



## IC PCE TEAM MEETING

### 1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The 4th virtual meeting was opened by Sarah Brunel, Implementation Facilitation Unit Deputy Lead for the IPPC Secretariat, she welcomed all members, and thanked them for making the time to attend the meeting.

### 2. Meeting Arrangements

- [2] Ms. Magda GONZALEZ was elected Chair of the meeting.

#### 2.1. Elected of Rapporteur

- [3] Mr. Mekki CHOUIBANI was elected rapporteur for the meeting.

#### 2.2. Adoption of Agenda

- [4] The agenda was adopted by all participants and is attached as appendix 1.

### 3. Update on PCE activities (PCEs being undertaken)

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat updated the participants on the PCEs being undertaken:

- Fiji has completed modules 10 - Phytosanitary import regulatory system and 13 - Export certification, re-export and transit after doing module 2- National phytosanitary legislation. The modules 10 and 13 were done in order to assess the gaps in the import and export systems. These gaps will be addressed in developing import and export regulations to support the draft Plant Health Legislation developed from module 2.
- Mongolia: subsequent to completing module 2 - National Phytosanitary Legislation, the national legal consultant submitted the first draft of the new legislation. This document is to be redrafted using the current legislation format endorsed by FAO. This draft is expected to be ready for review by the working group in the last week of September.
- Nepal is still having challenges meeting regularly due to limited staff and other activities requiring their attention. At the current meeting frequency, they will not be able to complete the PCE before the end of 2021. The PCE facilitator drafted a workplan and shared it with the national team. This workplan details activities that need to be accomplished in order to finalize the PCE before end of December 2021. The World Bank has decided to extend the contract to 31st December 2021.
- St. Lucia validated the four modules in their PCE and will generate the strategic plan from the PCE platform. The national team has done a short video on the PCE and will share that with the secretariat in September.
- Bahamas has completed the questionnaire for four modules and has taken one module the logical framework stage.
- Dominica's update will be sent in writing by the PCE facilitator.
- Trinidad took a break in December and has still not resumed.

- [6] The Secretariat informed members that a project to implement ePhyto is ongoing in Nepal and Fiji, and suggested linkages be explored between the PCE and ePhyto. The German Corporation (GIZ) is also looking at conducting a PCE in Senegal in the framework of the implementation the ePhyto. That project may be delayed as a PCE facilitator is yet to be identified.

- [7] There is currently a study going on regarding developing a draft regulation for implementing ePhyto in the framework of the COMESA project. Five target countries have been selected for this project. Discussion has started with two of them to identify challenges they may have to advance this draft. The aim is to pilot this draft regulation in these countries before recommending it for wider use.

- [8] The Secretariat informed the members that a webinar was held with ORISA and FAO Panama to inform countries on what is the PCE. A number of the countries expressed their interest in conducting the PCEs, following that, a news item was drafted on that event. <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/central-american-contracting-parties-inspired-to-undertake-a-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/>
- [9] The Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) has indicated their intention to hold a one-hour webinar to present the results from the evaluation of the project “Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Facilitators” (STDF/PG/401). Within that webinar the Secretariat will present the activities that the IC PCE team have planned as a result of the evaluation, and countries will be invited to share their experience of the PCE.
- [10] The Chair commented that from the information presented in the update of PCE activities, the difficulties of conducting PCEs virtually are clear. The Secretariat noted that the virtual space is proving not to be very effective at this time. It was suggested that a hybrid format could be considered, and that brainstorming among us should be done to improve the process virtually.

#### **4. . Implementing the PCE Strategy**

##### **4.1. Update, and actions taken from last meeting**

- The IPPC Secretariat updated the participants regarding the documents for PCE Facilitator accreditation procedure and the IC Sub-group on Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation terms of reference. These documents will be presented to the IC meeting in November.
- No progress has been made on the investigation into the ISPM 15 symbol protection to guide how to proceed on developing a legal component for protection the PCE through the confidentiality agreement.

##### **4.2. Updated PCE strategy with recommendations from the STDF project evaluation**

- [11] The secretariat reminded the members that a set of recommendations were made by the reviewer of the STDF project regarding the PCE. The Secretariat indicated that it would be good to have a road map of the deliverables of the strategy to guide the implementation process. The document presented showed the suggested revised strategy. It was noted that some items in the table were already included before the recommendations in the evaluation was made known. The table was adjusted to show what has been accomplished so far under the deliverables for 2022, and which activities are underway. A fifth column was added to the table to show the recommendations from the project, Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Facilitators (STDF/PG/401). The Chair suggested that going forward we focus on what needs to accomplish for next year. The Secretariat noted that according to one of the recommendations from the evaluation, we need to get clear commitment from the CPM regarding the PCE. The meeting agreed that a good strategy need to be developed to get the attention of the CPM. To make the PCE more visible, the meeting discussed whether a communication specialist should be employed to package the PCE to both donors and NPPOs. The edited document is attached as appendix #2.
- [12] In going through the strategy, the Secretariat under each Key Results area highlighted achievements so far and gave an update on what is in place to advance other deliverables for 2022. The Secretariat informed the members that they are invited to comment on the document by October 6<sup>th</sup> in order for us to have an updated strategy can be presented to the IC in November. Due to challenges with MS Teams, it was decided that drop box would be a better means of sharing the documents.

##### **4.3. Draft Terms of reference for IC PCE- Sub-group and Draft Terms of Reference for the Expert Working Group on the PCE**

- [13] The secretariat indicated that the purpose of these efforts is to set a sustainable framework for all PCE activities. The drafts were presented, and the team was taken through the contents. The team members

provided brief comments; however, they were asked to go through the drafts and provide their specific comments by October 6<sup>th</sup>.

#### **4.4. Draft outline for new PCE facilitators training course**

- [14] The document was presented by the Secretariat, noting that this proposal is in line with the PCE strategy and proposal from the review of the project 401.
- [15] The secretariat also indicated that the funds is not available at this time, however the training plan needs to be ready. The format is a blended learning modality including the relevant online courses offered by the IPPC with aspects of the former training included. The team members were invited to review the document and give their comments by October 6<sup>th</sup>.

#### **5. Any other business**

- [16] No other business was discussed.

#### **6. Next meeting dates**

- [17] The meeting date was set for the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 2021.

#### **7. Close of the meeting**

- [18] The Chair reminded the members to comment on the documents and thanked the members for their attendance.

**Appendix 1****VIRTUAL MEETING N° 4****IC PCE TEAM MEETING***September 9, 2021 (3 pm - 5 pm), Rome Time (Central European Time, GMT +1)***PROVISIONAL AGENDA****Agenda**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>		<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>	--	
1.1	By the IPPC Secretariat		Brent LARSON/Sarah BRUNEL
1.2	By the Chair		Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO
<b>2</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>	--	Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur	--	Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM04_01_PCE_team_2021_Sept	Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO
<b>3</b>	<b>Update on PCE activities (PCEs being undertaken)</b>		Sarah BRUNEL/ Fitzroy White/ Francisco GUTIERREZ/ Ringolds ARNITIS
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementing the PCE Strategy</b>		Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO/Sarah BRUNEL
4.1	Update and actions taken from last meeting: - PCE Facilitator accreditation procedure to be presented to the IC in November - PCE confidentiality agreement to be presented to the IC in November - Findings on ISPM 15 symbol protection - Discussions with UNICC		Sarah BRUNEL/Fitzroy WHITE
4.2	Updated PCE strategy with recommendations from the STDF project evaluation	VM04_02_PCE_Team_2021_Sep	Sarah BRUNEL/Fitzroy WHITE
4.3	Draft Terms of reference for ICPC- Sub-group and Draft Terms of Reference for the Expert Working Group on the PCE	VM04_03_PCE_Team_2021_Sep	Sarah BRUNEL/Fitzroy WHITE
4.5	Draft outline for new PCE facilitators training course	VM04_04_PCE_Team_2021_Sep	Sarah BRUNEL/Fitzroy WHITE

---

<b>6</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	--	Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO
<b>7</b>	<b>Next Meeting: October 21 from 3 to 5 PM Rome time</b>	--	Magda GONZALEZ ARROYO

## Appendix 2

### UPDATED PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY EVALUATION STRATEGY FOR 2020-2030

In May 2019, the IC agreed to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation strategy for 2020-2030.

Since May 2019, the IC Team met three times and achieved some results, the IPPC Secretariat undertook activities related to the PCE and the STDF published [ex-post evaluation of the Project 401 “Developing A Network of PCE Facilitators”](#).

An updated strategy is proposed in Appendix 1. The last column of the table of the key results of the PCE Strategy 2020-2030 provides the recommendations of the ex-post evaluation related to the six key areas.

When these recommendations were already captured in the strategy, the point of the recommendation was indicated after the related result in yellow. When the recommendation was not initially included in the strategy, a result with the number of the recommendation were added in yellow.

Activities undertaken under each key area are indicated in bold and italics.

*The IC Team on PCE is invited to:*

- (1) Review the table of the key result area with new activities and achievements;
- (2) Agree on a way forward to update and implement the PCE Strategy for 2020-2030

## APPENDIX 1

### PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY EVALUATION STRATEGY FOR 2020-2030

(As approved by May 2019 IC, Appendix 11)

#### *Introduction*

The PCE originally started as a pilot project developed by New Zealand in 1999 with the aim to assist countries to develop a national plan to improve their phytosanitary system and to justify requests for technical assistance.

In subsequent years the PCE was updated and implemented in the framework of projects, including the development of an on line version. The PCE is designed to help countries identify both strengths and weaknesses in their phytosanitary systems and to then develop a national phytosanitary capacity building strategy and prioritize actions to be taken to correct gaps. The PCE may be used to strengthen national phytosanitary systems including enhanced planning, management and leadership development, revision of phytosanitary legislation and related legal instruments, etc. Furthermore, many donors request the application of the PCE as a previous step that conditions fitness for funding projects proposals.

As of 2019, the PCE has been implemented in over 70 countries around the World.

#### *Vision*

Countries are empowered to continuously improve their phytosanitary systems [through ongoing analysis and review] to prevent the introduction and spread of pests.

#### *Strategic objectives*

The primary goal of the IPPC as outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 is that all countries have the capacity to implement harmonized measures to reduce pest spread and minimize the impact of pests on food security, trade, economic growth and the environment. The PCE strategy directs the implementation of two specific 2030 key result areas for implementation and capacity development to achieve this goal. They are:

- Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation has been widely used by member countries to understand strengths and weaknesses and develop plans to address capacity deficiencies.
- The IPPC Secretariat is resourced to help countries access assistance to address phytosanitary capacity needs.

***Key results***

- (1) Countries, donors and development organizations are aware of the PCE and understand the benefits arising from its application;
- (2) Long-term sustainable funding is in place to support the maintenance and administration of the PCE and resources are mobilized to support the application of the PCE;
- (3) The PCE software and platform are reliable, effective and easy to use;
- (4) The PCE Tool is revised and updated regularly and new modules and strategic planning tools are added as needed to support the IPPC Mission (e.g. environmental module, implementation follow up tool);
- (5) A strong network of phytosanitary expertise is available to facilitate the application of PCEs;
- (6) The Monitoring and Evaluation framework is used to analyse, measure and report outcomes from the application of PCEs.



*Key results of the PCE Strategy 2020-2030*

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
<p><b>1. Countries, donors and development organizations are aware of the PCE and understand the benefits arising from its application</b></p>	<p>A PCE communications plan is drafted.</p> <p>Communications products (factsheets, videos, presentations, etc.) are developed and published as per communications plan (5.4)</p> <p>Awareness materials integrate the manual “Preparing a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy” to guide CPs, donors and providers on PCE processes</p> <p><b>A dedicated PCE page on the IPP is available</b></p> <p><b>A video from the STDF 401 project is available</b></p> <p><b>A video from the PCE in Nicaragua is available</b></p> <p>An assessment is undertaken to maintain the integrity of the PCE Tool (e.g. copyright) (5.1)</p> <p><b>A confidentiality agreement for observed observers? was agreed by the IC PCE Team</b></p>	<p>Communications products (factsheets, videos, presentations, etc.) are developed and published as per communications plan.</p> <p>Annual country reporting of PCE application are held at CPM</p>	<p>Communications products (factsheets, videos, presentations, etc.) are developed and published, as per communications plan</p> <p>Annual country reporting of PCE application are held at CPM.</p>	<p>5.1 Review and revise confidentiality provisions surrounding the PCE, its use and outcomes to ensure they are relevant and appropriate while optimising transparency of the PCE and the evaluation process and providing options for countries to report evaluation outcomes.</p> <p>5.4 Promote the PCE and the benefits from its use to contracting parties, donor organisations and capacity development providers.</p> <p>11. Ensuring that the process being facilitated is recognised and supported by the proposing organisation as a core function will enable the allocation of resources to maintain and use it. An ‘orphaned’ process is unlikely to be sustainable in the medium to long term.</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
	<p>A standing point is introduced to the CPM agenda for countries to report on PCE applications.</p> <p><b><i>A webinar on PCE was organized for OIRSA countries (comms?, could be part of a regional strategy via RPPOs?)</i></b></p>			
<p><b>2. Long-term sustainable funding is in place to support the maintenance and administration of the PCE and resources are mobilized to support the application of the PCE</b></p> <p>There are three elements I see. Core functions should be funded from RP. Funding PCEs should come from donor source (trust fund (countries), project funds, donors). The strategy should reflect this:</p> <p>(i) PCE process – curating the process, admin, confidentiality, facilitators (RP – core IPPC function)</p> <p>(ii) Core IT tool/PCE capability (RP – core IPPC function)</p> <p>(iii) funding of evaluations (trust fund)</p>	<p>The IRSS table of donors is updated.</p> <p>A resource mobilization plan is drafted</p> <p>Mechanisms for funding PCEs is explored</p> <p>An IPPC trust fund for the application of PCEs is established (5.6)</p> <p>A costed 5-year plan for maintaining the PCE tool is endorsed by the Bureau Finance Committee for adoption by the CPM and implementation through the RP budget.</p> <p>Rules of procedures for accessing the IPPC Trust Fund on PCEs are established</p>	<p>The IRSS table of donors is updated.</p> <p>The resource mobilization plan is implemented.</p>	<p>The IRSS table of donors is updated.</p> <p>The resource mobilization plan is fully implemented.</p>	<p>4. The CPM should articulate a clear commitment to the PCE as a core method of providing information about the IPPC and for helping to evaluate national phytosanitary systems, including clear expectations on how and when it should be conducted, and ensure it is adequately funded. Articulating and demonstrating the benefits of a PCE to IPPC contracting parties and capacity development donors is also crucial to drive ongoing demand for PCE and ensure that the outcomes of this project are sustained and achieve improved phytosanitary capacity by contracting parties.</p> <p>5. The CPM should request that the Bureau with the assistance of the Strategic Planning Group work with the IC and: - Take a lead from the OIE and with regard to issues raised by the IC, define the evolution of the PCE and capture this in a revised PCE strategy that is prepared for adoption by CPM.</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
	<p>Discussions are held with donors (links with comms strategy?).</p> <p><b>COLEACP funds a PCE in Sierra Leone</b></p> <p><b>World Bank funds a PCE in Nepal</b></p> <p><b>GIZ funds a PCE in Senegal</b></p> <p><b>EC plans to funds 9 PCE in COMESA countries</b></p> <p><b>A webinar on PCE was organized for OIRSA countries</b></p> <p>IC sub-group for PCE set (point 5) and revises the PCE strategy (points 5 and 5.7)</p> <p>CPM 16 (2022) agrees on a clear commitment for the PCE and expectations of CPs using PCE to define and report capacity to implement the Convention. (point 4)</p> <p>Cost analysis for developing, validating, maintaining and deploying using facilitators drafted (point 10).</p>			<p>5.6 Direct sufficient resources from the Regular Program Budget to maintain the PCE tool as a core process.</p> <p>5.7 Review and revise the PCE strategy to integrate CPM decisions on the PCE and future actions to evolve the PCE.</p> <p>10. The drivers for using facilitators, as opposed to other approaches, should be defined and an analysis undertaken by the proposing organisation to determine whether they are the best solution. A benefit: cost analysis might be useful in weighing the up the cost of selecting, training and maintaining a pool of facilitators. If the use of facilitators is supportable for efficiency and is sustainable in the medium-term, the approach taken in this project offers a useful method of developing facilitation skills in technical experts. Since IPPC has done this the benefit cost analysis is likely less critical. However, there is a cost of maintaining/expanding the pool of facilitators that should be considered against benefits – A strategy element might be to review and define the processes for developing, accrediting, maintaining, deploying PCE facilitators (by 2025)</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
<p><b>3. The PCE software and platform are reliable, effective and easy to use</b></p>	<p>A study on IT solutions for the PCE is drafted. <b>UNICC was contacted to provide an offer to migrate the PCE platform</b></p> <p>The PCE software and platform are fully functional (i.e. stakeholders' analysis, SWOT, problem analysis and logical framework) (5.3)</p>	<p>Updates are integrated to the PCE Tool as necessary (as per 4 and 5).</p>	<p>Updates are integrated to the PCE Tool as necessary (as per 4 and 5).</p>	<p>5.3 Upgrade the PCE, including the on-line tool to ensure it is stable, robust and fit for purpose and allocate resources for ongoing maintenance and enhancement. The upgrade should integrate options for virtual application; consider separating modules to enable modular application of the PCE against specific value chains identified by the country; add a module that leads the country through the development of a national strategy and action plans; add any other modules that are considered useful by contracting parties such as border services to comply with the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement or risk-based sampling, review confidentiality and implement controls to safeguard processes and content using contemporary security and intellectual property controls</p>
<p><b>4. The PCE Tool is revised and updated regularly and new modules and strategic planning tools are added as needed to support the IPPC Mission (e.g. environmental module, implementation follow up tool)</b></p> <p>Two issues:</p> <p>Content – contemporary, relevant, modular, supporting country priority needs</p> <p>Evaluation processes – preparation to optimize</p>	<p>A Baseline Survey is launched to get feedback from all previous PCE users on modules and strategic planning tools to be improved or added into the PCE.</p> <p><b>A procurement order for this task is under preparation</b></p> <p>Working groups or e-forums are established to revise or develop new modules and tools to address identified needs. <b>TOR for an EWG are being drafted</b></p>	<p>Routine survey of all countries that have applied the PCE during the previous calendar year is launched to get feedback on the modules.</p> <p>The action plan on modules and tools to be revised and/or added is implemented through working groups or e-forums.</p> <p><b>Develop mechanisms to mutualize assets and gaps at the regional level (point 9).</b></p>	<p>Routine survey of all countries that have applied the PCE during the previous calendar year is launched to get feedback on the modules.</p> <p>The action plan on modules and tools to be revised and/or added is fully implemented through working groups or e-forums.</p>	<p>6. The IC and IPPC Secretariat, with input from PCE facilitators, should review and adapt the PCE and its processes for virtual delivery. This would be informed by virtual and hybrid (part virtual - part face-to-face) PCEs that are being trialled in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The virtual PCE should be modular and include a new 'pre-PCE' module to guide countries through a process of defining priority and targeted outcomes as the value proposition that the national capacity development strategy will achieve. A project to develop and implement a transition plan, based on this network of facilitators and current experiences, is both timely and warranted.</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
<p>outcomes, tools and strategies for virtual PCEs</p>	<p>An action plan on modules and tools to be revised and/or added is developed (point 6 and 7). Working groups or e-forums are established to review and revise processes for preparing for, initiating and completing a PCE, developing and implementing a national development plan using contemporary tools and technology in a post-Covid world (point 6 and 7).</p>			<p>7. Similarly, opportunities for innovation in applying the PCE need to be actively explored, assessed and implemented by the PCE Team. At very least, the PCE and processes need to rapidly adapt to a COVID-19 world.</p> <p>9. Options for sharing higher-level needs identified by multiple PCEs undertaken in a region to analyse and respond to address regional capacity needs would be informed by the recent 32 Evaluation of STDF/PG/401 PCEs in Africa and the Caribbean. A small group of facilitators who were involved in these PCEs should be invited by the PCE Team to share their experiences and recommend a mechanism for sharing outcomes with due regard to confidentiality considerations. This might be something that CAHFSa could facilitate and discuss through the RPPO Technical Consultation forum.</p>
<p><b>5. A strong network of phytosanitary expertise is available to facilitate the application of PCEs</b></p>	<p>Five trainees who followed the initial theoretical PCE facilitators training are accredited. <b>Two trainees were accredited.</b></p> <p>Use the PCE training material for a general phytosanitary training (points 1 and 2) <b>A phytosanitary curriculum is planned as a priority topic by the IC</b></p>	<p>A training course for new PCE facilitators is set and delivered (points 3, 5.5, 12, 13). <b>A training outline is being drafted</b></p> <p>Training on the updated PCE Tool is developed and delivered to current PCE facilitators (virtual or face-to-face) (as required).</p>	<p>A training course for new PCE facilitators is set and delivered on a regular basis.</p> <p>Training on the updated PCE Tool is delivered to all current PCE facilitators (virtual or face-to-face) (as required).</p> <p>A functional network of PCE facilitators is in place to share experiences and advocate for the PCE.</p>	<p>1. Training materials developed by this project should be published by the IPPC Secretariat, with appropriate security and safeguards to maintain the integrity of the PCE processes.</p> <p>2. The IPPC Secretariat training content should be consolidated by the IC as a general training module for on-line training or for use in training programs by trainers accredited to use it. It should be made widely available to raise awareness of the IPPC and as a platform of common understanding of the Convention that</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
	<p>Procedure for accrediting PCE facilitators is published (points 5.8, 14)</p> <p><b>The IC PCE Team agreed on the PCE facilitators accreditation procedure</b></p> <p>The ongoing role and function of PCE facilitators is endorsed by CPM and directs the program for maintaining sufficient facilitator capacity and capability to meet PCE needs of CPs (CPM decision)</p>			<p>drives harmonisation of standards, measures and implementation for safe trade.</p> <p>3. Training partnerships between technical experts in the IPPC community and expert training organisations should be brokered by the IPPC Secretariat to enable specialist skills training such as facilitation, within the IPPC context. This would be more efficient and control over the technical content would be retained by the IPPC Secretariat.</p> <p>5.5 Establish arrangements, including resources, to increase the number of validated facilitators to meet future demands for PCE as a way to conduct a needs assessment as well as a method to monitor capacity development.</p> <p>5.8 Request the IPPC Secretariat to publish the assessment criteria and competency requirements for PCE facilitators as the basis for their formal accreditation by the Secretariat. This will ensure that countries seeking an independent facilitator will have full confidence in their ability.</p> <p>8. The PCE facilitator training may need to be adapted for remote learning. However, the first priority should be for the IC to consider alternative validation processes that are aligned with but independent of a PCE in order to validate/accredit as many facilitators as possible from the first facilitator cohort</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
				<p>12. Depending on the structure and functions or processes of the proposing organisation, a hybrid model for implementing training may be more cost effective – that is using technical expertise of the program with input and training in facilitation and other ‘soft skills’ by external providers with expertise in this area</p> <p>13. A post-COVID world may drive a change the role of a facilitator to more of a mentor or trainer of in-country coordinators of capacity development projects, rather than a ‘fly-in’ expert and this should be taken into account when considering the benefit: cost and sustainability of using facilitators.</p> <p>14. The assessment process for PCE facilitators described in Annex 8 is both comprehensive and complex. Having been developed with professionals it was technically robust, but with a large number of candidates, it was time consuming, and the ongoing testing was difficult for some candidates. However, it is potentially a useful platform for others considering using facilitators in their capacity development programs.</p>
<p><b>6. The Monitoring and Evaluation framework is used to analyse, measure and report outcomes from the application of PCEs</b></p>	<p>The IPPC Secretariat M&amp;E framework measuring global impacts of PCE applications is developed (points 5.2 and 15).</p>	<p>The M&amp;E framework is used to report on PCE applications and outcomes.</p>	<p>The M&amp;E framework is used to report on PCE applications and outcomes.</p>	<p>5.2 Develop a mechanism for reporting and sharing the outcomes of PCEs such that confidentiality and sensitivities of contracting parties are safeguarded but intelligence generated from evaluations can guide capacity development options</p>

Key Results	2022	2025	2030	Alignment of STDF 401 Post Evaluation Recommendations
	<p>Outcomes of PCEs are consolidated into regional and/or global capacity development needs analysis and published. These are also used to inform IPPC capacity development and implementation priorities (integrated into IC and SC processes)</p>			<p>and opportunity at national, regional and international levels. A concept similar to the OIE's voluntary Observatory of Standards may be relevant and useful to the IPPC Secretariat for monitoring implementation of the Convention and its standards and recommendations.</p> <p>15. The logframe is a valuable tool. To ensure it is used most effectively, the STDF Secretariat should develop or refer to existing guidance on its use as a monitoring and reporting framework to assist project leads who are unfamiliar with the tool.</p>