

[20] The CPM:

- (7) *noted* the IPPC Secretariat annual report on the progress undertaken on the CPM work programme in 2014.

## 7. Governance

[21] Some CPs commented on the manner in which the new IPPC Secretary had been appointed and underlined the need to see a transparent and open procedure for selection in the future.

### 7.1 IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation

[22] The CPM Chairperson introduced the topic of the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation<sup>5</sup> and invited Mr Nico van Opstal, lead of the evaluation team to briefly present the results of the team's work.

[23] Some CPs stated that further time was required to complete a detailed analysis of the evaluation report<sup>6</sup> and requested the CPM to develop a process to collect and consider the comments from contracting parties, Bureau and the Secretariat. There was appreciation for the work of the evaluation team, which had completed the report in a relatively short time frame, and support for some of the recommendations.

[24] Some CPs raised issues and concerns in the report's recommendations including Governance, the frequency of CPM meetings, the role of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), the Finance Committee and article 14 issues.

[25] In response to questions, the representative from the evaluation team confirmed that the report was aligned with the terms of reference established concerning the conclusions of the previous 2007 evaluation. He further confirmed that in recommending a reduction in the number of meetings, there was no intention to create additional work for the Bureau. He clarified that suggestions regarding staffing and legal enhancement were also aimed at supporting the work of the Secretariat.

[26] In response to a CP request on the process to present comments to the Organization on the evaluation report, the FAO Legal Representative stated that as the IPPC is a statutory body with functional autonomy within FAO, it does not have direct reporting lines to the governing bodies of the Organization. Nevertheless, the CPM could still report to Council through the Committee on Agriculture (which meets next year) or, more appropriately, through the Programme Committee (whose next Session will take place in the autumn). A small group (Chile, Canada, EU, France, US Japan, with representation from the Bureau and the Secretariat) met to determine how best to respond to the report.

[27] The CPM:

- (8) *noted* the evaluation.
- (9) *invited* members, regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) and the Secretariat to provide comments on the report by 15 May 2015, and
- (10) *authorized* the Bureau to:
- a. *review* comments and input received at its June 2015 meeting;
  - b. *engage* with the new Secretary of the IPPC and FAO as the Organization also considers the evaluation and its recommendations;

---

<sup>5</sup> CPM 2015/16. The full Enhancement evaluation report is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/8074/>

<sup>6</sup> CPM 2015/INF/13; CPM 2015/CRP/09

- c. *formulate* a proposal for endorsement by CPM-11 (2016) regarding a plan for implementing the recommendations of the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation and present this to the SPG in October 2015 for review;
- d. *initiate* more immediate actions regarding those recommendations which are considered operationally and economically feasible by the Bureau and inform SPG 2015 on those actions;
- e. *develop* a practical mechanism for CPM to monitor and track FAO and Secretariat efforts at implementing the agreed recommendations in the evaluation report.

## 7.2 Summary of the Strategic Planning Group Report

- [28] The Chairperson of the SPG October 2014, Mr Peter Thomson, presented the SPG report<sup>7</sup>.
- [29] CPs commented on the highly participatory nature of the meeting and the innovative proposals put forward. Mr Thompson noted the strong presence of developing countries at this meeting.
- [30] A concern was raised on the selection process for members of the group as it was felt they may not speak for national plant protection organisations (NPPOs), and also did not necessarily report back to them.
- [31] The Secretariat supported the broader nature of the group and acknowledged the value of nominations taking place through NPPOs.
- [32] The CPM:
- (11) *noted* the report.
  - (12) *noted* the narratives developed for the themes identified by the 2014 SPG, understanding that these narratives will serve as the basis for future SPG discussion on strategic directions that the IPPC should consider.
  - (13) *agreed* to provide comments on the narratives as well as identify and describe other significant future trends to the Bureau member from their respective region by May 15 2015 for further discussion at SPG 2015.
  - (14) *agreed* to consider and discuss the proposed seven themes for the development of the new IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2029).
  - (15) *agreed* that the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2029) should be developed with the following themes in mind:
    - i. Technology, innovation and data
    - ii. Resource mobilization
    - iii. Advocacy and awareness through strong communication
    - iv. Implementation, participation and collaboration
    - v. The IPPC is a center of excellence and innovation
    - vi. The IPPC contribution to food security, environmental protection and economic prosperity
    - vii. Simplify regulatory environment for the complexities of future global trade

## 7.3 Abolishment of the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission

- [33] The Secretariat introduced the paper<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> CPM 2015/24 and CPM 2015/INF/03

<sup>8</sup> CPM 2015/21