

Extract from the Ex-post Evaluation on the STDF Project STDF/PG/350 ("Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project")
(Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat)

The Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures has reviewed the Evaluation on the STDF Project STDF/PG/350 ("Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project") and agreed to the following responses (Table 1). In addition, the IPPC Secretariat have also prepared responses to recommendations directed to the IPPC Secretariat (Table 2).

Table 1: IC responses to evaluation recommendations

(As agreed by 2019_eIC_Nov-09, 2019-09-24)

1	<p>Strategy, policies and process for the dissemination of IPPC guides and training materials still need to be established. Use the IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy and the draft IPPC Strategy 2020-2030 as the basis for the development of a new implementation and capacity development strategy.</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: the IC is already well underway to meeting this recommendation not just as it pertains to dissemination, but as it pertains to developmental processes for guides. The IC is also developing the Capacity Development Strategy and an implementation plan to align the IC's activities with the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030).</p>
2	<p>Prepare a Phytosanitary Capacity Development Training Tool for NPPOs within the strategy. A conceptual framework for capacity transformation, which considers individual, institutional and systemic levels and their difficult interaction, could be useful to consider the learning process beyond the actual content.</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: The IC is in the process of developing a Capacity Development Implementation Plan to replace the outdated IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy (2012-2017). Designing of the Phytosanitary Capacity Development Training Tool for NPPOs within the strategy could be considered as an essential activity in the CD implementation plan.</p>

3	<p>Additional funds are needed to promote the use of the technical resources. Partnerships and funding are needed to implement this, based on the project results. The manuals/guidelines should be made part of IPPC's overall outreach strategy, globally (CPM), regionally (at workshops with RPPOs), and through targeted partnerships (FAO, CABI, IICA, specific bilateral donors, etc.). This needs strategic thinking from the IPPC Secretariat and the IC. Communicate to NPPOs and the general public what IPPC has to offer in a comprehensive form, covering all resources and services. Avoid raising expectations on additional services that cannot be provided. Instead of creating more guides, consider combining the IPPC related content in a Procedural Manual, that is updated annually..</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: This is necessary, especially for manuals and guidelines. The IC believes it is already doing some of this, i.e., sharing the manuals in different ways. The issue of funding is also an excellent idea, but it is hard to identify where fund might come from.</p> <p>The IC will requested the IPPC Secretariat to include promotion of technical resources in the IPPC Secretariat's communication strategy to help address this issue</p>
4	<p>Developing new partnerships and initiatives based on the project results will be critical to ensure continued improvement of phytosanitary systems amongst IPPC contracting parties. The training course on "Developing national phytosanitary capacities" at CIHEAM Bari is successfully piloted and can be adapted to demands by NPPO. This should become a regular activity of the IPPC Secretariat and IC members</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: In general, it is very welcome to have partnership with scientists.</p>
5	<p>Give voice (in all languages) to the demand side for directing their support to the needs of the NPPOs in developing countries. This is a permanent task, not subject to a particular study. More dialogue with business and consumers is needed. SPS capacity is not only a concern of IPPC, but all national stakeholders must be involved. The implementation partnership with FAO should be more continuous and, in both directions, also to understand local needs, context and planning for sustainability</p> <p>IC RESPONSE :The IC believe that we already are doing that through regional workshops, but the essential component of dialogue with business and consumers is missing or not addressed in a sufficient way. To involve the private sector, the IC will request the IPPC Secretariat to seek advice from FAO legal service on what extent the IC can engage with business and consumers and how it is or is not covered in the IC TOR.</p>

6	<p>The IC should further strengthen its steering capacities for results-based projects. Steering could be more effective if handed over to the Secretariat or a permanent project director. The new IC project reporting template should include a monitoring of the agreed indicators. Project management should collect the Means of Verification as defined in the LogFrame or suggest proxies if the means are not accessible. Progress reports must contain the monitoring based on the defined indicators for both, output and outcome. When formulation projects, take outcome indicators or key performance indicators from existing strategies, which the IPPC monitors anyway. Have less ambiguous outcomes and chose SMART indicators that are easy to measure.</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: The IC believes it is already doing this. The IC has paired-up IC leads with Secretariat leads; the IC have developed project templates and are reporting on progress regularly.</p>
7	<p>An interactive needs-analysis should cover all aspects of NPPO capacity before entering into new projects. The PCE Tool - if used more actively – could help to identify the capacity needs of each NPPO. Facilitators inside the NPPOs should be trained and maintained. It could also lead to peer-networking and knowledge sharing among the NPPOs. In future activities, facilitators training should be based on the Manuals, if possible and appropriate. Synergies with the pool of PCE facilitators still need to be explored.</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: The IC agrees with this recommendation, as no project should be initiated unless it has the consensus to move forward. This transparency fosters trust in the project selection process and avoids “surprises”</p>
8	<p>IPPC should promote the "helpdesk" to questions and demands from the developing countries. This should be open to access for actors beyond the Contact Points, e.g. trade partners in conflict. Find opportunities to conduct technical assistance if requested. If the Secretariat structure does not allow efficient implementation, issue a service contract for external support.</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: The Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) had a component related to a helpdesk and the IC are working with the IPPC Secretariat to restructure the technical resources web pages into thematic areas/ components of a phytosanitary system to make them more accessible and more user friendly.</p>
9	<p>The participation of developing countries in the IC should be financed through core FAO/IPPC funding or other arrangements, e.g. developed country NPPOs that cover the expenses of developing country NPPOs).</p> <p>IC RESPONSE: During the CPM-14 (2019), the IC Chair encouraged the IPPC Secretariat to allocate sufficient resources to ensure IC members participation. Besides, contracting parties were invited to provide financial or in-kind contribution support to support the work of the IC.</p>

Table 2: IPPC Secretariat responses to evaluation recommendations

1	<p>The IPPC Secretariat should further strengthen its project implementation and IT capacities or leave project implementation to other organizations with the required expertise. Future projects should ensure that sufficient staff time is allocated to project management activities throughout the entire duration.</p> <p>IPPC SECRETARIAT RESPONSE: The Secretariat is continually building capacity to implement projects and has a portfolio of projects that are managed, achieving the desired outcomes. We are constantly looking for partners to link up with to help multiply our efforts. Several of our manuals have been translated into languages by our partner organizations (IICA into Spanish, COLEACP into French and the FAO Sub-Regional Office for Central Asia into Russian.</p> <p>We are uncertain what is meant by increasing IT capacities, unless it relates to the Phytosanitary Resource Page that housed our manuals, that collapsed, but all technical resources were relocated to the IPP (www.ippc.int) in a short period of time and are now all readily available (https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/).</p> <p>As with any organization, the IPPC Secretariat struggles with having sufficient human resources, thus staff are involved in many initiatives and it is a constant concern to ensure, sufficient staff time is allocated for different activities. In addition, as the majority of IPPC Secretariat staff, working on capacity development activities, are project funded, to ensure staff continuity is difficult.</p>
---	--

2

Continue identifying opportunities to promote the use of the manuals to the contracting parties, and to translate technical resources into other official FAO languages, such as French and Arabic. When developing new material, consider the didactical process and run enough test sessions. The manuals have to be self-explanatory, so that NPPOs can use them without additional guidance. There has to be a continuous improvement and updating process of the manuals, along with the update of the ISPMs. This needs to be managed and financed constantly. Consider leaving manual development to the FAO. Include ippc.int and the publication (again) in the FAO database searchable from www.fao.org/publications/search. Publications should give credit to the authors by mentioning their names and to STDF if financed by project funds.

IPPC SECRETARIAT RESPONSE: We have partnered with several organizations to translate manuals when possible (see response to #1). We believe the Secretariat already considered didactical process and that our manuals are self-explanatory) (we found no evidence in the evaluation to support that users could not use the manuals without first receiving guidance). We agree that continuous updates are crucially important and this is in the IC approved *Process for the development of IPPC guides and training materials*, but subject to resources.

We find it conflicting in the evaluation to receive praise for developing manuals utilizing volunteer experts and review by the IC but now stating we should leave the development of manuals to FAO. We think the IPPC Secretariat, with input from the IC, is best placed to coordinate the development of phytosanitary technical resources.

The IPPC Secretariat policy is in the development of all of our published documents (standards, CPM Recommendations and guides) is to not credit individuals as input is received from so many resources and we the IPPC Community to take the credit rather than the individuals. Individuals do receive a Certificate of Appreciation after a manual they worked on is published.

All the manuals now go through the FAO publication approval process and are posted in the FAO publications database (as well as on the IPP), they are also published on the STDF web page. We do agree that NPPOs are still unaware, as you can see they are often not referred to in STDF grant applications, so efforts continue to promote them.

3	<p>Collect and document NPPO manuals publicly. When a PCE does revise reference documents at the NPPO, do collect best practices of common use, and do also spread the IPPC manuals for national use. Respect document ownership, this will improve the usage. Known users of manuals should be interviewed or surveyed for potential improvements of the content and methods. This can be done by tracer studies after training activities.</p> <p>IPPC SECRETARIAT RESPONSE: The IPPC Secretariat calls for “contributed” resources is constantly open, allowing, NPPOs , RPPOs or other organizations submit their own technical resources. They are reviewed by the IC to ensure they are in line with the IPPC and ISPMs and those approved by the IC are posted on the IPP under contribute resources: (https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/contributed-resource-list/).</p> <p>The PCE is a tool to help NPPOs evaluate their phytosanitary system and does not revise reference documents, during the evaluation process, the PCE facilitator will often highlight manuals that could be used. The IPPC Secretariat is currently working on a call for case studies to show the usage of manuals and hopes to have this publication finalized in 2020.</p> <p>There is a user survey in the front of every manual that collects user information, however the submission rate for this survey is low.</p>
4	<p>IPPC should stop efforts to recover the website "www.phytosanitary.info" as a historic version. In the reorganization of the Phytosanitary resources page, consider a sustainable solution for future knowledge exchange.</p> <p>IPPC SECRETARIAT RESPONSE: The evaluation took place shortly after the Phytosanitary Resource web page went down, so we think this is an inappropriate recommendation, see response in #1.</p>

5	<p>The IPPC Secretariat should focus on reestablishing trust and momentum with the knowledge community that contributed so actively in the project. The contributors should be motivated to continue knowledge sharing on the upgraded level. IPPC Secretariat should maintain an open call for possible contributions of technical resources. With guidance from this community, a new solution for exchange will appear. It should be technically and financially stable, mirrored at several institutions and curated by several partners, not IPPC alone. Make arrangements to sustain the ePhyto Website after the end of project STDF/PG/50414 in November 2019.</p> <p>IPPC SECRETARIAT RESPONSE: Several manuals and guides have been developed after this project and the Secretariat does not feel we need to re-establish trust as we do not feel we lost it, nor is there evidence in the report to support this. We are however, receiving fewer nominations of experts in response to our calls, but this could also be due to the fact that NPPO staff don't have the extra resources.</p> <p>The call for contributed resources is open continuously.</p> <p>We do think that our manuals are available on other sites, eg STDF, FAO and IPPC.</p> <p>We do agree that sustainable funding should have been set aside to support the Phytosanitary Resource Page after the project finished, but this was not done and decisions were taken to not maintain two web sites but to rather focus limited resources on one web site.</p>
---	---

The STDF Working Group is invited to review the IC and IPPC Secretariat responses and provide feedback if needed.