel: (+962) 6 568 6151/795 895 691 Fax: (+962) 6 568 6310</p>	katbehbader@moa.gov.jo	3 rd term / 2 years	2014	Near East/ Jordan
√	Member of the Bureau	<p>Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Export Management Division Department of Plant Quarantine Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency MIFFAF 433-1 Anyang- 6 dong Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016) Gyunggi-do Tel: (+82) 31 420-7665 Fax: (+82) 31 420-7605</p>	koyim@korea.kr	2 st term / 2 years	2014	Asia/ Republic of Korea
√		<p>Mr Peter THOMSON Director - Plants, Food & Environment, Ministry for Primary Industries 25 The Terrace, Pastoral House PO Box 2526, Wellington Tel: (+64) 4 894 0353 Mbl: (+64) 29 894 0353</p>	peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz			South West Pacific / New Zealand

√	Member of the Bureau	Mr John GREIFER Assistant Deputy Administrator Plant Protection and Quarentine Animal Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture RM 1128 South Building, USDA 1400 Independence Ave. Washington DC 20250 Tel.: (+1) 202 799-7159 Fax: (+1) 202 690-0472	john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov	2 st term / 2 years	2014	North America/ USA
√	Member of the Bureau	M Lucien Konan KOUAME' Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du Controle et de la Qualité Point de contact de la CIPV - Ministère de l'agriculture B.P. V. 94 , Abidjan Tel: (+225) 07903754 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	lucien.kouame@aviso.ci	1 st term / 2 years	2014	Africa/ Côte d'Ivoire
√	Member of the Bureau	Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ Director of Plant Health Plant Health Department Belize Agricultural Health Authority Central Farm, Cayo District Tel: (+501) 824-4899 Mbl: (+501) 604-0319 Fax: (+501) 824-3773	frankpest@yahoo.com	3 nd term / 2 years	2014	Latin America and Caribbea n/ Belize

IPPC Secretariat

√	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Yukio YOKOI Secretary to the IPPC	yukoi.yokoi@fao.org			
√		Mr Craig FEDCHOCK Coordinator	craig.fedchock@fao.org			
√		Mr David NOWELL Information Exchange	dave.nowell@fao.org			
√		Ms Celine Germain Standards Setting	celine.germain@fao.org			
√		Mr Orlando SOSA IRSS	orlando.sosa@fao.org			
√		Ms Eva MOLLER Note-taker	eva.moller@fao.org			

APPENDIX 3: Action list from the October 2012 Bureau meeting

	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
1.	Encourage regions and RPPOs to fulfil reporting obligations	Bureau members	Ongoing
2.	Explore opportunities for speakers for the opening ceremony i.e. the Italian Minister for Agriculture and an FAO senior manager who could speak about the link between the IPPC and food security	Secretariat	31 December 2012
3.	Explore getting ministerial video speeches, as was done at CPM-7 (2012)	Bureau members	31 December 2012
4.	Call for speakers for Probit 9	Secretariat	30 November 2012
5.	Confirm if the IPPC Secretariat can fund speakers for the scientific sessions	Secretariat	30 November 2012
6.	Report to the CPM on the implications of the MoU in terms of methyl bromide exemptions for quarantine use.	Secretariat	15 December 2012
7.	Confirm dates for the ePhyto workshop to be held in Brazil in November	Secretariat	COMPLETED
8.	Explore with the donor (IRSS) the possibility of getting additional funding for translations of questionnaires to ensure broad participation	Secretariat (IRSS)	April 2013 Bureau meeting
9.	Coordinate the nominations for the alternate members of the CDC	Bureau members	April 2013 Bureau meeting
10.	Explore a clearer way to distinguish between the different member consultation periods in the OCS	Secretariat (Standard Setting)	Before next member consultation
11.	Secretariat to continue to work with the FAO Legal Service on the issue of registration of the ISPM 15 mark.	Secretariat	Continuing
12.	Organize a side session or evening session at CPM-8 (2013) on information exchange implementation	Secretariat (Information Exchange)	31 December 2013
13.	Obtain advice from FAO legal office regarding the criteria for maintaining RPPO status	Secretariat	April 2013 Bureau meeting
14.	Consider the issue of prioritizing DP development	Standards Committee	November 2012 SC meeting
15.	Discuss suggestions for scientific sessions for future CPM sessions	Bureau	April 2013 Bureau meeting
16.	Cluster the IPPC budget in SOs	Secretariat (Coordinator)	15 December 2012
17.	Revise the Communication plan to focus on fewer subjects and to cover at least two years (2013-14)	Secretariat (Information Exchange)	December 2012
18.	Seek clarification from FAO legal on which ROPs of the CPM would need to be changed based on the SPG discussions	Secretariat	30 November 2012
19.	Present a proposal for a CPM recommendation to complement the ROPs of the CPM	Secretariat	15 December 2012
20.	Seek advice from FAO legal whether the CPM Bureau ROPs could be a CPM recommendation, to facilitate adoption and amendment	Secretariat	April 2013 Bureau meeting
21.	Propose the CPM Bureau ROPs as a CPM recommendation (dependent on point 19)	Secretariat	30 November 2012
22.	Seek clarification on the implications of Art. XIV autonomy for the	Secretariat	30 November 2012

	IPPC		
23.	Set up meeting with the DG of FAO in December 2012	Secretariat with the Bureau Chair	30 November 2012
24.	Invite FAO Legal Services to CPM-8 to answer any query from CPs on the question of IPPC Article 14 autonomy	Secretariat	15 December 2012
25.	Explore possibilities of collaborating with the Italian Ministry for Agriculture to host the poster session and cocktail combined, possibly also co-sponsored by industry organizations	Secretariat	30 November 2012
26.	Explore the idea of a Donors' Forum	Secretariat	April 2013 Bureau meeting
27.	Clarify which international organizations can comment on draft ISPMs and specifications in the OCS, and what the rules are on giving access	Secretariat (Standard Setting)	April 2013 Bureau meeting
28.	Liaise with Bureau members in time to ensure they do not have problems connecting to the virtual meeting taking place on 10 December 2012	Secretariat	5 December 2012
29.	Contact Ms Sally Jennings, newly appointed to the CDC, to see if she is interested in development of the training materials, in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat, for the introduction course for new members to the IPPC.	New Zealand	30 November 2012
30.	Review the revised TORs and ROPs of the SPG and submit comments to the Secretariat	Bureau members	30 November 2012
31.	Distribute the SPS paper to the Bureau when available	Secretariat (Coordinator)	COMPLETED

APPENDIX 4: Revised draft Rules of Procedure for the CPM Bureau

DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Rule 1. Purpose of the Bureau

The purpose of the Bureau is to provide guidance to the CPM on the strategic direction, financial and operational management of its activities in cooperation with others as approved by CPM.

As appropriate, members of the Bureau will also assist the CPM in its administrative, and operational duties. The Bureau provides continuity in the management of the CPM and, through representation of all FAO regions, facilitates the expression of all viewpoints on strategic, administrative and procedural matters on an ongoing basis.

Rule 2. Functions of the Bureau

The Bureau shall have the following functions:

Ensuring the efficient implementation of the CPM work programme in coordination with the Secretariat.

Making recommendations to improve CPM management and delivery of strategic directions, financial and operational activities.

Assisting with the administrative, and operational duties of the CPM in areas such as:

- Delivery of the IPPC Strategic Framework
- Addressing specific issues assigned to it by the CPM
- Assist with financial planning and management

Providing advice, guidance and direction to subsidiary and other bodies in between plenary sessions of the CPM

Rule 3. Membership

The members of the Bureau shall be elected by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures(CPM) as per Rule II of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM. Members serve for terms of two years, and shall be eligible for election for another two consecutive terms in the same office. In exceptional circumstances, an IPPC Contracting Party, may submit a request to the CPM for an exemption to allow a member to serve an additional term(s).

Rule 4. Replacement of members

With reference to the Rules of Procedure for the CPM, Contracting Parties shall nominate replacements for members of the Bureau and submit them to the CPM for confirmation. The replacement should be eligible to be a member as set forth in these Rules. Each FAO region shall identify a maximum of two potential replacements.

If a member of the Bureau becomes unavailable for a meeting, his/her respective replacement may substitute for him/her during that specific meeting. If it becomes apparent to the IPPC Secretary that a member of the Bureau is unable to complete their term, if they resign or if they fail to attend two consecutive meetings, the replacement member will complete the term of the member of the Bureau.

Rule 5. Chairperson

The Chairperson of the CPM shall be the Chairperson of the Bureau.

Rule 6. Meetings

Bureau meetings shall be convened by the IPPC Secretary. A majority of the members of the Bureau shall constitute a quorum. The Bureau shall meet twice a year or as required. The IPPC Secretary may also convene a meeting of the Bureau if necessary to enable any outstanding specific activities to be undertaken before the next CPM or scheduled Bureau meeting.

In the absence of the Chair, a Vice Chair, selected by the CPM Bureau will chair the meeting.

Meetings of the Bureau shall be closed unless otherwise determined by the Bureau. The Bureau may invite experts to provide advice or information on specific matters. The IPPC Secretary or designate shall attend the meetings of the Bureau.

Rule 7. Decision making

Decisions will be made by consensus. Situations where consensus cannot be reached shall be described in the meeting reports and presented to the CPM for guidance and appropriate action.

Rule 8. Documentation, records and reports

The Secretary, in consultation with the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairpersons of the CPM, shall prepare a provisional agenda for the Bureau meetings and make it available to members of the Bureau preferably four weeks prior to the beginning of each meeting.

The Secretariat shall make meeting documents available to Bureau members as soon as possible after the preparation of the provisional agenda.

The Secretariat shall keep the records of the Bureau and minutes of the Bureau meetings. A report should be available within one month after each meeting and posted on the IPP.

The Chairperson shall submit a yearly report to the CPM on the activities of the Bureau.

Rule 9. Language

The business of the Bureau shall be conducted in English, unless otherwise decided by the Bureau.

Rule 10. Amendment

These Rules and amendments or additions thereto shall be adopted by two thirds majority of the members of the Commission present and voting, provided that not less than 24 hours notice of the proposal for the amendment or addition has been given.

APPENDIX 5: Report of the IPPC Financial Committee meeting, October 2012

(see next page)



REPORT

Rome, Italy
8 Oct. 2012

Meeting of the IPPC Financial Committee October, 2012



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
2. Adoption of the agenda.....	3
3. Housekeeping	3
4. Report of last meeting.....	3
6. Updates of financial summary for 2012 (including variation analysis).....	4
7. New and emerging issues	5
7.1 Updates.....	5
8. FC 2012 Work Programme.....	5
8.1 Resource mobilization.....	5
8.1.a Development of documents for potential donors	5
8.1.b Analysis of use of multi-donor trust fund	6
8.1.c (ex item 10) Opportunities arising	7
8.1.d Process for developing funding proposals.....	7
8.2 Financial process.....	8
8.2.a Sharing templates for standardized budgeting and reporting	8
8.2.b Financial reports to be presented to CPM (format and status snapshot)	8
8.3 Consideration of external participants (14.53 – 1h).....	9
8.4 2013 IPPC budget	9
9. 2013 Work Programme	9
10. Discussions on agenda items for next meeting.....	10
11. Other business.....	10
12. Next meeting (scheduling).....	10
13. Close of meeting.....	10

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda	11
APPENDIX 2 - Documents list.....	13
APPENDIX 3 - Participants list.....	14
APPENDIX 4 - Revised IPPC Financial Committee Working Arrangement.....	16
APPENDIX 5 - Revised Resource mobilization efforts and results	17
APPENDIX 6 - IPPC Financial Committee Work Programme 2013	21
APPENDIX 7 - Action points from the FC October 2012 meeting	22

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The Secretary welcomed the members of the Financial Committee (FC) to the meeting. The Secretariat noted that one member of the first FC had left, and that a replacement had not been found. Mr KOUAMÉ (Côte d'Ivoire) was not be able to attend the meeting due to travel delays.
- [2] The FC elected Ms YIM (Rep. of Korea) as Chair and agreed not to select a Rapporteur. (The draft report will be prepared by the Secretariat and circulated for comments.) The Secretariat thanked the Chair for taking on the role.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The FC made a number of changes to the Agenda and adopted it as revised ([Appendix 1](#)).

3. Housekeeping

- [4] The Documents List and Participants List were reviewed and noted ([Appendix 2](#) and [3](#)).

4. Report of last meeting

- [5] The FC reviewed the report of the FC June 2012 meeting.
- [6] At the first meeting, Rules of Procedure (ROPs) (renamed as Working Arrangement) had been discussed in relation to the Terms of Reference (TORs). It was noted that the structure of the committee should not be too formal. Regarding the work programme, some critical issues related to the multi-donor trust fund (MTF) had been discussed. Specifically, it was noted that while there are several advantages to the MTF, one disadvantage is that it is harder to track expenditures against activities compared to unilateral trust funds (TF) that have funds allocated to specific projects. On the other hand, staff spend significant amounts of time reporting on the unilateral TFs. Resource mobilization was discussed, and will be further elaborated on in this meeting.
- [7] Another issue arising from the first meeting is to develop standardized budget reporting and monitoring formats. While information relevant to this topic had been requested from members of the FC in the previous meeting, no such information had been provided. Budget monitoring will be discussed further in the current meeting, specifically about what to present to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).
- [8] There was discussion on what the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), the CPM and the CPM Bureau (Bureau) need to be informed about because, while the SPG has historically been the body charged with discussing budget related issues, there needs to be a change now that the FC is established. It was clarified that the SPG may discuss the budget superficially through a narrative report, whereas the FC should discuss the budget in greater detail. The FC meetings should focus on the budget discussions, while the SPG should focus on the diminishing MTF contributions.
- [9] The problem of coordination of the back to back meetings (FC, SPG and Bureau) was mentioned and there was a general agreement that the Secretariat should not have to duplicate efforts for the preparations of meetings.
- [10] It was noted that the Terms of Reference (TORs) of the FC did not perfectly correspond between *Appendix 5 Draft working arrangement of the IPPC Financial Committee*, and those in section 5 and 6 of the FC June 2012 report. The former uses the term *Roles* whereas *functions* are mentioned in the TORs. The Working Arrangement should be an informal agreement that can be changed and thus it should not be adopted by the CPM. The Secretariat noted that some countries may comment that if the working agreements are indeed ROPs, these would normally have to be adopted by CPM.
- [11] It was generally felt that the FC, being a subcommittee of the Bureau, should first report to the Bureau and through the Bureau to the CPM. One member noted that the idea of the FC was to provide additional transparency on spending to guarantee contracting parties that their funds are correctly

spent. If the FC does not assist in doing this, the FC would otherwise only help the Secretariat budget for the coming year. Some concern was expressed that the work of the FC was not publicly available. In this context, it was noted that the Bureau report has the FC report annexed, and the Bureau report is public. For transparency purposes, the posting of FC documents publicly should be considered. However, it was mentioned that there may be some confidentiality issues. The current working arrangements outline that confidentiality should be upheld, e.g. by mentioning this on the FC documents, so it may not be possible to make all documents public.

[12] The FC:

- (1) *decided* to revise the draft FC Working Arrangement ([Appendix 4](#)) to ensure alignment with the TORs, and *agreed* that this new arrangement should be changeable as needed and thus not have to be adopted by the CPM
- (2) *confirmed* that the reporting of FC activities for CPM should be through the Bureau report.

6. Updates of financial summary for 2012 (including variation analysis)

[13] The Secretariat provided an overview of the current IPPC financial situation¹. The total operational budget for the IPPC is USD 3 927 000 for 2012. The largest portion is funded by FAO regular programme (RP) (53 percent of the total budget and 36 percent of the operational budget). The IPPC TF represents 28 percent of the operational budget and the capacity development trust fund and the EU TFs for specific purposes also count for very significant portions of the budget.

[14] It is anticipated that most funds will be fully spent with the exception of a carryover to 2013 of approximately USD 658 000 from the IPPC TF. It was noted that efforts are made to spend all RP funds to demonstrate that the funds provided by FAO are used to produce the results expected.

[15] Final accuracy of expenditures can only be given after the so-called *thirteenth* fiscal month during which any outlying expenditures are reviewed and accounted for, and where monies may be moved around to ensure full expenditures on some accounts and no deficits on others.

[16] In 2012, Republic of Korea contributed USD 100 000, Switzerland contributed CHF 300 000 giving the first tranche of CHE 150 000 (approximately USD 158 000) and New Zealand has given clear indication of a commitment of USD 30 000. Recently, Japan, and United States of America provided contributions to hire experts to work in the Secretariat. There are no other firm contribution commitments for 2013. It was underlined that the IPPC TF needs additional funding in the future to ensure delivery of the work plan. In this context, it was highlighted that resource mobilization efforts need to be increased.

[17] The Secretariat was complimented for the paper presented because it was felt that it was very clear and concise and exactly what is needed. The CPM will be able to use this type of reporting to easily consider priorities.

[18] It was suggested that inclusion of outturn figures, e.g. in the 2012 report these would be the final spend for 2011, would help illustrate the actual costs of activities in the programme. The Secretariat was concerned that given the change in describing the work programme arising from the adoption of the strategic framework this would be a challenge. It might be easier for subsequent years' reports.

[19] It was suggested that staff allotments should be shown in the overview (i.e. not only operational budget) because it would evidence the RP funds spent and ensure clarity for donors on any kind of decrease in RP allocations. It was noted that staff costs are naturally high in an international organization where there is a need for expertise.

[20] The FC:

- (3) *noted* the updates of financial situations of 2012

¹ IPPCFC_2012-Oct_05

- (4) *asked* the Secretariat to work towards adding outturn data
- (5) *decided* to show staff allotments as well as aggregated approximate figures in the overall budget presentation to the CPM for transparency purposes

7. New and emerging issues

[21] The Secretariat introduced the agenda item and noted that, although there is no firm information, some reduction in RP budget is anticipated for the upcoming biennium (2014-15). It is also anticipated that the IPPC TF may not receive as many funds in the coming biennium as previous years, so the carryover between the years will be decreasing. Unfortunately, the IPPC Secretariat is not informed of the final budget allocation (and possible cuts) until very late in the year.

7.1 Updates

[22] A number of updates of relevance to the FC were mentioned:

- (1) development of the new four strategic objectives (SOs) under FAO reform for the next biennium against the current 11 SOs
- (2) preparation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Ozone Secretariat which is planned for signature in November
- (3) the improved situation regarding FAO territorial recognition issues, allowing the IPPC Secretariat to resume the work related to STDF and participate in the relevant meetings (with the exception of participation in meetings taking place in territories not recognized by the United Nations)
- (4) the ongoing review of the Memorandum of Cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) which could be linked to financial implications, e.g. Global Environment Facility (GEF), the designated funding mechanism of CBD, and it was suggested that a background document on phytosanitary funding from GEF would be useful
- (5) ongoing discussions on the Article XIV bodies in relevant FAO meetings, including the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) and FAO Financial Committee, noting that particular attention should be paid to a document prepared on this issue because it is also critical for the long-term financial status of the IPPC
- (6) a new operational system to be introduced in FAO (GRMS) at the end of October, which could affect IPPC financial reporting.

[23] The FC:

- (7) *noted* the current Secretariat updates
- (8) *asked* the Bureau and the Secretariat to prepare an appropriate response to the Article XIV body issue.

8. FC 2012 Work Programme

8.1 Resource mobilization

8.1.a Development of documents for potential donors

[24] The Secretariat presented the paper² noting there is some guidance available to FAO staff members on how to approach donors, but that there is no availability of any standard documents. The reason for this may be that there has not been a corporate resource mobilization strategy until recently. The discussion centred on the need for linking the documentation to the actual donor. The most important task is to assess how the donor may benefit.

[25] Knowledge of donor demands and their areas of interest should be identified after screening efforts and relevant follow-up actions need to be planned.

² IPPCFC_2012-Oct_06

- [26] It was suggested that the Secretariat provides a list of potential donors and the FC assists in prioritizing which donors to focus on.
- [27] With regard to the *Introductory Guidelines*, the need for a brochure for non-experts or laypersons was stressed. The brochure should demonstrate how the IPPC is linked to alleviation of hunger, environmental protection and trade facilitation in clear concise language, together with PowerPoint presentations on those subjects which are targeted at specific donors. The FC believed that resource mobilization is partly a public relations issue and persuasive material that could be understood by laypersons is fundamental. For instance, it is clear that the general public is interested in topics only once it is clear how they affect human life and wellbeing, rather than diseased or dying plants. Furthermore, the brochure should be developed in a manner that would also link easily to the IPPC SOs.
- [28] The Secretariat introduced a document³ that describes how the Secretariat can focus on fewer donors and the resources which are needed.
- [29] The FC considered that it would be easier to draw donor attention to specific standards such as those related to air containers, sea containers, or waste in international travel.
- [30] Another suggestion was to focus on implementation issues, because this is normally in the interest of industry (whose interest is in ensuring that costs can be reduced), noting that part of the funds could be used for the development of standards. The FC could facilitate providing this kind of documentation to donors, explaining implementation issues of a specific standard.
- [31] There was general agreement that while contributions for specific activities should be sought, it should not be the donors who determine the work programme.
- [32] It was suggested that one standard should be selected, for which an action plan would be prepared for the June 2013 meeting, linked to the development of a general action plan for resource mobilization based on the elements presented in the introduced document.
- [33] Reference was made to previous discussions and it was agreed that the first step of the current plan should still be to produce the public relations material, to have a proper basis on which to build up the efforts.
- [34] The FC:
- (9) *decided* that the first step in the resource mobilization process would be to produce IPPC brochures understandable by non-experts
 - (10) *agreed* that a first draft of the brochure should be ready for review at the June 2013 FC meeting
 - (11) *asked* the Secretariat to provide a list of potential donors for the FC to make a prioritization on which donors to focus on.
 - (12) *noted* that the Secretariat would commence work on a resource mobilization action plan and an action plan for a selected standard
 - (13) *suggested* that the IPPC Advocacy Officer should partner with Ms YIM (Rep. of Korea) and Mr LOPIAN (Finland) in order to have the IPPC historical and technical approach when developing proposals.

8.1.b Analysis of use of multi-donor trust fund

- [35] The Secretariat presented a paper⁴ providing a brief summary of the different nature and arrangements of the various TFs currently available under the IPPC framework. It was noted that the rate of project

³ IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_11 (agenda item ex10)

⁴ IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_07

support costs (PSC)⁵ of the IPPC multi-donor trust fund (IPPC TF) is 6%. This is currently the lowest rate applicable with the exception of the EU trust fund. Further discussions with the EU may be needed to try to broaden the scope of the EU TF.

[36] As the guidelines of the MTF (Attachment 2 of the paper) did not seem to align with real needs, the FC considered that review and revision of the guidelines should be undertaken in order to broaden the scope to include funding for standards development, among other things.

[37] In this context, donor recognition was brought up because it was noted that a donor may be more interested in having a unilateral TF, even if the PSC is higher, because of the ability to be recognized and have greater control on the activities being carried out, whereas donations made to the MTF may seem more anonymous. It was stressed that contributions should be properly recognized while it was noted that some in-kind contributions may be difficult to recognize in an appropriate manner, as is the case with hosting of meetings where the total contribution may be hard to determine.

[38] A suggestion was made that donations should be categorized as financial contributions, hosting of meetings, etc. to facilitate the recognition of the various donors and their specific donations at CPM.

[39] It was further noted that donors should be consulted on their wish for recognition because some donations may be small and the donor may not feel comfortable with making that information public.

[40] The FC:

- (14) *agreed* to revise the guidelines for the MTF within the next two years (2014) to give more flexibility and broaden the scope of the MTF
- (15) *agreed* to enquire with the AGP budget assistant whether the 6% PSC rate can be kept when the guidelines are revised
- (16) *agreed* to enhance recognition of donors and their donations.

8.1.c (ex item 10) Opportunities arising

[41] The Secretariat introduced a paper⁶ on resource mobilization efforts and results (revised after meeting; [Appendix 5](#)) asking if there would be any improvements on the communication provided to the CPM. The Secretariat was asked to make the necessary adjustments for consistency in use of language.

[42] Responding the query on branding efforts, the Secretariat presented a capacity development brochure as an example of branded material, which can be used when meeting potential donors. The FC expressed its appreciation for the professional lay-out of the brochure.

[43] The FC:

- (17) *agreed* to keep the table of contributions combined and not divide it up in financial and in-kind contributions and to not mentioned the amounts
- (18) *asked* the Secretariat to double-check the content of the table of contributions is correct
- (19) *asked* the Secretariat to ensure coherent wording in the report on resource mobilization efforts and results
- (20) *agreed* to report to the CPM only the ongoing efforts that are effectively resulting in contributions

8.1.d Process for developing funding proposals

[44] This agenda item was not further discussed, because the FC found that it had been fully covered in 8.1.a.

⁵ Project support costs (PSC) are imposed on trust funds as a fund operation support cost which covers services such as recruitment/personnel servicing, external and internal audits, procurement services, trip arrangement and other administrative support.

⁶ IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_10

8.2 Financial process

8.2.a Sharing templates for standardized budgeting and reporting

- [45] A suggestion was made regarding FC standardized budgeting and reporting. It was suggested that a standardized budget format showing what has been spent and on what activities would be a good tool also for resource mobilization purposes. The standardized EPPO budget reporting format may be a useful tool to be considered for future use. Additionally, different times of the year should see the production of different standardized reports, e.g. a statement of expenditures would be presented at the end or beginning of a year. This would be a way to increase donor confidence because it would be easier to understand the reports.
- [46] Standardized reports of FC meetings may also decrease reporting time and this is an important point because there are not enough resources in the Secretariat to do extra reporting.
- [47] The FC:
- (21) *agreed* to produce a standardized budget reporting format.
 - (22) *asked* Mr LOPIAN (Finland) to draft a standardized budget reporting format starting in December 2012
 - (23) *asked* Ms YIM (Rep. of Korea) to draft a standardized report format of FC meetings.

8.2.b Financial reports to be presented to CPM (format and status snapshot)

- [48] The Secretariat presented the paper⁷ on financial reporting to the SPG and the CPM, as well as the draft financial report to CPM-8, for the purpose of discussing possible improvements to easily capture the overall financial situation.
- [49] The standardized structure for the budget and the financial report should be maintained in a consistent format to ensure that Contracting Parties (CPs) are accustomed to the finances of the IPPC. A suggestion was made to add the 2013 budget figures in this paper and title it “budget proposal”. The CPM would need to see approximate figures in order to determine priorities as well as to understand that when new activities are proposed there will be a need for additional monetary support for those activities. It was also noted that showing the full figures increase transparency. The level of breakdown may be discussed, e.g. with regards to staff costs.
- [50] The Secretariat expressed some concern about a high level of detail because this may result in detailed discussions during CPM. It was suggested that these discussions could be directed at the FC. Another suggestion was to add 2011 figures to display expenditures over the years on the specific activities. This may be challenging because the SOs have changed since then and thus also the reporting scheme. For the coming years, however, this should not be an issue, and a three year period (previous-present-future) could easily be shown to demonstrate the difference in expenditures on specific activities. In this context the FC agreed that it is in the interest of donors to see aggregated figures historically to get an overview.
- [51] Another issue for transparency relates to the management of RP and TF monies because RP is also linked to general FAO budgeting regulations. Issues could arise if the CPM discusses the full budget. However, it was felt that if RP expenditures are shown clearly, CPs can see that FAO also contributes to the mandate of the IPPC and donors will be less reluctant to make contributions.
- [52] If the operational costs are shown, then this should be clear in the title of the document. Staff costs are to be presented separately.

⁷ IPPCFC_2012-Oct_08

[53] The FC:

- (24) *agreed* that the financial report should reflect approximate figures and be as full as possible for the purpose of transparency. The most important thing is that it is accurate and there is consistency between documents
- (25) *agreed* that the FC will check the final budget related papers to be presented to the CPM, if the papers are available in time
- (26) *agreed* to have a full budget pie-chart as well as a separate operational cost pie-chart and to have a table containing detailed information on RP and TF expenditures
- (27) *agreed* to add budget information for a three year period (past-present-future) to demonstrate expenditure developments on specific activities, noting that the standardized reporting format should assist the Secretariat in preparing this information.

8.3 Consideration of external participants (14.53 – 1h)

[54] Although the various potential benefits arising from inviting external participants were discussed, it was felt it was too early to decide on this, but that it should be discussed at future meetings when specific needs arise.

The FC:

- (28) *confirmed* that external participants for specific purposes (budget assistants, STDF or similar) can be invited but that they are not considered as members
- (29) *agreed* that the possibility of an external member should be discussed in the future when the FC has functioned for a while and the needs of the committee can be better assessed.

8.4 2013 IPPC budget

[55] The Secretariat presented a detailed 2013 budget and noted that there are some activities performed by the Secretariat for which there are no direct budget allocations. Some of these activities may not be able to be carried out in the future should the general budget be reduced significantly.

[56] The Secretariat introduced the 2013 financial report and budget. The ability of TF monies to be transferred across accounts was stressed because the current budget may change based on actual expenditures to cover e.g. less spending than anticipated on RP.

[57] A question was raised about the mission of pest reporting. The purpose of that activity is to improve reporting. A second question was related to the IRSS help desk to which no funding had been allocated. It was felt that this component should be initiated to start with rather than subsequently.

[58] The FC:

- (30) *noted* the 2013 IPPC budget.

9. 2013 Work Programme

[59] The FC discussed the 2013 work programme⁸ that had been developed from discussions in the FC June 2012 meeting. The work programme was adjusted to reflect discussions ([Appendix 6](#)).

[60] It was pointed out that the activities related to monitoring budget and financial reporting should be added.

[61] The FC should work with the Secretariat to produce these documents as well as check other relevant budget documents in January / February for CPM-8 (2013).

[62] There were some discussions on the function of the two FC meetings (June and October) and it was agreed that it may be more appropriate to carry out budget planning at the October meeting, because

⁸ IPPCFC_2012-Oct_09

FAO's fiscal year is a calendar year, and focus the June meeting on checking and monitoring the expenditures. This would also be in line with follow up from the CPM. Finally, in January or February there should be a final review of the budget (possibly a virtual meeting) with the purpose of reporting to the CPM.

[63] The FC:

- (31) *decided* to have a generic work programme from year to year with specific tasks that will change depending on the year
- (32) *agreed* that the work programme will be presented to the CPM for noting.

10. Discussions on agenda items for next meeting

[64] As the meeting itself was not fixed, agenda items for next meeting were not discussed.

11. Other business

[65] The FC discussed the selection of a permanent Chair and Vice-chair of the FC. It was decided not to select a Vice-chair. Ms YIM (Rep. of Korea) was selected permanent Chair. The appointment length will be subject to the terms of the Bureau members. It was agreed that no replacements are needed, but the Bureau will discuss the replacement when the actual need arises.

[66] The FC:

- (33) *decided* to not select a Vice-chair or replacements
- (34) *selected* Ms YIM as permanent chair of the FC.

12. Next meeting (scheduling)

[67] The Bureau will discuss a possible meeting in December and if the Bureau meeting is fixed, the FC will decide on whether to hold a back to back meeting on that occasion. In January / February there could be a virtual meeting. A physical meeting should be held the day before the Bureau meeting in April and it was agreed that the FC should meet for only a few hours to discuss answers to potential queries from the plenary, probably on the Sunday afternoon before the CPM.

13. Close of meeting

[68] The Chair thanked the participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures****Financial Committee Meeting**

8 October 2012

FAO, Rome, Italy

*(Monday, Start time: 9:00, Canada room A357)***AGENDA**

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
1. Opening of the meeting		Yokoi
2. Adoption of the Agenda	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_01	Fedchock
3. Housekeeping		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents list • Participants list • Local information 	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_02 IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_03 IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_04	Fedchock
4. Report of last meeting		
	IPPC FC Report (June 2012) <i>available on IPP:</i> https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1111149&no_cache=1&L=0	Fedchock
5. [merged into 7-1]		
	<i>[Orally]</i>	Fedchock
6. Updates of financial summary for 2012 (including variation analysis)		
	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_05	Fedchock
7. New and emerging issues		
1) Updates	<i>[Orally]</i>	Fedchock
2) FAO financial processes	<i>[Orally]</i>	Bonomi (if needed)
8. FC 2012 Work Programme		
1) Resource mobilization		
a. Development of explanatory documents to potential donors	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_06	Yokoi/Franich
b. Analysis of use of multi-donor trust fund	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_07	Yokoi
c. Opportunities arising (efforts and results)	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_10	Yokoi/Franich
d. Processes for developing funding proposals	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_11	Yokoi
2) Financial process		
a. Sharing templates for standardized budgeting and reporting	<i>[Contributions from FC members]</i>	

Agenda item	Document No	Presenter
b. Financial reports to be presented to CPM (format and status snapshot)	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_08	Fedchock
3) Consideration of external participants	<i>[Orally]</i>	Fedchock
4) 2013 Budget		
9. FC 2013 Work Programme	IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_09	Yokoi
10. [merged into 8-1]		
11. Discussions on agenda items for next meeting		
12. Other business		
13. Next meeting (scheduling)		

APPENDIX 2 - Documents list**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****FINANCIAL COMMITTEE MEETING****DOCUMENTS LIST***(Updated: 5 October 2012)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA NO.	AGENDA ITEM	POSTED
--	04	Report of IPPC Financial Committee (June 2012)	2012-09-04
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_01	02	Draft Agenda	2012-09-18
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_02	03	Documents list	2012-09-18
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_03	03	Participants list	2012-09-11
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_04	03	Local information	2012-09-11
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_05	06	Updates of financial summary for 2012	2012-10-05
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_06	08	Development of explanatory documents to potential donors	2012-10-05
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_07	08	Analysis of use of multi-donor trust fund	2012-10-04
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_08	08	Financial reports to be presented to CPM	2012-10-05
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_09	09	Draft Work Programme of IPPC Financial Committee in 2013	2012-10-04
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_10	10	Opportunities arising	2012-10-04
IPPC-FC 2012/Oct_11	10	Processes for developing funding proposals	2012-10-05

APPENDIX 3 - Participants list**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****FINANCIAL COMMITTEE MEETING****PARTICIPANTS' LIST***(Updated: 10 October 2012)**A (✓) indicates attendance at the meeting*

	Role / Region	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Chair / Asia	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Export Management Division Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency (MIFFAF) 433-1 Anyang-b dong, Manan-gu, Anyang City (430-016) Republic of Korea Tel.: (+82) 31-420-7605 Fax: (+82) 31-420-7605	koyim@korea.kr	1 st term	2014
✓	Member / Europe	Mr Steve ASHBY Food and Environment Research Agency, (FERA), DEFRA Plant Health Policy Programme - Sand Hutton - York YO41 1LZ United Kingdom Tel.: (+44) 0 1904 465633	steve.ashby@fera.gsi.gov.uk	1 st term	2014
✓	Member / Europe	Mr Ralf LOPIAN Senior Adviser International Affairs Department of Food and Health Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Mariankatu 23 A, PO Box 30, Helsinki Finland Tel.: (+358) 9 16052449 Fax: (+358) 9 16052443	ralf.lopian@mm.m.fi	1 st term	2014
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Yukio YOKOI Secretary to the IPPC	Yukoi.Yokoi@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK IPPC Coordinator	Craig.Fedchock@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Tea Franich Resource Mobilization Officer	Tea.Franich@fao.org	N/A	N/A

✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Celine GERMAIN Standard Setting Officer	Celine.Germain@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Eva Moller Support staff / Report writer	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A

Not attending

	Resource person (FAO staff)	Ms Maria BONOMI Programme and Budget Assistant Plant Production and Protection Division Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department	maria.bonomi@fao.org	N/A	N/A
	Member / Africa	Mr Lucien Konan KOUAMÉ Directeur de la Protection des Végétaux, du Contrôle et de la Qualité Point de contact de la CIPV Ministère de l'agriculture B.P. V. 94 (Immeuble Caisse de Stabilisation) Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire Tel.: (+225) 20 222260 Fax: (+225) 20 212032	l_kouame@yahoo.fr	1 st term	2014

APPENDIX 4 - Revised IPPC Financial Committee Working Arrangement

(as revised at the meeting of IPPC Financial Committee, 8 October 2012)

This is an informal understanding of working arrangement of IPPC Financial Committee, which was agreed by its members within the Terms of Reference of the Committee approved in the CPM7, in March 2012 (Attachment II of the CPM7 Report). This Working Arrangement will be made available on IPP.

1. Membership

The IPPC Financial Committee (“the FC”) consists of four members selected by, and including at least one member of, the CPM Bureau. The Bureau will consider and select replacements if necessary. Members serve for no longer than five years. The FC members will fund their own participation. The FC can invite in consultation with the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat, additional participants, as necessary.

2. Chairperson

The FC will elect its Chairperson from the FC members who are also members of the CPM Bureau. The Chairperson will serve for two years in accordance with the Bureau cycle, and can be re-elected if they continue as a Bureau member.

3. Sessions

The FC meets at least once per year, preferably associated with a Bureau meeting. Additional meetings will be agreed by the FC in consultation with the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat. The meetings can be convened virtually (e.g. video conference).

4. Roles

The FC is established by CPM under the IPPC Resource Mobilization Strategy. It provides advice on financial matters and resource mobilization issues to the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat, as specifically described in the Terms of Reference approved by CPM7.

5. Reports

Actions will be agreed before the closure of the meetings. The meeting reports of the FC will be prepared by the Secretariat and circulated for endorsement of participants within one month after the meetings. In the following Bureau meeting, an oral report will be made by a participant.

6. Review

The FC should provide reports on its functions and procedures to the Strategic Planning Group (the SPG) in 2015 for the purpose of reviewing and revising if necessary.

7. Language

The working language of the FC is English.

8. Amendments

Amendments to the functions and procedures of the FC will be discussed in the CPM Bureau and proposed to CPM as required.

9. Confidentiality

The FC will have due respect for confidentiality where documents or electronic information are labelled as confidential. Such documents presented to the FC will be restricted to its members, invited participants, Bureau members and the IPPC Secretariat.

APPENDIX 5 - Revised Resource mobilization efforts and results

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION (EFFORTS AND RESULTS)

Introduction

1. The IPPC Financial Committee identified in its first meeting in June 2012 the resource mobilization issue as one of the working areas for the Committee, and asked the Secretariat to update the efforts and results of resource mobilization.

Financial and In-kind contributions to support the IPPC work programme in 2012

2. Table 1 is a list of resource contributions to the IPPC activities from various countries and organizations received this year until the end of September 2012. The list will be updated by the end of the year and incorporated into the Secretariat report for the CPM-8 (2013).

Table 1: Financial and in-kind contributions to support the IPPC work programme (Jan - September 2012)

Contributing Contracting Party/ Organization	Contribution	Use of the contribution
Countries		
Australia	Trust fund for meeting and activities related to capacity development, information exchange and standard setting	Support to the EWG CD and 2 consultants for the Capacity Development (including information exchange) and 1 for standard setting
Brazil	Meeting host and financing for workshop	Upcoming ePhyto Workshop
Canada	2 staff members	standard setting support (part time: 25%)
China	Translation	IPP, Chinese
EU	Trust Fund for participation	Travel assistance for participations to various meetings

EU	Trust Fund for IRSS programme	Implementation of IRSS programme including consultant recruitment
France	1 staff member	1 staff to support standard setting [26 months from March 2012]
Japan	2 staff members	1 staff to support standard setting (until March) and 2 staff for CPM-7 preparation (2 weeks)
Japan	Trust fund for 1 staff member	1 staff to support capacity development (4 years from coming November)
Japan	Arrangement associated with CPM	Event support
Japan	Meeting host	TPPT meeting arrangements
New Zealand	2 staff members	standard setting support (part time: 5% through August 2012 and 10%)
Republic of Korea	Meeting host and funds for some participant travel	Regional workshop on draft ISPMs, coming IRSS related symposium
Republic of Korea	Trust fund for general use	General use
Russian Federation	Meeting host and partial funds for some participant travel	Regional workshop on draft ISPMs, Russian speaking countries
Switzerland	Trust fund to support standard setting	Support EWGs (2) and TPDP annual meetings, and contribute towards a part-time assistant (2 years)
United Kingdom	A staff member	CPM-7 preparation (2 weeks)
United States	Trust fund for 1 staff member	1 staff to support standard setting under APO programme (until July 2012)

Regional Plant Protection Organizations		
APPPC, EPPO, IAPSC, PPPO, OIRSA and COSAVE	Organization assistance	Regional workshops on draft ISPMs in each region
APPPC	Organization and funds for some participant travel	Regional workshop and coming IRSS related symposium
OIRSA and COSAVE	Funds for some participant travel	Regional workshops
COSAVE	Arrangement associated with CPM	Event support
EPPO	Meeting host	ePhyto workshop + TPDP meeting arrangements
NAPPO	A staff member	CPM-7 preparation (2 weeks)
PPPO		Organization of the 24 th TC among RPPOs
Organizations		
IICA	Meeting host and funds for some participant travel	Regional workshop on draft ISPMs for Latin America
IAEA/FAO Joint division	1 staff member	standard setting support (part time: 5%)
Collaborative programmes		
Several contracting parties, regional organizations and international organizations	Meeting host	EWGs, TPs and workshops

Ongoing efforts

3. The followings are other ongoing efforts for resource mobilization and related activities:
 - 1) **The EU** and the IPPC Secretariat had meetings to improve the fund currently provided and to consider the potential areas to further contribute, including DG Trade and DG SANCO
 - 2) **The EU** is considering a secondment programme
 - 3) **Sweden** is considering funding an APO position to support capacity development in 2013.
 - 4) **Qatar** is considering providing financial contributions to the IPPC activities

- 5) **Belgium** is considering a possible contribution (translation work and/or secondment) as a follow up of the meeting with the IPPC Secretariat
- 6) **SSAFE**, which is a group of multi-national food companies, is under consideration for possible contribution (secondment for IT works) as a follow up of the meeting with the IPPC Secretariat, as a part of their contacts with FAO
- 7) The IPPC Secretariat is in contact with several major funding donors, including World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Islamic Bank, Asian Development Bank and International Funds on Agricultural Development.
- 8) The IPPC Secretariat has been further seeking the possibility of having new funding partners through participating the meetings held in FAO and visiting the potential donors and countries.
- 9) As regards efforts for awareness raising and resource mobilization, the IPPC Secretariat has developed material for easy briefing in various occasions.
- 10) Several efforts to brand the IPPC have been made.

Possible Financial Committee's actions

4. The Financial Committee is invited to:
 - a. *note* the contributions and development so far (possibly identify missing/wrong information)
 - b. *provide* additional suggestions / leads for additional resources,
 - c. *discuss* the ways of presentation to CPM and *provide* guidance to the Secretariat.

APPENDIX 6 - IPPC Financial Committee Work Programme 2013

	2012			2013					2014	
	Jun	Oct	Dec	Jan-Feb	Apr	Jun	Oct	Dec	Jan-Feb	Apr
Basic set up	- Review the Terms of Reference (ToR) - Draft Working Arrangement (WA)	- Confirm and request Bureau to note the WA	- Review WA if needed							- Initially discuss review/ revision of ToR and WA
Resource mobilization	- Discuss process for resource mobilization - Identify immediate actions	- Discuss 1) explanatory documents 2) use of multi-donor trust fund 3) process for developing funding proposals	- Discuss draft action plan		- Discuss draft action plan - Discuss the revision of guidelines for IPPC multi-donor Trust Fund	- Discuss draft action plan	- Discuss draft action plan	- Finalize draft action plan		- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM
Financial process	- Discuss improvement of financial process	- Discuss financial report forms/ process with examples	- Discuss financial report forms/ process with examples	- Partially apply the results to CPM8 report	- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM8	- Discuss financial report forms/ process	- Discuss financial report forms/ process	- Finalize financial report forms/ process	- Apply the results to CPM9 report	- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM9
Work programme (WP)	- Initially discuss WP 2012	- Discuss WP 2012 and 2013	- Finalize WP 2013		- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM	- Review WP 2013 and discuss WP 2014	- Discuss WP 2014	- Finalize WP 2014		- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM
Financial budgeting/ reporting		- Discuss draft report 2012 and draft budget 2013	- Discuss draft report 2012 and draft budget 2013 in temporary format	- Finalize draft report 2012 and draft budget 2013 in temporary format	- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM	- Monitor financial situation 2013	- Discuss draft report 2013 and draft budget 2014	- Discuss draft report 2013 and draft budget 2014 in suggested format	- Finalize draft report 2013 and draft budget 2014 in suggested format	- Review and reflect guidance from Bureau and CPM

APPENDIX 7 - Action points from the FC October 2012 meeting

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Standardized budget reporting format (incl. information for a three-year period)	Secretariat and Mr Lopian	June 2013
Standardized report format for the FC meetings	Ms Yim	June 2013
Full IPPC budget pie chart, a separate operational cost pie chart and a table containing detailed information on RP and TF expenditures	Secretariat (Coordinator)	December 2012
Brochure on IPPC issues for non-experts	Secretariat	Before FC June 2013 meeting
List of potential donors for the FC to make a prioritization on which donors to focus on	Secretariat	Before FC June 2013 meeting
Resource mobilization action plan and an action plan for a selected standard	Secretariat (Resource mobilization) together with Lopian and Yim	Before FC June 2013 meeting
Enquire about implications for revision of guidelines for the multi donor trust fund	Secretariat	Before FC June 2013 meeting
Consider participation of external participants to the FC	FC	FC June 2013 meeting
Revise the guidelines for the multi donor trust fund	Financial Committee	By CPM-9 (2014)