**Extracts Relating to Technical Capacity Building**

**from Responses by the SPTA and FAO Council and FAO Programme Committee to the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements**

**(taken from CPM 2008/15 and CPM 2008/INF25)**

**…**. At its second session in 2007, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) was given an interim report by the evaluation team undertaking the external evaluation of the IPPC. The CPM was also informed that the final evaluation report would be presented to the FAO Programme Committee at its 98th session in September 2007. The CPM agreed that the meeting of the FAO Programme Committee would provide an appropriate opportunity to present CPM positions to FAO in regard to the future funding and support for the IPPC within the context of this evaluation report.

. In order to review the recommendations of the final evaluation report and generate timely CPM positions and other inputs for the Programme Committee, the CPM convened an extraordinary meeting of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (ESPTA). The CPM further agreed that the ESPTA should focus on recommendations that were FAO-relevant and that all decisions by the ESPTA going forward to the FAO Programme Committee should be taken by consensus. The CPM noted that the final evaluation report and its implications for the budget would be further discussed at CPM-3 in 2008.

. The ESPTA met on 19-22 June 2007 in Rome. In general, the ESPTA agreed with many of the recommendations in the evaluation report, although some changes or amendments were proposed to make them more suitable to IPPC circumstances.

. The recommendations in relation to technical assistance and capacity building were to a large degree not accepted. The ESPTA believed that the expertise to coordinate these activities is mainly present in the IPPC Secretariat. Also the recommendations concerning the role of the IPPC in biodiversity-related standard setting were believed difficult to realize.

**…**

. The Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) at its meeting in October 2007 discussed each of the recommendations again, reviewed the ESPTA recommendations, and considered the responses and comments provided by the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs) and by FAO management. The SPTA added recommendations and suggested action items. A detailed table of SPTA responses is provided in Annex 1. The full SPTA report is available at CPM-3 documents desk.

# Summary of recommendations and SPTA responses to the recommendations in the evaluation report

. The following is a summary of the recommendations and the SPTA responses. The recommendations have been arranged in clusters of loosely related themes. They have been paraphrased and simplified. Refer to Annex 1 for a full description of each recommendation and response.

# Recommendations regarding technical assistance and capacity building

1.12 Regional workshops on draft standards

2.1, 2.2, 2.4 Assist and provide training, including refresher training, to meet information exchange obligations

3.1 FAO to coordinate global support for capacity building

3.2 FAO to coordinate a consultative group on capacity building

3.3 FAO to organize technical capacity as part of its regular program

3.5 IPPC to only provide technical assistance related to core activities

6.5 Regional plant protection officers to perform specific tasks

. The SPTA disagreed with the proposals that would take the coordinating role for technical assistance and capacity building away from the Secretariat. The SPTA preferred to have the IPPC actions for capacity building follow the CPM Business Plan and recommended to develop and facilitate the implementation of a comprehensive capacity building strategy (see detailed proposal under agenda item 12.3). It noted that the open-ended working group (OEWG) on a possible IPPC compliance mechanism had made a proposal for an implementation review and support system (see agenda item 11.3). The reports generated from this system could also be useful in determining where capacity building was most needed. IPPC Secretariat would continue to coordinate technical assistance for capacity building, but links with the FAO-TCP programme and donor countries need to be strengthened.

. CPM is invited to:

* 1. Comment on the SPTA responses to the recommendations
  2. Confirm and adopt the SPTA responses to the recommendations
  3. Agree that the Bureau prepares appropriate modifications to the CPM Business Plan and the relevant action plans for implementation of the agreed recommendations, for consideration and approval by the SPTA and CPM-4.

Annex 1

Detailed response by the SPTA to the Independent Evaluation of the Working of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements

| Recommendation | Agreement  by  SPTA | SPTA Comment on the Recommendation | Recommendation to CPM-3 | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Timing | Unit Responsible |
| 1. Standards and Standard-setting Process |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs; | Agree with the 1st part  Partially  agree with the 2nd part | Workshops supporting implementation -within a capacity building strategy  [Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was:  Agree with the recommendations including assistance from RPPOs .  A coordinated strategy will be necessary between IPPC and RPPOs in order to accomplish the new regional WS on implementation  The TC-RPPOs notes that Goal 1 of the CPM BP includes RPPO assitance to members for the implimentation of standards] | Expand technical assistance and capacity building strategy in relation to the issue of implementation  Combination of RWS on ISPMs with training on implementation of ISPMs proposed | 2008 | Secretariat, SPTA, IWG-TA  CPM-3 |
| 2. Information Exchange |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistance to Contracting Parties |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1. The IPPC Secretariat should continue to assist countries to better understand their information reporting obligations and to provide training on how to use the IPP to meet those obligations; | Agree |  | As per recommendation | Ongoing | Secretariat |
| 2.2. Once the Secretariat finishes giving the basic workshop to Contracting Parties in all the regions, future training support should involve the development and provision of short refresher courses to reinforce the training and ensure capacity; | Agree | Opportunities should be explored to combine training workshops with refreshers workshops, consider networking amongst editors | As per recommendation | Ongoing, and as resources become available | Secretariat |
| Evaluation of obligation status |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4. In view of the arrival of new editors and the need for refresher information by existing ones, the IPPC Secretariat should continue the development of appropriate capacity-building tools; | Agree |  | Develop appropriate capacity-building tools and IPP manual | 2008 depending on resources | Secretariat, IPP Support Group |
| 3. Technical Assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coordination of Global Support |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 FAO, and not the IPPC Secretariat, is best placed to coordinate global support for strengthening national phytosanitary capacity; and | Disagree | Contrary to the recommendation in the report, the SPTA feels that the IPPC secretariat is best placed to coordinate phytosanitary capacity building. To this end, the SPTA recommends the development of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy which addresses implementation, funding, and linkages to FAO resources. The strategy, as developed, will specify reporting channels.  The requirements for phytosanitary capacity strengthening are best understood within the IPPC and not in the larger FAO system. The recommendation in the evaluation report would have the effect of relegating phytosanitary issues to a lower level. The CPM is made up of the world leaders of plant health and the Secretariat is staffed with some of the best expertise that can be found worldwide in phytosanitary matters. It would be better if the capacity of the IPPC Secretariat was improved to address the shortcomings of the technical assistance programme identified in the evaluation report. In this regard, the link between the IPPC Secretariat and FAO-TCP programs and donors needs to be strengthened with the lead within the IPPC Secretariat, rather than outside it. | Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy | starting 2008 | Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM |
| 3.2 An International Consultative Group on Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building on Phytosanitary Matters should be set up and coordinated by the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division.  The group:  a) would be open to all donors and recipient countries in the field of phytosanitary capacity;  b) objectives would be to define priority needs, facilitate resource mobilization, and ensure coordination;  c) it should establish effective linkages with the CPM; | Disagree | Same reason asfor 3.1. In addition it is felt that the recommendation in the report would add unnecessary new layers of decision making. |  |  |  |
| Organization of Technical Capacity |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 FAO, through the Plant Production and Protection Division, should organize the necessary technical capacity outside the IPPC Secretariat as part of its regular programme with a view to providing technical assistance in support of phytosanitary capacity development. FAO should do so taking into account its resources and in partnership with other main actors; | Disagree | Taking into account its resources and in partnership with other organizations, FAO should provide strong support to the IPPC for phytosanitary capacity building in developing countries. | Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy | Starting 2008 | Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM |
| IPPC Technical Assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.5 Technical assistance carried out directly under the IPPC should be limited to its core business, i.e. closely linked to a better understanding of standards and monitoring of the impact of these standards, the development and use of the IPP as a tool for information exchange among Contracting Parties, and support to developing country attendance at technical and governance meetings; | Partially agree | The technical capacity building strategy should consider:   * support in the development and implementation of standards * better understanding of these standards * monitoring of the impact of these standards * development and use of the IPP as tool for information exchange * support for developing countries’preparation for and participation in technical meetings. * support for developing countries’technical inputs into phytosanitary policymaking   In addition, the CPM Business Plan specifies the critical areas addressed under the IPPC’s technical assistance programme as being:   * modernization of legal frameworks * institutional strengthening * training in relation to the implementation of ISPMs * pest surveillance * pest risk analysis skills * information systems for decision making * documented procedures * laboratory facilities * strengthening of national capabilities and systems for the eradication/containment of introduced pest species * establishment of pest free areas. | Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy | Starting 2008 | Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM |
| 6. Secretariat |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical Assistance |  |  |  |  |  |
| In view of the proposed changes regarding the role of the Secretariat on technical assistance:  6.5. Regional Plant Protection Officers should perform specific tasks against reimbursement from the IPPC budget. Activities funded from this source should be concerned with the primary role of the IPPC (e.g. standard-setting, information exchange and dispute settlement); | Agree | The time that FAO regional plant protection officers dedicate to IPPC activities should be broadly correlated with the IPPC contribution to their post. The activities of the regional plant protection officers will be determined by the CPM work programme and the technical capacity building strategy | Regional officers report through the Chief, AGPP to the IPPC Secretariat on phytosanitary activities | Immediate | FAO, IPPC Secretariat |

FAO Governing Bodies’ Response to the Independent Evaluation of the Workings

of the International Plant Protection Convention

and its Institutional Arrangements

. 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).

**…**

. 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 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.

. 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.

**….**

. The CPM is invited to:

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

Annex

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.

**…**