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# Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

## 1.1 Formal opening of the meeting

The chairperson of the Capacity Development Committee (CDC), Mr Corné van Alphen, welcomed the participants. The Capacity Development (CD) Officer of the IPPC Secretariat, Mrs Ana Peralta, emphasized the importance of the meeting to review current capacity development activities and plan future activities for global impact in plant health.

Mr Ho Haw Leng announced that the Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division, Department of Agriculture of Malaysia would host an evening event and that technical visits were planned to fruit processing, treatment and NPPO inspection facilities.

Mr Yusof Othman, Director of the Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division, Department of Agriculture, Malaysia, welcomed the group on behalf of the government of Malaysia. He expressed appreciation for the global participation in efforts to develop the IPPC’s capacity development work program and technical resources, and wished the group a successful meeting.

## 1.2 Adoption of the agenda

The participants made minor adjustments and agreed to the agenda (Appendix 1). Additional documents were added to the documents list (Appendix 2) and the meeting participants introduced themselves (Appendix 3).

## 1.3 Election of the rapporteur

The CDC elected Ms Shelia Harvey as rapporteur for the meeting.

## 1.4 Updates from the IPPC Secretariat

### 1.4.1 CPM-8 update

Dr Kyu-Ock Yim, the Bureau member attending the meeting, and the CD Officer summarized relevant decisions and discussions from CPM-8 (April 2012). It was noted that the CPM’s revision to its rule on observers may impact on other bodies’ operations related to observers, and that this would be discussed under agenda item 3.2.1.

They noted that implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs emerged as a prominent area of discussion during the CPM, as the CPM had received a paper from New Zealand on the importance of implementation for the IPPC. The paper will be analyzed by the SPG and Bureau to present suggestions to the next CPM.

The Bureau member mentioned that the CPM has taken a clear position on the roles of the SC and CDC in terms of implementation, based on the Bureau’s decision in June 2012.

CPM-8 adopted an IPPC communications strategy, and the United States of America has offered contributions to help develop this work plan with professional assistance. The CDC was informed that it was foreseen that the CD development area of the Secretariat was going to need to give input to the work of the consultant and that the CDC operational plan should take this upcoming task into account. The CDC agreed that the chairperson would be the contact person for this task.

The Bureau member explained that the discussion on registration of the ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) symbol emphasized that contracting parties need guidance on how and why to register the symbol. The CD officer confirmed that the FAO legal office was in the process of developing guidance to this effect, based on questions submitted at the CPM-8 evening session. The Bureau developed, and CPM approved, a strategy to move forward with registration of the symbol that would include sending letters to high-level ministers. CDC members agreed that this written guidance on how to register the symbol was needed, that the approach of engaging high-level political support would be valuable, and that information on how to register the ISPM 15 symbol should be developed by the FAO legal office.

CPM-8 also discussed a range of options to approach this topic of movement of grains, and the CPM agreed to continue work towards an ISPM to address the phytosanitary issues of this topic, and consider development of guidance based on the future ISPM. This may be relevant for the CDC later on and CDC members were encouraged to stay up to date on this topic.

### 1.4.2 Presentations by meeting participants

#### “ Single Window - Jamaica’s experience” by Ms Shelia Harvey

Ms Harvey presented materials from the side session she led at CPM-8 on successes and challenges in Jamaica’s implementation of a single window approach for border management regulators. The presentation is available at <http://www.phytosanitary.info/node/1570> and was a result of the December 2012 CDC’s proposal to facilitate a discussion on this emerging issue at CPM-8.

The CDC expressed appreciation for the presentation and discussed issues related to the single window approach, including:

* ensuring that plant health risks are incorporated sufficiently into decisions about determining priority risk commodities
* ensuring that appropriate inspections and other phytosanitary measures still take place despite the increased emphasis on faster turnaround times
* need for cooperation and political will at a high level, and including high-level commitment to phytosanitary issues
* need to ensure that plant health issues are addressed, and not considered synonymous with food safety or quality issues
* need for appropriate training if inspections are conducted by personnel of an agency other than an NPPO
* the challenge for NPPOs to continue to collect fees for services rendered if fee collection is consolidated
* the importance of a stable governance context for this model to succeed

#### Trade Facilitation and STDF presentation by Mr. Melvin Spreij

The representative from the STDF made a presentation on trade facilitation in the context of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and on-going Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) work on the linkages between Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) issues and trade facilitation. He noted that at present there is no single agreement under the WTO for measures aimed at trade facilitation. He commented that the WTO provides support for national trade facilitation needs assessment programs carried out by national trade facilitation task forces. The results of these assessments are confidential unless the country decides to put results in the public domain. NPPOs should be encouraged to enquire about these needs assessments at national level and to participate effectively in the taskforces where appropriate.

The STDF work focuses on: (i) examining the trade flow (export and import) in specific agricultural commodities among specific countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia - including measures which are unjustifiable (i.e. not based on a health risk) and/or justifiable but considering issues related to implementation requirements and procedures (i.e. excessive documentary requirements, fees that are higher than the cost of the service provided, etc.); and (ii) identifying and cataloguing areas where customs are increasingly cooperating with SPS agencies as part of efforts of collaborative border management (single window, joint inspections, etc.). While export promotion is a task of SPS agencies and often has the political attention (including in donors and development agencies), domestic and import control and inspection systems are often less questioned and scrutinized. It is expected that most gains in trade facilitation can be made on the import side. The overall objective of the STDF work is to provide guidance to developing countries on how to decrease SPS-related transaction costs and the time needed for SPS controls, while minimizing risks and promoting safe trade. Another objective is to provide guidance for future capacity building projects in the area of SPS and trade facilitation.

The group discussed the need for SPS measures to address risks and the challenges that regulatory agencies face to maintain this commitment in the context of trade facilitation initiatives. The CD Officer emphasized the importance of involving experts with technical understanding of SPS issues in analyses of SPS controls, including assessing impacts of single window approaches. Several participants also highlighted the need for further clarity on regulation of consignments in transit and re-export. One participant suggested a revision of ISPM 25:2006 (*Consignments in transit*). The Secretariat noted that revisions of standards take place through the call for topics on the standard setting work programme, which is open through 31 August 2013.

The CDC agreed to wait for the results of upcoming STDF studies on the issue and the Bali WTO ministerial, and to then consider whether to plan activities to address this issue at CPM-9. This would be discussed at the November 2013 meeting of the CDC and in the meantime the presentations from the CPM-8 side event would be clearly posted on the phytosanitary resources page ([www.phytosanitary.info](http://www.phytosanitary.info)).

#### “ IPPC Training material- IPPC Participation” by Ms Sally Jennings

Ms Sally Jennings summarized her experience developing and presenting training materials on IPPC participation in a series of side events at CPM-8 in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat. In October 2012 the Bureau had proposed developing materials to orient new CPM members, and the CDC agreed. The IPPC Secretariat and the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of New Zealand cooperated to produce training materials, which took a broader approach to address needs not just of new members to the IPPC but for all who participate in IPPC processes.

The sessions resulted in positive feedback and future trainings would be valuable, keeping in mind:

* timing to allow for less rushed participation (such as mornings or a separate day before the CPM sessions)
* addressing different learning styles
* identifying a venue with options for small group activities
* inclusion of practical information and case studies
* inviting RPPO or NPPO delegates to present
* offering these sessions as an opportunity to facilitate mentoring relationships and to encourage active participation from all contracting parties

Ms Jennings offered to develop a question and answer paper based on questions asked at the sessions. She noted that a practical guide to IPPC participation for contracting parties had been drafted, but would benefit from additional input prior to finalization.

The CD Officer welcomed these training materials and expressed interest in identification of funding for additional preparatory materials and events prior to CPM. She noted that regional preparatory workshops for CPM would be valuable. The CDC agreed that new participants join the phytosanitary community on an ongoing basis and that these trainings would be valuable in the long term.

In addition to welcoming the positive feedback received from survey feedback on these training sessions, the group discussed the challenge of evaluating effectiveness of participation in the CPM and other IPPC activities. Several options were discussed regarding number and incorporation of interventions at CPM, but it was also noted that participation and influence can take a range of forms not all of which are as visible as interventions. The importance of arriving to CPM having studied the documents and agreeing on a position and plan was emphasized.

The value of collaboration at a regional level was emphasized, including through regional preparatory workshops. The potential to partner with regional economic communities was discussed, and it was agreed that in these collaborations the RPPOs should still be strongly involved as the regional leaders in the IPPC framework and given the technical nature of issues discussed.

The CDC agreed that the training sessions were a positive experience to build upon in the future, and committed to contribute to further development of a practical guide to IPPC participation.

Action:

* Secretariat to post the draft manual on IPPC participation online for comments

### 1.4.3 Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

The IRSS Officer presented updates on the project. He demonstrated the new website (<https://irss.ippc.int>) and requested the CDC’s support to encourage use of the helpdesk functions such as the question and answer forum and country profiles. It was noted that this information was voluntary, in contrast with the mandatory reporting obligations under the IPPC, but provided useful information.

The IRSS Officer noted that the interim report on the study of ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) was used by the SBDS in their review of the SBDS role, and that a final report on the analysis of implementation of ISPM 13 would be published soon. As a follow up to the CDC’s review of draft report on implementation of ISPM 13, the Secretariat asked contracting parties that indicated in the survey they had a standard notification format for non-compliance to provide these formats to the IPPC. The CDC can then work with these formats to develop a template that could be used by contracting parties, leading to further concrete results to address capacity development needs identified through IRSS analyses.

He commented that the general survey of implementation the IPPC and its standards concluded and an early draft of the report would be sent to the CDC.

He noted that the three-year project of the IRSS would conclude in March 2014 with an implementation review report that would summarize the results of the studies. A concept note is under preparation for an additional phase of the project, and a focus group may be proposed to discuss concepts for continued work under the IRSS in addition to other discussions of implementation highlighted in the CPM paper CPM/2013/INF/13 https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents//1365158240\_CPM\_2013\_INF\_13\_Implementation\_I.pdf). The draft concept note, including comments received from the SC, would be sent to the CDC with comments requested by 11 July 2013.

A concept note for the IRSS project to undertake work to develop indicators to measure implementation would be proposed to the Bureau for work to begin in 2013 and continue in the next phase of the IRSS. The draft would be sent to the CDC with comments requested by 12 June 2013.

The CD Officer highlighted that now would be an opportune time for the CDC to provide thoughts on how the IRSS can contribute to developing capacity to implement the IPPC and its standards. She highlighted that the mutual contributions between the IRSS project and the CDC have been strong.

The IRSS Officer commented that the stewards of ISPMs 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas)*, 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) and 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) were interested in further analysis of the survey results for implications in the revision of these ISPMs. The stewards plan to meet with the IRSS team to examine these survey results in further detail.

He recalled the suggestions for capacity development activities on ISPMs 4/6/8/13 that the CDC drafted based on IRSS studies could be useful for STDF to consider.

The CDC agreed to revisit the IRSS analyses of survey results of the ISPMs in further detail at the next meeting of the CDC. The purpose would be to identify other ways to support countries through CD activities adding value to the efforts made by countries to participate in the surveys.

It was noted that the Republic of Korea built upon the results of the survey on ISPM 6 and subsequent Global Symposium on Surveillance to fund a regional project to strengthen surveillance.

Actions:

* CDC members to encourage use of helpdesk functions on irss.ippc.int
* CDC members to comment on concept notes on indicators for implementation of ISPMs by 12 June
* CDC members to comment on concept note for second cycle of IRSS project by 11 July
* Include analysis of survey results on implementation of ISPMs 4, 6, 8 and 13 on agenda of next CDC meeting

# Agenda Item 2: Capacity Development Activities

## 2.1 STDF Project 350: Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project

### 2.1.1 Update on status and future actions

The Secretariat presented an overview of the project, updated the CDC (the steering committee for the project) on recent advances and asked for input on next steps. Under the project, a range of globally relevant materials will be developed in line with criteria established by the CDC to fill gaps in available technical resources, address emerging needs and provide support to strengthen NPPO management issues. The Secretariat noted that contributors to the resources have been identified and that work plans for their development are in progress. The list of products in development is included in Appendix 4.

The CDC discussed and advised on the following issues related to the project in its role as steering committee:

* Timing and extension: The CDC noted the high volume of work required to develop and review the materials, and discussed the option of requesting an extension. The representative from the STDF commented that a request for a no-cost extensions could be submitted by the IPPC for a decision by the STDF Working Group in its October 2013 meeting . He noted that the maximum duration of STDF projects recently increased from two to three years, and that in this context there was a good justification for an extension considering (i) the volume of work that had been condensed into the current two-year time frame and (ii) the limited immediate availability of technical experts. The Secretariats of the STDF and IPPC may discuss the possibility of using remaining funds, if any, to cover translation of some materials towards the end of the project. The CDC agreed that the IPPC Secretariat submit this request for a no-cost extension of the project.
* Review processes: The CDC discussed the value of reviewing materials prior to their publication. The value of a range of reviewers was discussed, including technical experts as well as other areas of expertise such as training experts. The CDC committed to help to identify additional reviewers for these products.
* Input materials – The Secretariat noted that relevant ISPMs would provide a basis for these materials, but that existing guidance materials would also be valuable to build on existing efforts. Some resources had been identified through the global call for phytosanitary resources, but not in relation to several important topics (such as export certification, import verification, NPPO management, and stakeholder relations). The CDC members were encouraged to identify relevant resources that would be useful for the development of these materials.
* Flexibility in outputs: The group discussed the original allocation of manuals, SOPs and training kits and agreed to allow flexibility for the experts developing the materials taking into consideration the effectiveness, cost, practicality and impact of the materials to be developed.
* Comments on forestry import/export training: The FAO forestry department developed a training on import/export of forestry products, to which the IPPC contributed. The IPPC plans to adapt this training to a more general resource on import/export. The CDC is requested to review this training and provide comments to be used in developing the other materials on import/export. Deadline: end of June
* Translation partnership ideas: The CDC had previously agreed on the need to be proactive in exploring opportunities to provide these materials in languages other than English. So far, the Secretariat has identified partnership opportunities for translation of the import/export and NPPO management materials into Spanish, and the market access manual into French. The CDC was encouraged to suggest and pursue other opportunities to provide translation of these materials through funding, in-kind contributions, or other options. The inclusion of these materials in future project proposals was identified as a useful option in this regard.
* Monitoring and use of the final products: The CDC discussed options to monitor access, use, and impact of the materials. Suggestions included tracking downloads of materials, and promoting use of the materials in WTO trainings and other partner’s activities. The value of working with partners including NPPOs and RPPOs to pilot the products and provide feedback was highlighted, noting that OIRSA had offered to do this with the import/export and NPPO management materials.

Actions:

* Secretariat to submit request for no-cost extension of the project to the STDF Secretariat and cooperate in the development of a fact sheet for this project
* CDC members to suggest reviewers for the materials
* CDC members to recommend existing materials that would be relevant as reference material for development of these resources
* CDC members to review forestry import/export training materials and provide comments on adapting this material to a more general import/export training by the end of June
* CDC members to explore opportunities for translation of these materials through financial, in-kind or other partnership opportunities
* CDC members to consider partnership and pilot-testing opportunities

### 2.1.2 Dielectric Heating Manuals

The Secretariat reminded the CDC that it had identified dielectric heating as an emerging issue of high priority for development of guidance because the treatment was being adopted by the CPM and was not widely used or understood. A first draft of the manual had been developed by a private company that has commercialized the treatment and reviewed by the TPPT. The CDC had received the manual, commented on and discussed this draft manual at its December 2012 meeting and March 2012 teleconference.

Based on the CDC suggestion that more basic materials be provided, the company drafted a simplified version of the manual. The Secretariat had asked the CDC to provide input on this simplified version through an online consultation. In addition, the Secretariat requested guidance on next steps, such as whether this simplified manual met the needs that the CDC had identified and what additional consultation would benefit the materials.

The CDC agreed that the simplified version was useful, but that many basic questions remained, especially for NPPO leaders who are not treatment experts. The CDC decided that a very brief flyer on basic information on the treatment would be valuable, and agreed on content to be addressed in this new document. The Secretariat would then request the company to address these points in order to offer a concise summary of the relevance of this treatment in the context of ISPM 15 and the IPPC framework.

CDC members expressed interest in cost information and other practical implications of the treatment. It was clarified that this kind of information would vary greatly based on how NPPOs designed the treatment system to meet their needs (including the volume of products that would be treated, whether the facility would treat only wood packaging material or also other products, etc). Although a manual could not provide this specific information, the group considered that factors affecting the cost of a treatment facility could be described in the brief summary that would be developed. Specifics related to costs and design of the facility would take place in consultation between an NPPO and whichever firm is contracted to design the facility, and would not be part of the CDC’s current work on capacity development materials because that information would be specific to each national context.

The group agreed to proceed with development of the basic version of the manual, in addition to the 1-page summary, and to request further comments on the manual from the CDC by the end of June 2013. Additionally, input would be requested from specific experts familiar with this technique. The group identified that there were experts in dielectric heating in the USA and Republic of Korea, and agreed to send this to them as well as to invite selected members of the TPPT to review the material from the perspective of general expertise in phytosanitary treatments.

The more advanced version of the manual that was reviewed in December 2012 by the CDC, would be finalized to incorporate the comments of CDC members, formatted, and posted to the phytosanitary resources page as an available technical resource ( as a document produced by the developer of the dielectric heating method, not under the auspices of the IPPC).

Actions:

* Secretariat to request development of 1-page, simple document with basic information on dielectric treatment
* Secretariat to send basic manual for further consultation to selected experts and to request further comments on the manual from the CDC by the end of June 2013
* Secretariat to finalize formatting for advanced manual and make it available on the phytosanitary resources page

### 2.1.3 Transit Manual

The CDC noted the manual would be finalized and made available on the phytosanitary resources page.

### 2.1.4 ”Market Access Guide” by Ms. Kyu-Ock Yim

The Secretariat reminded the group that this product had been developed through a letter of agreement, and that the CDC had been invited to comment on the materials. The draft had been used in a recent workshop hosted by the Republic of Korea, and the Secretariat welcomed comments on use of the manual in practice.

Dr Yim explained that the Republic of Korea hosts an annual two-week workshop on IPPC capacity development issues and invites a growing number of countries to participate. This year’s participants identified market access as an important topic to address. The workshop content focused on market access and included participants with a wide range of experience in these negotiations, ranging from those with many years of successful experience to others who were in early stages of exploring market access options. The author of the market access manual was invited to present at the workshop.

At the workshop, countries presented their challenges and steps taken to address challenges in market access. Key challenges and opportunities identified at the workshop included:

* lack of reliable pest lists
* challenge to produce PRA material if assistance is not provided by the importing country
* difficulties on cooperation and communication between the NPPO and industries
* low capacity for market analysis to ensure that demand for products is sufficient to be worth the investment in market access negotiations

Dr. Yim noted that the manual was valuable material to have available as a basis for the workshop without having to start from scratch. She commented that additional materials, such as case studies, examples of PRA material and time frames, would be helpful. She noted that the concepts and application of systems approaches and pest free areas presented difficulties for some participants. In general the manual was considered very useful and it would be valuable to monitor its use and continue to receive feedback.

The Secretariat commented that it would be useful to make the presentations from the workshop available on the phytosanitary resources page.

The CDC discussed the format and content of the manual. Some suggested that a more user-friendly and practical approach was needed, including flow charts, case studies and checklists/templates of the steps and types of information needed to proceed, as well as information on market analysis. The CD Officer commented that the CD materials should specifically address phytosanitary issues that affect market access, rather than general themes such as market intelligence research. In addition, it was noted that this manual was developed through a letter of agreement that had already concluded, so revision would require additional resources.

The Secretariat noted that it was developing guidance for authors of future manuals and welcomed volunteers from the CDC to contribute to this exercise in order to guide authors to meet the objectives that the CDC has identified. In addition, the Secretariat urged CDC members to review future outlines and drafts of technical resources with a view to ensure that they met the objectives discussed, and to get feedback from other reviewers.

The group agreed to consider future development of additional practical materials to complement the manual on market access. It was emphasized that additional feedback from field-testing the manual in workshops would be valuable to continue to identify areas for improvement and future opportunities to revise and strengthen this and other materials. CDC members were encouraged to explore opportunities to use the manual and gather additional feedback to continue to build on the manual.

One member suggested that there may be an opportunity to partner with an existing project on market access in her region to develop complementary materials on market access. The Secretariat welcomed further information and encouraged CDC members to pursue opportunities to partner with existing and future initiatives to field-test technical resources that are in development.

Actions:

* CDC members to pursue field-testing options to use this material
* CDC to consider development of complementary materials (see agenda item 4.4)
* Ms Jennings to provide contacts on partnership opportunity

### 2.1.5 Review of proposed materials for PRA awareness-raising

The Secretariat presented an outline of the proposed objectives, target audiences and outputs of the materials for PRA awareness-raising to be developed under the STDF 350 project. It was emphasized that these materials would focus on PRA awareness-raising because technical trainings on how to do PRA have been developed and are available in English in Spanish on the phytosanitary resources page. The Secretariat noted that opportunities to translate the technical training material on PRA into additional languages, or to develop additional regionally-specific information for the PRA training would be welcome and encouraged all participants to pursue these opportunities.

The Secretariat explained that the USDA pest risk analysis laboratory (PERAL) would develop the technical information for these materials as a generous in-kind contribution. This information would then be reviewed by the CDC and the International Advisory Group on PRA (IAGPRA). Then a multimedia contractor would be engaged, using funding from the STDF 350 project, to transform the information into interactive materials. The technical experts would continue to have input during this process to ensure accuracy of the messaging. The CDC reviewed the outline to ensure that the planned objectives and outputs met the needs that the CDC had identified when it prioritized development of these products.

Action:

* Secretariat to add the PRA outline to Yammer for additional CDC comments

## 2.2 STDF Project 401 “Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Facilitators”

### 2.2.1 Update

The Secretariat reminded the group that the STDF Working Group approved the project in October 2012 and that the STDF Secretariat had provided valuable input into the project document. The project document would need to be finalized and the project contracted by October 2013. The Secretariat noted that it would collaborate with the STDF Secretariat to incorporate their comments and finalize the project document. Some of these comments were addressed in the following agenda item.

Action:

* Secretariat to finalize project document and contract the project with the STDF

### 2.2.2 Criteria for selection of participants by Sally Jennings

At the December 2012 meeting of the CDC the group discussed the value of careful selection of participants for the PCE facilitation and training of trainer projects in order to invest in human resources that would have a lasting impact. Ms Jennings had offered to explore this issue and she presented a proposed approach to the CDC.

Ms Jennings emphasized that personality characteristics and competencies both contribute to good facilitation and training abilities. She discussed options to pursue evaluation of candidates to select individuals with strong potential to succeed as facilitators and trainers. She proposed using a combination of personality assessment questionnaires and interactive competency interviews to assess the characteristics and knowledge of candidates to be trained in workshops on PCE facilitation and trainings of trainers.

The participants reviewed the terms of reference for selection of participants in STDF 401 that it had developed. The CDC agreed to continue to use these criteria in addition to considering personality traits and competency interviews to select candidates for this project.

The representative from the STDF commented that some participants may come from the private sector or other institutions outside of NPPOs, and that it may make sense for these participants to contribute financially to these trainings. He also suggested that the STDF, as the donor, would not be interested in using project funds to support the participation of candidates from high-income developed countries because those participants likely had other options to fund their participation. The Secretariat noted that the option to charge for trainings issue was relevant and had been explored at length, but that the FAO system and the CPM constrained this approach.

The group agreed that in order to take into account that not all participants in the PCE facilitation trainings would require funding for travel, criteria would be set for allocating travel funds. This criteria would differ from the funding criteria that the IPPC Secretariat usually uses in order to offer stronger support for participation by middle-income countries.

The STDF representative noted that incorporation of human resource evaluation processes and use of criteria for financial assistance would have implications for the project budget. He requested that the project budget be revised after the participant selection process. The IPPC Secretariat noted that it may consider applying cost savings towards other options to strengthen the project, and agreed that a budget revision would be provided after the selection of participants.

Actions:

* Secretariat to finish project document and contract
* Secretariat to implement personality assessment and interviews for selection and develop criteria for travel support of participants in the project
* Secretariat to revise project budget after selection of participants was complete

## 2.3 STDF Project 402 ”Training of trainers for Phytosanitary Capacity Development”

### 2.3.1 Status

The Secretariat recalled that the STDF had considered this project submitted by the IPPC Secretariat and therefore evaluated it by an external reviewer, prior to presentation to the STDF working group (in line with the STDF operational procedures for projects submitted by STDF partners). The Secretariat had distributed the conclusions from the external evaluation to the CDC, and these were discussed at the CDC’s March 2013 teleconference.

The external review had suggested alternative approaches to a training of trainers model, such as developing a masters degree course and mentoring programs. In March the CDC agreed to continue with a training of trainers approach because development of masters degree staff or mentoring of senior officers would not address the gap in individuals with effective skills in leading trainings on phytosanitary issues. The CDC had also expressed preference for the training of trainers model because of its increased links with NPPOs and greater cost-effectiveness than university degrees. The Secretariat noted that the conclusions from that discussion had been elaborated to present suggestions to the STDF Working Group at its March 2013 meeting. The relevant report section from the STDF Working Group meeting was presented.

The Secretariat explained that in order for the project to be considered at a future STDF working group meeting, the project would need to be revised and externally reviewed again. The STDF representative requested the Secretariat to inform the STDF of its intention to re-submit the application in a timely manner so that preparations an external evaluation of the proposal could be put in place.

## 2.4 Phytosanitary resources

### 2.4.1 Phyto.info web page

The Secretariat provided updates related to the phytosanitary resources page ([www.phytosanitary.info](http://www.phytosanitary.info)). Updates included a transfer to a new platform, a CPM-8 side event to demonstrate of the site, and a commitment from OIRSA to add their capacity development activities to the Activities Database.

The site had launched in 2012 and already contains over 200 resources. The Secretariat asked the CDC members to reflect upon whether the site was fulfilling the objectives they had intended. The Secretariat advised that it would make some changes to the page, and send a request for CDC comments and examples for improvements to the page with a deadline of one month from the request.

The CDC members were encouraged to promote and actively build awareness about the phytosanitary resources page and to encourage that capacity development activities taking place in their region be added to the activities database.

The successful inclusion of over 100 diagnostic protocols in the site demonstrated that many useful materials are available on the page. The site had been created to completely separate unofficial resources from the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)) and had a disclaimer indicating that none of the materials on the page were endorsed, adopted or approved by the CPM.

However, now that the site offers a wide range of diagnostic protocols the SC expressed interest in including the IPPC diagnostic protocols on the site as well. The Bureau considered this and decided that adopted IPPC standards (including phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols) could be added to the site, and agreed to request the modification of the disclaimer on the phytosanitary resources page to clarify that resources on the site were unofficial unless otherwise specified.

The CDC had previously decided not to include explanatory documents on the site because they were an individual’s viewpoint on an ISPM and would require review by the CDC prior to being posted because they were not adopted or produced by the IPPC. The CDC acknowledged that some of the explanatory documents offered useful information, while others required extensive updates and/or revision.

The CDC indicated interest in identifying selected explanatory documents with high value for capacity development to review/update/complement for inclusion in the phytosanitary resources page.

Actions:

* CDC members to provide comments on phytosanitary resources page (Secretariat to give deadline one month in advance)
* Adapt examples of notifications of non-compliance into a general format for inclusion on the phytosanitary resources page

### 2.4.2 Status on the call for technical resources and call for consultants to the Roster

The Secretariat announced that the phytosanitary capacity development roster of consultants (http://www.phytosanitary.info/consultants) launched in April 2013. So far 30 individuals have registered, and 11 have submitted profiles, which demonstrates that there is active interest in the roster. The Secretariat informed the CDC that it planned to send an announcement to relevant partner organizations informing them about the roster.

An additional call for technical resources was planned, and the CDC was encouraged to promote contributions to the page. One member had distributed public information materials from her NPPO on fruit fly management, and it was encouraged that this be added to the resources page.

Actions:

* CDC to encourage contributions to the phytosanitary resources page

### 2.4.3 Work plan to review resources

The Secretariat reminded the group that 313 resources had been received in response to the first call for resources. The CDC had decided that some types of resources (such as bilateral agreements, diagnostic protocols and PRAs) could be directly added to the phytosanitary resources page without any review. 244 of the materials had already been posted to the page in line with the criteria for the resources that did not require additional review. The Secretariat proposed a work plan for how to review and note the 69 resources that required review to ensure appropriateness for inclusion on the phytosanitary resources page.

The CDC discussed options to prioritize products for review and agreed that some materials may require minimal review while others would need more detailed consideration. To begin, the group agreed to start with a trial of five resources and categorize them according to whether they were suitable for immediate posting, unsuitable for posting, or required closer review. The Secretariat would explore a mechanism to organize this review and would allow CDC members one month to respond.

The representative from the STDF highlighted the STDF’s virtual library as a repository of SPS-related capacity development materials such as: cost benefit analyses, needs assessments, and project reports. He suggested that news of the phytosanitary resources page be included in an STDF newsletter.

Actions:

* Secretariat to send five resources to the CDC, allowing one month to respond
* Secretariat to follow up on opportunity to highlight the page in an STDF newsletter
* CDC members to encourage the provision of relevant documents to STDF for inclusion in the Virtual Library

### 2.4.4 Yammer

The group discussed use of this platform to coordinate CDC comments. The group agreed that it was generally a useful tool, though a challenge to learn to use well. The Secretariat offered additional practical training sessions throughout the week.

## 2.5 Update and highlights of IPPC projects

The CD Officer presented a table of the projects in which the IPPC was active during 2012. She highlighted projects that have been particularly successful:

* The project in Burundi involved successful collaboration between several agencies (USDA, COPE, UNIDO and the NPPO of the Netherlands). The project also involved collaboration between plant health sectors (including phytosanitary and pesticide issues).
* A regional project for Central Africa was working to strengthen national and regional phytosanitary capacity in ten countries, based on application of the PCE. The countries were successfully interacting with one another to learn from their experiences, for example stakeholder involvement. The project has shown clearly increased knowledge and capacity to deal with IPPC issues, and increased participation at CPM-8 was evident. Expression of interest in reproducing this model in West Africa and the SW Pacific have been made.
* The Beyond Compliance: Integrated systems approach for pest risks management in Southeast Asia project aims to facilitate discussions and agreement on efficacy and has developed an innovative way of thinking about efficacy using a quantitative model.
* A project in Libya, funded by Libya, includes a phytosanitary component, requires high level coordination between different teams in FAO and is the most important project in financial terms , obtained by the IPPC.

She discussed several projects that are under consideration after December 2012 and highlighted that a set of five projects to address *Bactrocera invadens* in SADC countries is in development, and that other projects by other agencies on the same problem are in development in other African countries. She emphasized that the Secretariat encourages *B. invadens* issues be coordinated on a continent-wide level. She noted that this is an urgent issue in which the FAO DG has expressed interest.

In addition, the Secretariat is collaborating with colleagues in FAO to incorporate a phytosanitary component into projects on seeds that are being developed in Tanzania and Ghana. It was noted that the additional projects in development offered positive opportunities but would require additional staff for the Secretariat to manage.

Ms Jennings reiterated interest in replicating the Central African project in the SW Pacific region. The CD officer encouraged CDC members to liaise with the FAO Regional and Subregional Plant Production and Protection Officer in their regions regarding potential projects within their own region.

## 2.6 Regional IPPC workshops

### 2.6.1 Update on the content of the workshops

The CD Officer explained that the Secretariat planned seven regional workshops as had taken place for the past five years, and that the workshops would now address a broader range of IPPC issues in addition to comments on draft ISPMs. This evolution in content had been reported to CPM-8 and was reflected in the new, more inclusive name for the workshops. These were planned in cooperation with a range of regional partners, and some with EU funding.

1. The CD Officer reviewed plans for each of the seven upcoming workshops, and noted that that the new standard setting process includes a longer consultation period which allows for more evenly spacing between the timing of the workshops.
2. This years workshops would include several new approaches, incorporating suggestions from positive experiences in regional workshops in Asia, in order to strengthen effectiveness of the workshops. This would include enhanced responsibilities for workshop organizers, participants, and national contact points. This was to ensure that participants are suitable candidates for the workshops, invest time into preparation for their participation, and that the contact points commit to submitting at least one comment after the workshops as a condition for receiving funding for participation in future workshops.
3. The Secretariat has developed a menu of nine topics to address at the regional workshop, in addition to the draft ISPMs. Regions will be invited to incorporate some, all, or other issues into their workshops as appropriate to their regional priorities.
4. The group discussed options to evaluate the impact of these workshops. The CDC noted that because of the significant shifts in the approach to the workshops this year it would be sensible to evaluate the workshops in a few years, after experience is gained in the new approach to workshops. The CDC suggested that this information be transmitted to the Bureau.
5. Actions:
* Inform Bureau of plan to evaluate regional IPPC workshops in a few years.

# Agenda Item 3: Work plan and strategies

## 3.1 Operational issues of the IPPC Capacity Development Committee (CDC)

### 3.1.1 Status on alternate members

The Secretariat informed the CDC that a nomination for an alternate member for the European region had been received. Nominations were still needed for alternate members from Africa, Near East and North America. According to the CDC rules of procedure nominees would be reviewed by the Bureau and selected based on technical expertise. The CD Officer emphasized that this was not a regional nomination process and coordination could take place regionally , at the level of the RPPOs, but it would be the responsibility of contracting parties under each RPPO to determine if they want to proceed in such a way and communicate it appropriately to the Secretariat.

The CDC agreed that alternate members should be provided with access to the meeting documents.

Actions:

* Secretariat to provide access to the CDC documents to alternate members
* CDC members to update alternate members on activities of the committee
* CDC members to encourage submission of nomination of alternate members

## 3.2 Procedural issues

### 3.2.1 Role of observers

The Secretariat explained that CPM-8 revised the CPM rule on observers. The revised rule indicates that CPM subsidiary bodies may have their own rules on observers in conformance with the CPM rule. The Secretariat noted that the CDC was not a subsidiary body, but invited the group to consider its relationship with observers keeping in mind the CPM rule and the modification performed by the SC at the CPM-8 meeting.

The group considered that having the STDF and Bureau representatives participate in CDC meetings as observers had been extremely valuable, and discussed the opportunities and challenges that additional observers may present. The group agreed for the Secretariat to draft a proposal for revising the CDC rule on observers for consideration at the next meeting.

Action:

* Secretariat to draft proposal for revised rule on observers for CDC to review at its next meeting

### 3.2.2 CDC to submit comments on draft ISPMs

At its December 2012 meeting, the CDC had asked whether it would have the opportunity to comment on draft ISPMs. The Secretariat requested guidance from the Bureau, which had not yet come to a conclusion.

The CDC recalled that this interest had been raised in order to have an opportunity to highlight significant capacity development challenges related to the implementation of draft ISPMs, and for the CDC to plan work on emerging issues. The potential relevance of CDC input on whether capacity development issues could influence the priority and selection of topics on the standard setting work programme was mentioned.

The Secretariat noted that this issue would be placed on the agenda of the June 2013 Bureau meeting.

## 3.3 Review of the long-term work plan

The chairperson recalled that at its December 2012 meeting the CDC had begun to integrate many related documents into a CDC work plan. This detailed version of the work plan for the Secretariat and CDC’s use was considered a living document. A simplified outline version had been presented and noted by CPM-8.

The chairperson introduced several general points for the CDC discuss in order to further develop and manage its work plan. The CDC considered these points. It agreed to maintain an operational plan of the CDC, which the Secretariat and CDC would implement and maintain collaboratively using this living document for internal use. This operational plan would serve for the CDC to define the concrete outputs of the CDC and monitor the progress. The CDC agreed to continue to present simple summaries of its work to the CPM while maintaining a more detailed and dynamic version for use by the CDC and Secretariat.

The CDC reviewed and revised its operational plan to focus on activities that would be implemented by the CDC and capacity development area of the Secretariat, and considered organizing future meeting agendas according to the operational plan. In addition, the CDC discussed plans to evaluate its work, noting that the CDC had been formed for a two-year period. The CDC considered that an external evaluation of IPPC CD activities since the adoption of the IPPC CD strategy in 2010 would be valuable. The CDC suggested that, given the short time frame of its initial period of existence, that this evaluation should take place after the full term of the CDC. Actions: Secretariat to discuss timeline of evaluation of CD activities with Bureau at its June 2013 meeting. Terms of reference of evaluation to be developed based on outcomes from June 2013 Bureau meeting. Secretariat to incorporate modifications into operational plan. Secretariat to incorporate operational plan activities into future CDC meetings.

# Agenda Item 4: Future Capacity Development Activities

## 4.1 ISPM No. 15 - Review of Project proposal

The CD Officer recalled that the 2012 meeting of the expert working group on capacity development (Cairns) had discussed the possibility of developing a project on ISPM 15. At the December 2012 CDC meeting (Rome), the Secretariat had asked for input on whether to include registration of the ISPM 15 symbol as part of the project, and the CDC had advised against this. The CD Officer explained that the Secretariat was developing a concept note for a project on ISPM 15 and reaching out to donors, but had not identified an interested donor so far. She noted that there were many projects currently in development in the Secretariat and requested the CDC to set priorities for the development of proposals of projects or activities , as resources to develop and manage and supervise additional actions were not available.

The CDC discussed a range of options to include in a project on ISPM 15, including the option of exploring public-private partnerships to develop capacity to implement this standard. The CDC also discussed that a project could be one of the options, but other alternatives could be the development of specific training resources. In any case, additional information on the current levels of implementation, as well as challenges that inhibit implementation, would be needed to design any type of action. It was noted that this would complement the CPM strategy to encourage registration of the ISPM 15 symbol in all contracting parties (through the FAO legal office).

The CDC agreed that the Secretariat would develop a scoping paper for the next CDC teleconference on needs, and opportunities, and other ISPM 15-related capacity development activities that are taking place. The Secretariat would also send the FAO approved strategy on public-private partnership approaches to the CDC. Ms Jennings volunteered to draft, with other CDC members, a paper on criteria for prioritization of capacity development activities for the CDC to discuss at its next meeting.

Actions:

* Secretariat to develop scoping paper
* Secretariat to send FAO public-private partnerships document to CDC
* Ms Jennings and Mr van Alphen to draft discussion paper on criteria for prioritization of capacity development activities

## 4.2 Project and Activities Proposals

### 4.2.1 Training of trainers, future actions

The CDC discussed options to develop activities for training of trainers on phytosanitary management issues. The CDC had previously suggested continuing to look for a donor to support the training of trainers model, which would complement other projects currently underway.

The CD Officer noted that in line with a request from the Strategic Planning Group, the Secretariat studied costs and availability of graduate-level courses on IPPC issues. A table of identified courses was presented containing IPPC-related courses available in two regions. Costs were around 60-80 thousand dollars per individual trained and did not have strong links with IPPC issues. The CD Officer noted that development of freely available university-level material on IPPC issues could be valuable to complement a training of trainers approach. This analysis will be presented to the SPG meeting in October 2013 for further discussion.

Actions:

* Secretariat to continue cataloguing IPPC-related courses
* CDC members to send information on IPPC-related courses in their regions to the Secretariat

## 4.3 E-certification

The CD Officer discussed progress on efforts related to e-certification. CPM-8 had set terms of reference for a new steering group to advance this issue. The CD Officer emphasized that a clear vision and understanding of the electronic certification process would need to be established and communicated because it would affect the global phytosanitary community, particularly in cases of re-export of consignments.

The representative from the STDF indicated that development and pilot-testing of a toolkit related to e-certification may be an interesting project proposal for the STDF because e-cert would be an innovative approach to addressing SPS and trade facilitation issues.

The Secretariat encouraged the CDC to monitor developments related to e-certification and to give thought to what kinds of capacity development activities and CDC involvement would be relevant to this emerging issue.

## 4.4 Other proposals

### 4.4.1 Market access manual – supplementary materials

The CDC discussed options to develop materials to complement the market access manual in order to provide additional practical information and CDC agreed on the follow-up actions.:

Actions:

* Secretariat to ask the author for presentations given at the workshop on market access, for inclusion on the phytosanitary resources page
* Ms. Jennings to produce a procedural guide to complement the manual with additional practical information for discussion at a later meeting
* Three CDC members (Ms Jennings, Ms Harvey and Mr van Alphen) to provide case studies on market access
* All CDC members and the Secretariat agreed to try to identify a full set of PRA information that could be made available as an example

# Agenda Item 5: Any other matters

## 5.1 Capacity Development Trust Fund

The CD Officer presented information on the IPPC Capacity Development Trust Fund. She explained that unlike other IPPC trust funds, resources can be earmarked for specific projects and activities related to the IPPC capacity development strategy. She also noted that each project in the fund can have its own separate financial agreements and reporting requirements, which allows flexibility to cooperate with the varied reporting requirements of donors. This structure allows funds to be contributed in a more efficient process than the other trust funds. The CDC discussed challenges related to the management of many trust funds in the IPPC while appreciating the value of this fund’s flexibility.

## 5.2 Phytosanitary certificates

A CDC member highlighted challenges that many NPPOs face to determine the validity of phytosanitary certificates. He suggested that the phytosanitary.info site could be a platform to host NPPO’s templates of their certificates. The CDC recalled that providing examples of phytosanitary certificates was not a requirement under the IPPC, but also considered that making the examples available on a voluntary basis could be useful. The CDC also acknowledged the security challenges involved in making PC formats publicly available. The CDC agreed to consider adding an area for examples of PCs to a revised version of the phytosanitary resources webpage.

Action:

* CDC members request NPPOs in their region to provide template PCs
* Secretariat to explore options to post PCs online on the phytosanitary.info site in a secure format

## 5.3 SC and TP Interest in capacity development manuals:

The CD Officer explained that the next Bureau meeting would review a request from the SC that the SC and TPs review treatment manuals produced under the auspices of the Secretariat.

The CDC agreed that the strict timeframes required by the funding sources for these manuals would not allow for a formal process to link the CDC with other IPPC bodies, but that individual experts from the SC and TPs could provide valuable expertise. The CDC members noted that they planned to identify leading experts in their regions to review the draft resources and that this could include outreach to members of the SC and technical panels in their region in order to welcome input through an agile process.

Action:

* Secretariat to provide list and contact information for SC and TP members, organized by region, to CDC members
* CDC members to encourage the SC/TP members to add their relevant expertise to the capacity development roster of consultants

# 6. Date and venue of the next meeting

The next in-person meeting was planned 25-29 for November 2013 in Italy, with telephone conferences to be arranged in the meantime.

# 7. Review and adoption of the Report

The CDC adopted the report of the meeting. The chairperson thanked the participants for their contributions and closed the meeting. The group thanked the hosts of the meeting for the excellent organization of local logistics and field visits.
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|  | **Observer** | Mr. Melvin SPREIJCounsellor, STDF Unit Agriculture and Commodities DivisionWorld Trade OrganizationRue de Lausanne 1541211 Geneva 21SwitzerlandPhone: (+41) 22 7396630Fax: (+41) 22 7395760  | melvin.spreij@wto.org |
|  | **IPPC Secretariat** | Ms. Ana PERALTAImplementation OfficerInternational Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)Food and Agriculture Organization of the United NationsViale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ItalyTel: +39 06 5705 5322 | Ana.Peralta@fao.org |
|  | **IPPC Secretariat** | Mr. Orlando SOSAImplementation Review and Support System Officer(IRSS)International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)Food and Agriculture Organization of the United NationsViale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ItalyTel: +39 06 5705 53613 | Orlando.Sosa@fao.org |
|  | **IPPC Secretariat** | Ms. Johanna GARDESTENInternational Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)Food and Agriculture Organization of the United NationsViale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ItalyTel: +39 06 5705 53768 | Johanna.Gardesten@fao.org |
|  | **IPPC Secretariat** | Ms. Sonya HAMMONSInternational Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)Food and Agriculture Organization of the United NationsViale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ItalyTel: +39 06 5705 54362 | Sonya.Hammons@fao.org |

# Appendix 4: Phytosanitary Technical Resources Under Development

Products under development through project STDF 350: Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project

* NPPO external/internal relations (manual)
* NPPO management (manual and training kit on establishing an NPPO; manual, SOP and training kit on operating an NPPO)
* Import verification procedures, export certification procedures and phytosanitary measures for export (manual, SOP and training kit for each)
* Surveillance (manual)
* Pest risk analysis awareness (information/training kit)
* Export and import of forestry products (e-learning)
* Participation in the IPPC (manual and e-learning)
* Dielectric heating (manual, fact sheet)

Additional products under development through the IPPC Secretariat

* Market access (manual)
* Transit (manual)
* Equivalence (manual)