



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)