E

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Sixteenth Session
Virtual Meeting, 5, 7 and 21 April 2022
Implementation, Review and Support System - Options for transitioning to more sustainable system
Agenda item 11.5
Prepared by the IPPC Secretariat

I. Purpose

This paper summarizes the preferred options for transitioning the Implementation Review and Support System[1] (IRSS) into a more sustainable system. Details on these options are available in the report, *Analysis to support the transition to a sustainable Implementation Review and Support System*, which is available on the IPP[2]. This report was developed with input the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) Sub-group on IRSS (with members representing the CPM Bureau, the IC, the Standards Committee and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs, as identified via their Technical Consultation). The advice of several stakeholders within the IPPC Community was captured through interviews. The IC discussed this report at several meetings and through e-mails.

II. Background

1.   The IRSS was adopted by the third session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM, 2008)[3] as a system to verify compliance with the IPPC and to gauge uptake of ISPMs. Under the IRSS, identified gaps in implementation were to be addressed through an assistance-based and facilitative approach. The IRSS programme adopted by the CPM listed three main components: an implementation review system to monitor implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs, an implementation support system to establish an IPPC Help Desk, and an implementation review response to summarize the activities and findings of the other two components and to propose appropriate action plans.

---

2.   CPM-12 (2017) dissolved the Triennial Review Group (TRG) which was the former group providing advice on IRSS. When the IC was established during this same CPM, the functions and procedures of the TRG were transferred to the IC. The IC, in November 2019, established and approved a Terms of Reference for the IC Sub-group on IRSS, which provides guidance on activities related to the IRSS and recommends priorities to the IC.

3.   In October 2020, the IC requested[4] that a clear message on the benefits of the IRSS should be presented and a proposal for how the IRSS might be embedded to work of the IPPC Secretariat to support the CPM and its subsidiary bodies. In addition, options on how the IRSS could be funded should be presented in order to move it away from being funded by single donors through several projects. It was agreed that the IRSS should be used by the CPM and subsidiary bodies as a component in the development of standards and their implementation.

4.   CPM-15 (2021)[5] noted the intention of the IPPC Secretariat to move the IRSS from a project driven activity to a System for the IPPC Community with a long-term work plan and funding from multiple sources.

5.   In June 2021, a diagnostic of the IRSS was carried out in response to this request from the IC. The objectives of this analysis were to analyze the history and the implementation of the IRSS with a view to:

- identify major factors to be considered to shift the IRSS from the current project management cycles to a sustainable system;
- to develop guidance to shift the IRSS to a sustainable system; and
- to prepare a proposal for a sustained system embedded in the IPPC Secretariat for presentation to the IC via the IC Sub-group on IRSS.

6.   Through a review of documents related to the IRSS and feedback from members of the IC Sub-group on IRSS, various stakeholders and the IPPC Secretariat, the history of the IRSS was analyzed and lessons learned were identified. The review of documents related to the IRSS indicated that the IRSS responds to a real need, i.e., the need for information on challenges faced by NPPOs in implementing the IPPC, and there is support from the IC for embedding the IRSS into the day-to-day work of the IPPC Secretariat. Major factors relating to the system design and execution were also identified. The findings of the analysis were summarized in a draft report "Analysis to support the transition to a sustainable Implementation Review and Support System" and presented to the IC Sub-group on IRSS at its 2nd Virtual Meeting in July 2021. The IC Sub-group on IRSS reviewed the draft report and provided comments. The draft report was also circulated to the CPM Bureau, IC, SC and RPPOs to solicit their comments.

7.   The IC Sub-group on IRSS agreed to select the preferred options to transition to a sustainable IRSS for presentation to the IC. To identify areas of consensus and to facilitate the decision-making process, a questionnaire on preferred options for transitioning the IRSS to a sustainable system was administered to the IC Sub-group on IRSS in September of 2021 and the questionnaire responses were discussed in the 3rd meeting of the IC Sub-group on IRSS in October 2021.

8.   In November 2021, IC discussed the conclusions of the IC Sub-group on IRSS on the preferred options for the transition to a sustainable IRSS and recommended them to be presented to CPM-16 (2022).

4 IC VM07 report: https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2021/02/Report_IC_VM07_2020_Oct_2020-12-11_TcQsYG6.pdf

5 CPM-15 report: http://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2021/04/CPM-15_Final_Report_with_ISPMs_Appendices-2021-04-30.pdf

III.   Preferred options for the transition to a sustainable IRSS

9.   The preferred options for the transition to a sustainable IRSS agreed by the IC are presented in Appendix1 as well as the rationale for the proposed changes.

A.   Name:

10.   In order to reflect better its objectives and missions, the "IRSS" name should be changed to "IPPC Observatory".

B.   Scope:

11.   The IPPC Observatory should:

- monitor the implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations;
- identify related challenges and best practices; and
- provide recommendations to CPM for follow-up action.

12.   The IPPC Observatory would no longer be involved in developing implementation and capacity development material and resources, as it is understood that the IC and other IPPC bodies are better placed to conduct such activities. The role of the Observatory would therefore be limited to providing recommendations on ways to address implementation issues identified.

C.   Integration into the IPPC Secretariat:

13.   The IPPC Observatory should be led by a full-time, dedicated Secretariat staff person, within a new team supported by staff from the existing units of the Secretariat and steered by the IC Sub-group with representatives from the CPM Bureau, IC, SC and RPPOs as well as participation from IPPC Secretariat staff from the different units. For the transition stage, the lead would be maintained under the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the IPPC Secretariat.

D.   IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030:

14.   The IPPC Observatory would contribute to monitoring the achievement of the objectives outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 by providing data gathered via inter alia, studies and surveys.

E.   Guiding principles:

15.   The following guiding principles have been proposed for the IPPC Observatory:

- Transparency,
- Impartiality and independence,
- Usefulness,
- Driven by a work plan and based on set terms of reference,
- Continuous improvement based on feedback.

F.   Overall objectives:

16.   The objectives should line up with those of the IPPC.

G.   Outcomes:

17.   The CPM, IC, SC, Contracting Parties and other members of the IPPC Community are made aware of gaps and successes in implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations.

18.   The IPPC Community responds to IPPC Observatory analysis by addressing implementation gaps.

H.   Outputs:

19.   The challenges and successes of contracting parties' implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM recommendations are identified, monitored and evaluated.

I.   Work plan development:

20.   The IPPC Observatory will have a three-year work plan, which is approved by the IC and updated annually as necessary.

J.   Funding model:

21.   Baseline funding should be allocated from the IPPC Secretariat regular programme to cover fixed costs. These fixed costs are estimated at approximately 185,000 USD per year to cover a full-time P3 level post, including consumables and supplies.

22.   In addition to the baseline funding from the IPPC Secretariat regular programme, funding to cover studies and surveys should be mobilized from other sources such as the multi-donor trust fund, projects and in-kind contributions. The provisional three-year work plan and three-year communication plan have been estimated at 911,000 USD for three years.

K.   Communications:

23.   The IPPC Observatory will have a common approach for communication with target audiences and the use of the adapted language (i.e. use accessible language for a wider audience). A three-year communication plan will also be developed.

L.   Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL):

24.   IPPC Observatory monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) should be developed as part of the overall IPPC Community Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework. MEL should be part of the IPPC Observatory.

M.   Survey design and delivery:

25.   Data will be collected using surveys designed by experts. There will be periodical monitoring (every 3-5 years) of the implementation of the CPM, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations. Surveys will be short, simple and objective.

26.   The CPM is invited to:

1) *approve* the change of the name of the "Implementation Review and Support System" (IRSS) to "IPPC Observatory" and *request* the IC to rename the IC Sub-group accordingly.
2) *agree* to narrow the scope of the IPPC Observatory by releasing the "Support function" which means that this system is limited to providing recommendations on ways to address implementation issues identified.
3) *agree* to allocate baseline funding from the IPPC Secretariat regular programme to cover fixed costs which includes a fulltime post, consumables and supplies amounting to 185,00 USD per year. Additional funding to cover studies and surveys should be mobilized from other sources such as the multi-donor trust fund, projects and in-kind contributions.
4) *approve* the management structure of IPPC Observatory led by a full-time, dedicated Secretariat staff person, within a new team supported by staff from the existing units of the Secretariat, with guidance provided by the IC Sub-group, via the IC.

5) *approve* that IPPC Observatory contribute to monitoring the achievements of the objectives outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.
6) *approve* the following five guiding principles for the IPPC Observatory: 1) Transparency, 2) Impartiality and independence, 3) Usefulness, 4) Driven by a work plan and based on set terms of reference and 5) Continuous improvement based on feedback.
7) *approve* that the IPPC Observatory have a three-year work plan and a three-year communication plan approved by the IC and updated annually as necessary.
8) *approve* that Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) is a part of the IPPC Observatory
9) *request* the IPPC Observatory to improve the surveys design and set up an efficient periodical mechanism (every 3-5 years) to monitor the implementation of the CPM, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations.
10) *request* the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee and the IPPC Secretariat to take the necessary actions to enable the effective operationalization of the IPPC Observatory.
11) *encourage* Contracting Parties to contribute to the funding of the IPPC Observatory.

Consideration in the transition to a sustainable IRSS

Factor	Current status	Preferred option	Rationale for the preferred option
Name	Implementation Review and Support System	IPPC Observatory	• The current name does not provide clarity on purpose of the IRSS, is difficult to say, and does not stimulate interest or contribute to brand identity. • The proposed new name reflects its purpose, is also used by OIE for a similar system, and is more translatable.
Scope	Three components: 1. Implementation review system to monitor implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs 2. Implementation support system 3. Implementation review response to propose appropriate action plans.	A cross-cutting implementation review system • To monitor implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations • To identify related challenges and best practices • To provide recommendations for follow-up action	• There is confusion about the IRSS scope, particularly, the "implementation support" component is unclear. • The IRSS predates the establishment of the IC and the IFU, which now provide implementation support. • Information on implementation challenges and emerging issues is crucial for orienting the work of the whole IPPC Community.
Integration into the IPPC Secretariat	• Part-time support from IPPC Secretariat contingent on project funding • Placed in the IFU • Steered by the IC Sub-group with representatives from the CPM Bureau, IC, SC, RPPOs and IPPC Secretariat Units	• Lead by a full-time, dedicated Secretariat staff person • Supported by Staff from IPPC Secretariat Units • Interim placement in the IFU • Steered by the IC Sub-group with representatives from the CPM Bureau, IC, SC, and RPPOs	• There is clear support for embedding the IRSS in the IPPC Secretariat. • There is a need for a full-time Secretariat staff person to provide sustained support. • The placement in the IPPC Secretariat is unclear as the IRSS is not purely an IC project.
IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030	Undefined	The IPPC Observatory should contribute to monitoring the achievement of the objectives outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 by providing data.	• The IRSS could contribute to the delivery of the Strategic Framework 2020-2030, e.g. for selection of indicators, collecting baseline data and ongoing monitoring • Studies could support the IPPC development agenda.
Guiding principles	Undefined	Main guiding principles: • Transparent • Impartial and independent • Useful • Driven by work plan and based on set terms of reference	• Guiding principles are needed to help set expectations and address lessons learned. • The guiding principles can be reflected in the system design and the approach to execution.

Factor	Current status	Preferred option	Rationale for the preferred option
		• Improved based on feedback	
Overall objectives	Various iterations listed in the project documents	1. Improved contracting party implementation of the Convention, ISPMs and CPM recommendations 2. Contracting party implementation contributes to the mission of the IPPC and its Strategic Framework 2020-2030.	• The stated objectives of a programme such as the IRSS should reflect the longer-term changes to which it aims to contribute. • The objectives should line up with those of the IPPC.
Outcomes	Various iterations listed in the project documents	1. The CPM, IC, SC, Contracting Parties and other members of the IPPC Community are aware of gaps and successes in implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations. 2. The IPPC Community responds to IPPC Observatory analysis by addressing implementation gaps.	• The outcome statements should describe the specific short to medium-term purpose for which the IPPC Observatory is being implemented. • The outcome statements should describe the changes in behaviour in the IPPC Community which the IPPC Observatory is intended to lead to.
Outputs	1. Challenges and successes of contracting parties' implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM recommendations are identified, monitored and evaluated. 2. Contracting parties are helped to address gaps in implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM recommendations through specific actions or activities to improve implementation.[1]	Challenges and successes of contracting parties' implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM recommendations are identified, monitored and evaluated.	• The outputs should reflect the tangible goods and services delivered directly by the activities of the IPPC Observatory.

---

[1] Outputs listed in the project document for the third cycle of the IRSS

Factor	Current status	Preferred option	Rationale for the preferred option
Work plan development	The IRSS has had three-year work plans which have been agreed with the donor. Following the establishment of the IC Sub-group on IRSS, the Sub-group has periodically updated the work plan.	• Three-year work plan which is approved by the IC and updated annually as necessary. •	• The IRSS work plan has been driven by project cycles. • Feedback has indicated that the IRSS has lacked clear and measurable work plans. • The IPPC Community has been unclear on how to provide input into the work planning process.
Funding model	The IRSS has operated as a project with 3 three-year cycles of extra-budgetary funding, largely from the EC IRSS Project.	• Baseline funding should be allocated from the regular programme to cover fixed costs, for example to cover a fulltime staff person. • Additional funding to cover studies and surveys should be mobilized from other sources such as the multi-donor trust fund.	• Issues identified with funding IRSS funding model are related to ownership, transparency, continuity, etc.
Communications	• The IRSS deliverables are highly technical. • The reach of IRSS studies has largely been limited to the internal IPPC community.	• A three-year communication plan based on the three-year work plan • A common approach to communications with audience segmenting and accessible language is needed.	• Communications on what the IRSS is and does need to be improved. • Communications targeted at decision-makers and other audiences have been lacking.
Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL)	• Annual reporting to the CPM and various other oversight bodies • Triennial review reports • Reporting to the donor against the indicators in the project document	• IPPC Observatory M&E should be developed as part of the overall IPPC Community M&E Framework. • MEL should be part of the IPPC Observatory.	• While the IRSS is implicitly a monitoring tool, how it relates to the IPPC's overall M&E approach is unclear. • The IPPC Community does not have a shared understanding of what a successful IRSS looks like.
Survey design and delivery	Studies and surveys have been designed either internally (e.g. by the IPPC Secretariat) or by consultants, often with input from groups such as the SC or the IC Sub-group on IRSS.	• Expert-designed surveys are needed to collect relevant information • Periodical monitoring (every 3-5 years) of implementation of the CPM, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations • Surveys should be short, simple and objective.	• Issues with survey design and delivery have been identified. • Survey response rates have been typically low. • Data has not been cross comparable across General Surveys.