

April 2008



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

Organisation
des
Nations
Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et
l'agriculture

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

E

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Third Session

Rome, 7 – 11 April 2008

FAO Governing Bodies' Response to the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements

Agenda Item 8.2 of the Provisional Agenda

1. The Report of the Evaluation was presented to the FAO Programme Committee along with the Report extraordinary meeting of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (ESPTA) and the Management Response by FAO to the Evaluation. These were considered by the Programme Committee in an all-day session. The Vice Chair of the CPM, Mr. Lopian, was invited to participate in that discussion, as was Mr. Brader the Leader of the Evaluation Team. The report of this discussion in Programme Committee was submitted to the 133rd Session of the FAO Council (Document CL 133/3, Item 3, paragraphs 18 – 26, annexed below).
2. The 98th session of the FAO Programme committee welcomed the Evaluation, the Management Response by FAO, and the participation of the Vice-Chair of the CPM during its discussion. The report of the Programme Committee was welcomed (Document CL 133/REP, paragraph 23, annexed below) by the FAO Council.
3. The FAO Council stressed that IPPC should receive increased Regular Programme funding. The biennial budget for Programme Entity 2CP01 in the Programme of Work and Budget 2006-07 for was USD \$4,656,000. The biennial budget for Programme Entity 2CP01 in the Programme of Work and Budget 2008-09 is USD\$5,327,000, an increase of USD \$671,000 or 14.4%.
4. The FAO Council shared the emphasis placed by Programme Committee on “capacity-building to enable developing country Members to maximise the potential benefits from FAO standard setting bodies.” The Programme Committee further “required both an overall FAO strategy for capacity building and a global strategy for phytosanitary capacity building drawing

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.

Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

W0000

fully on the resources of FAO the CPM and its membership.” Capacity-building to strengthen Members’ benefits from international instruments is emphasized in the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division’s programme for 2008-09.

5. Both the FAO Council and Programme Committee stressed the important role of extra-budgetary resources for capacity building. These would need to be found beyond the increased Regular Programme funding. The Programme Committee additionally suggested that the potential for multilateral trust funds with a broader scope than the present IPPC multilateral trust fund should be further explored. FAO is exploring this with donors.

6. The Programme Committee recognized significant cost-savings could be achieved by outsourcing translations and agreed that FAO policy that does not permit such outsourcing should be further reviewed with a view to its relaxation.

7. Overall, the Programme Committee supported recommendations to strengthen the IPPC Secretariat. It concurred with the Management Response to maintain the Coordinator’s position, together with a full-time Secretary at D-1 level, and that the selection of the full-time IPPC Secretary should follow a transparent process, including a greater engagement of the CPM Bureau. FAO is committed to working with the Bureau in this transparent process, and to define concrete options to secure funds to support both positions.

8. The Programme Committee stressed that funding issues and options could not be properly addressed further without a multi-year funding strategy that clearly indicated resource requirements, potential funding sources, and expected outputs and benefits. Other Agenda items present elements of this strategy for consideration.

9. The CPM is invited to:

1. *Note* the responses of the FAO Governing Bodies to the Independent External Evaluation.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF FAO**Hundred and Thirty-third Session****Rome, 14-16 November 2007 (Doc. CL133/REP)**

....

23. The Council welcomed the evaluation report of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) that had been discussed in the Programme Committee. The Council particularly stressed the importance it attached to FAO's functions in international standard-setting and the roles of the IPPC and the Codex Alimentarius Commission and that they should receive increased Regular Programme funding. The Council shared the emphasis placed by the Programme Committee and the IPPC evaluation on capacity-building to enable developing country Members to maximise the potential benefits from FAO standard-setting bodies. In this regard, the important role of extra-budgetary resources was stressed. A number of Members also considered that the standard-setting bodies needed to be more inclusive and transparent in their institutional arrangements if they were to adequately meet the needs of developing countries.

Report of the Ninety-eighth Session of the Programme Committee**Rome, 3 - 7 September 2007 (Doc. CL 133/3)**

.....

Item 3: Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements

18. The Committee appreciated the quality and thoroughness of both the Evaluation Report and the Management Response. It was also grateful to have the opportunity to interact with Dr Lopian, one of the Vice-Chairs of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and to receive the response of the CPM to the evaluation report. While acknowledging the status of the CPM as a body falling under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, the Committee agreed not to confine its discussion to FAO-related recommendations and to take a flexible view of the legal framework.

19. The Committee stressed the importance of technical assistance, especially to develop member countries' capacities to fully benefit from the IPPC. It acknowledged the expertise available in the CPM on phytosanitary matters and stressed the potentially important role of FAO in the design, implementation and facilitation of capacity building. In line with the assessment made by the IEE, capacity building deserved much greater emphasis in future, and this required both an overall FAO strategy for capacity building and a global strategy for phytosanitary capacity building, drawing fully on the potentials of FAO, the CPM and its membership. This should take into account what all other organizations are doing in this area. The Committee considered that a catalytic role in capacity building should continue to be a priority for the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme, while acknowledging its limitations in longer-term support. The limited resources currently channelled through the IPPC and FAO in support of technical assistance related to phytosanitary capacity were noted, and the Committee suggested that the potential for multilateral trust funds with a broader scope than the present IPPC multilateral trust fund should be further explored.

20. The Committee supported the recommendation to make greater use of standards developed by regional organizations. It stressed the need to strengthen the capacity of regional organizations,

especially in sub-Saharan Africa, to play this role and to promote the regional harmonisation of standards.

21. The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the action taken by the CPM as recommended by the evaluation to combine the functions of the Bureau and that of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA). It recognised that the recommendation regarding the size of the Standards Committee was a matter for decision by the CPM, but welcomed that the CPM would be examining the issue further, in line with the recommendation of the evaluation that a smaller group would be more efficient for decisionmaking.

22. The Committee noted the value of the dispute settlement provisions in the IPPC.

23. With respect to staffing, the Committee concurred with the Management Response that the Coordinator's position should be maintained, together with a full-time Secretary at D1 level, given the tasks involved. As recommended by the evaluation and accepted in the Management Response, the selection of the full-time IPPC Secretary should follow a transparent process, including a greater engagement of the CPM Bureau, similar to the process for selecting the Secretary of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources. Overall, the recommendations aiming at strengthening the IPPC Secretariat were supported.

24. The Committee acknowledged that the recommendation of outsourcing translation was not in conformity with the policy of the Organization, although it was recognised that significant cost-savings could be achieved in doing so. It also noted the view of the Vice-Chair of the CPM that standards were highly technical and best translated by plant protection professionals. The Committee agreed that the FAO policy in this regard should be further reviewed with a view to its relaxation.

25. The Committee regretted that FAO management had only accepted partially the recommendation that the Organization should undertake a Review of the World Phytosanitary Status because of resource constraints. It recommended that a less-costly product be produced jointly by the CPM and the FAO Secretariat.

26. The Committee concluded the discussion on the evaluation by addressing the funding issues. It acknowledged that funding options had been explored at length by the CPM and the evaluation report and stressed that these could not be properly addressed further without the development of a multi-year funding strategy that clearly indicated resource requirements, potential funding sources and the expected outputs and benefits. The Committee also stressed the importance of increased and reliable FAO Regular Programme funding to the IPPC to enable effective implementation of the outcome of the IPPC evaluation to underpin and promote extrabudgetary resource mobilisation and the mobilisation of resources in kind.