Implementing the Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items

Prepared by the CPM Focus Group on Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030

In 2019, CPM-14 endorsed the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030, with its eight development agenda items identifying priority work areas that are aligned to the IPPC’s vision, mission, and strategic objectives

In 2020, the Strategic Planning Group recommended a Terms of Reference be developed for a CPM focus group, to develop a clear plan for sequencing the implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 development agenda items.

In 2021, CPM-15 adopted the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. The need to have sufficient funding in place was emphasized, as was the importance of having an implementation plan for the Framework. CPM-15 agreed to establish a CPM Focus Group on Implementation Plans for the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.

The CPM Focus Group on Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda Items (FG SFDAIs) is responsible for ensuring the development of an overarching implementation plan for all IPPC Strategic Framework 2020 – 2030 development agenda items. The implementation plan needs to provide sequencing and staging for each initiative with clear start dates, milestones, feasible timelines, a monitoring and evaluation framework, and adequate estimation of required budget and staff, which may be used for resource mobilization purposes.

The FG has held ten virtual meeting since September 2021.

The FG quickly found that each of the SFDAIs are at very different stages of implementation. Each are using the suggestions for activities contained in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 as a guide. Some had clear short-term plans but for others planning had not started. Some have resources secured to fund the planned work and others do not. None of the SFDAIs that had clear goals, deliverables and budgets out to 2030. As a result, developing an overarching implementation plan has been a challenging task.

The FG has worked with Secretariat staff, relevant subsidiary bodies, focus groups on other topics, and steering committees to develop plans and budgets for each of the SFDAIs. These were then combined into one overarching integrated plan. During the integration process some activities and budgets have been adjusted to make the plan more feasible to smooth both financial and work pressures. The plan shows some SFDAI’s not starting, or being put on hold, until later in the 10-year period covered by the strategic framework. This does not indicate these SFDAIs are not a priority, simply that they cannot all be funded and worked on at the same time.

The attached report contains the proposed overarching and integrated plan. The FG seeks feedback on the proposed plan prior to submitting it for approval by CPM. Further work is required to properly test with the Secretariat subsidiary bodies and other groups before submitting for consideration by CPM.

There are several items and issues the FG highlights for SPG consideration. Any feedback on the following issues before, during or after the SPG meeting would be appreciated:

1. Note the report document is still draft and there are some areas still to be completed. Continuity and consistency checking is still to be done to ensure decision in one part of the document are reflected in other parts.
2. Figure 1 of the report on page 6 places each of the SFDAIs on a complexity: impact grid. Do you think the placements are approximately correct? Do you think such an illustration is helpful or should it be removed?
3. Figure 2 of the report on page 9 proposes sequencing and phasing for the SFDAIs. Recognise that many of the SFDAIs have already started in some way. Do you think the proposed sequencing is sensible and logical?
4. The finance and resource plan in Figure 3 is underpinned by more detailed tables identifying where secretariat and contract resource is required. Do you think CPM will need to see the detailed information to decide to approve the plan?
5. A large proportion of the plan is for staff resources in the secretariat. As the plan was being developed Secretariat staff made it clear that they do not have the capacity to take on the additional work required to properly plan and implement the SFDAIs. Do you agree additional funded staff resources should be provided to implement the Strategic Framework? Should this include staff to manage the programme of work in addition to deliver each SFDAI?
6. In the absence of guidance from the yet to be established Steering Group on POARS or the Bureau, the budget for POARS has been set at the level proposed for the first 3 years of POARS operation in paper 2022/36 paras 54-55. This level has been used after CPM feedback indicated the full proposal of $950k per annum was too high. Is the proposed budget starting at $295 increasing to $425k per annum appropriate until a firm recommendation is received for CPM approval?
7. Under figure 3 the report states “Projects should not proceed to Delivery phase until sufficient resources have been secured to support delivery.” Do you agree? Why?
8. Developing effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is challenging. Do you have any suggestions that would strengthen the proposed monitoring and evaluation framework?
9. Appendices A – H and the section ‘Plan Summaries for SFDAIs’ could provide a strong basis for an investment prospectus to support resource mobilisation activities. Some funding and staff time would be required to develop such a resource. Do you think developing such a prospectus would be of value? If yes, what would it need to contain?
10. Additional Feedback:
    1. Is the report clear and easy to understand? If not, what do we need to change?
    2. Does it have the expected information? If not, what is missing? Is it too long? If so, what should we remove?
    3. Do the recommendations throughout the paper seem reasonable and justified?
    4. How do you think it will be received and why?
    5. Does it provide a good basis for decision-making at CPM?
    6. Is there anything else needed before the FG reports back to CPM?

**Next Steps**

* 1. Following SPG, the FG will continue to consult with the Secretariat and other IPPC bodies to continue to improve the document and submit it to Bureau for approval. Once endorsed by the bureau, it will be submitted to CPM for approval. At this point the FG will have completed its work. It is anticipated that Bureau and the Secretariat would then manage implementation in line with the plan.
  2. The FG appreciates the input from each of its members, the Secretariat, and other IPPC bodies who have contribute to the plan.

**Recommendations**

SPG is requested to:

1. *Note* the attached draft report from the FG SFDAI
2. *Provide* feedback to the FG SFDAI to improve the attached report prior to it being received by CPM-17 (2023).
3. *Endorse* the report, subject to changes requested by SPG being made.