

REVIEW OF POARS GOVERNANCE OPTIONS: PROS AND CONS

(Document prepared by the Governance team in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat)

[1] This paper outlines a review of governance options for the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System (POARS), presenting the pros and cons of various potential structures. The goal is to determine the most effective governance model to manage POARS within the context of IPPC operations. Here's a breakdown of the options:

- Option 1 – POARS Subsidiary Body
- Option 2 – IC Sub-group
- Option 3 – Steering/Technical Group (akin to the E-phyto Steering Committee)
- Option 4 – A Subsidiary Body Composed of POARS and Either the APP or Certain Topics of the IC
- Option 5 – CPM Focus Group

[2] The pros and cons analysis for each option is presented as follows:

Option 1 – POARS subsidiary body

Pros
A committee reports directly to CPM speeding up some procedures for emergencies.
Creating a dedicated body would signal to the community and stakeholders that the issues under POARS are being taken seriously, potentially enhancing credibility and support.
POARS activities are broader in scope than the IC, requiring outcomes from the SC and IC.
A lot of advocacy and resource mobilization is needed for POARS.
Cons
The new body might overlap with existing committees, such as the IC
Establishing a new body would require additional resources for the Secretariat, including funding, time, and personnel.
The return on investment (ROI) for creating a new body is unclear.
Convincing contracting parties to support the creation of a new subsidiary body could be challenging, especially if the concept is not clearly defined or lacks immediate perceived benefits.

Option 2 – IC sub-group

Pros
The POARS is an implementation activity and therefore fits under the IC remit.
It would not require the same resources and funding as for a subsidiary body.
Cons
The IC is overloaded with several key topics to manage.
There is currently a lack of resources and staff time available for a sub-group
To function, a sub-group would need at least 10 members or more, almost as many as the full IC itself. This would be an unwieldy structure.
Processes will be slower than if there was direct reporting to the CPM.

Options 3 – Steering/technical group (akin to the E-phyto steering committee)

Pros
A committee reports directly to CPM speeding up some procedures for emergencies
Creating an individual group would send a positive signal to the community and stakeholders
Establishing this group would not take the same level of resource, funding, time and personnel as for a subsidiary body. The foundation has already been developed.
POARS activities are broader in scope than the IC, requiring outcomes from the SC and IC
Separate advocacy and resource mobilization could be initiated for POARS
Cons
Greater levels of resources, funding, time and personnel would be required than for an IC sub-group
The new body might overlap with existing committees, such as the IC

Option 4 – A subsidiary body composed of the POARS and either the APP or certain topics of the IC (creating two IC subsidiary bodies)

Pros
This would be of a scale sufficient for setting up another subsidiary body
Cons



The POARS would not be as flexible or as quick to respond when encumbered by other areas of work

Option 5 - CPM Focus Group

This was not considered fully, as a Focus Group is not permanent and would therefore not be adequate to sustain the POARS.

Transition arrangements

It should be noted that transition arrangements could also be considered, with certain options evolving into others as the need arises.

The POARS SG is invited to:

- *Review and agree* with the pros and cons outlined for options 1-5.
- *Recommend* which governance option should be adopted for POARS.