August 2007

E

منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة | 联合国粮食及农业组织 | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture | Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Ninety-eighth Session

Rome, 3 - 7 September 2007

Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

A. OVERALL RESPONSE TO THE EVALUATION

1. FAO Management welcomes this evaluation, which is the first undertaken for a Convention established under Article XIV of the Constitution of the Organization. Both the technical contents and the policy context of the IPPC are complex and continue to evolve. The evaluation team's efforts during the evaluation process as well as its report make real contributions to one of FAO's core activities. The evaluation raises important questions, offers a number of alternatives and provides a starting point for more efficient operations. The process has particularly enriched the discussion on the IPPC and its activities among the Contracting Parties. The outcomes achieved are fundamental to the Organization's mandate.

2. At its second session (26-30 March 2007), the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) was presented with an interim report from the IPPC evaluation team on the preliminary findings of the evaluation. In order to review the recommendations of the final evaluation report and generate timely CPM positions and other input 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 relevant to FAO and that all decisions by the ESPTA, being forwarded 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.

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

W0000

3. The ESPTA was held from 19 to 22 June 2007 in Rome. The report of the ESPTA meeting is presented separately. FAO Management notes that in regard to a number of recommendations dealing with FAO internal administrative matters, such as pay-grades, staff selection and FAO/IPPC constitutional relationships, the ESPTA meeting did not have the legal expertise to give detailed positions, but nevertheless indicated its preferences on an "in-principle" basis.

4. FAO Management considered the report carefully. Of the 60 recommendations, 36 are addressed to FAO and 24 to the CPM. Of those addressed to FAO, Management accepts wholly or in part 32 and rejects 4. It welcomes the team's overall conclusions provided in paragraphs 203 to 206.

5. FAO Management agrees that serious concerns remain about the under-staffing of the Secretariat and funding limitations. The Organization has tried to meet a number of the financial requirements of the IPPC within the falling real value of the overall Regular Programme budget, such that IPPC's share of FAO's budget has increased by 75% since 2002-03. The proposed PWB 2008-09 provides for a "maintenance budget" that does not allow for major adjustments to resources, also pending the eventual recommendations of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) and the governing bodies' responses to them.

6. With regard to paragraphs 207 to 209, FAO Management supports the recommendations' aim to promote greater efficiency of actions taken at various levels. It agrees that equitability among all Contracting Parties could be further improved. However, it also wishes to point out that the accomplishments referred to in paragraphs 203 to 206 could not have been achieved without there already being a very high level of ownership of the processes and outputs by FAO Members in general and more specifically the Contracting Parties (*para* 208).

7. FAO Management considers FAO's relationship with Bodies established under Article XIV of its Constitution, and in particular the IPPC, to be of fundamental importance. The FAO Conference has considered these issues in detail on various occasions, the latest in 2005, and has taken a number of decisions that are reflected in the Basic Texts of the Organization. The evaluation report does not discuss these various legal provisions which determine how the IPPC, its Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the provision of the Secretariat are embedded within FAO, and which offer the elements for strengthening them. Several findings, including those reflected in paragraphs 166, 208 and 209, need to be reviewed in the light of these Conference decisions and it may be necessary to develop a special paper on these issues for review by the CPM and FAO Governing Bodies.

8. FAO Management notes that the implementation of a number of the recommendations depends on additional funding. While recognizing that there are insufficient funds to sustain the present programme, the report identifies a number of additional activities. Management would have appreciated it if an analysis had also been presented on their cost implications and on possible options to meet them.

9. FAO Management agrees that the Secretariat's overall funding base for its activities needs further review (*para* 209ii). These issues have been discussed at the CPM and its predecessor, the ICPM, without positive results. FAO Management agrees fully with the team's conclusion that further steps are required on resource mobilization and it would welcome a commitment by Contracting Parties to ensure the necessary additional funding over a significant period.

10. With respect to technical assistance for phytosanitary capacity building, FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team's emphasis on the urgent and widespread need for capacity building, and the desirability of better coordinated efforts by all actors including donors and development cooperation agencies, including FAO to respond to this need. Management also agrees that a broader range of FAO's technical resources, networks, and experience in technical assistance for capacity building should be brought to bear through specific strategies and partnerships to build national phytosanitary capacity. FAO Management holds that all training

activities associated with the IPPC are inter-related and that the Standards set by the CPM will only benefit the Members, especially developing countries, if their capacities to implement them are strengthened. Therefore, FAO Management considers the IPPC Secretariat to be best suited to catalyze and coordinate that response, because it concentrates FAO's knowledge on phytosanitary development, and because it has privileged access to the wealth of expertise present in the CPM. The bulk of country-level work would not be executed by the Secretariat, but the Secretariat would provide guidance, indicators, suggest partners and assess progress. FAO would be one provider of capacity building in the context of better shared knowledge among bilateral and multilateral providers. FAO Management has recently started an Organization-wide initiative on capacity building, and phytosanitary capacity represents an opportunity for that initiative to move quickly.

B. COMMENTS ON FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

11. FAO Management appreciates the scope and focus of the evaluation report. FAO Management agrees with great majority of the findings by the evaluation Team and welcomes the opportunity the report provides to bring to the attention of FAO Members the major issues faced by the IPPC. In this section FAO management offers comments on those recommendations where clarification would assist the Membership's consideration.

12. FAO Management appreciates the evaluation team's clear description of the diversity of Members' interests currently served by the IPPC and of the different sources of the relevance it maintains for different Parties (*paras*. 20 -25).

Standards and the standard setting process

13. FAO Management agrees with the Evaluation Team that Biodiversity concerns (*paras 31-35*) are growing in international importance and are relevant to the IPPC and the work of the Secretariat. The scopes of the IPPC and of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) partly overlap in relation to Invasive Alien Species and Biosafety. The CPM, the CBD Conference of Parties (COP) and the Secretariats of the two Conventions have therefore addressed this, notably in their Memorandum of Cooperation (2003). The revision of ISPM 11 on Pest Risk Analysis was accomplished with the full technical collaboration of the Secretariat of the CBD, and ISPM 5 also includes environmental and biodiversity issues. FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team that more could be done within the frameworks of both the CBD and the IPPC, if additional resources were available. FAO management would have appreciated additional discussion in the report of the added value and cost-effectiveness of a special Technical Panel on Biodiversity and the incorporation of specific statements on biodiversity implications in all ISPMs.

14. FAO Management appreciates the evaluation team's clear identification of impediments to the standard setting process in its report. The CPM, during its second session, recognized the limitations and organized a special Focus Group which met in July 2007 to develop recommendations for consideration at CPM-3 (2008). A flexible approach to standard setting allows for rapid action where required, using a thorough and participatory process.

15. FAO Management appreciates the balanced presentation by the evaluation team of the different perceptions and interests expressed when Parties discuss the rate of standard setting (*paras 49, 50*). Management recalls that not all countries need to apply all standards at the same time. FAO management agrees with the evaluation team's judgment that 3-4 standards per year is a realistic rate at the present time.

16. FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team that the Standard Committee's membership and size require consideration from the point of view of operating efficiency and cost. FAO management believes that three issues are involved: the first being the criteria for membership; the second is related to the workload of the Committee; and the third is geographical representation. The report does not explain how the latter two issues could be better met through reducing the membership to 14.

Information exchange

17. FAO Management agrees that there appears to be satisfaction with the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) as a tool to provide information from the Secretariat (*paras 97, 106*). FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team's findings that the IPP mechanism for information exchange among Parties remains in its infancy (*paras 105, 107*), as many Parties have not yet fulfilled all of their reporting obligations, including information from major importing countries. FAO Management urges Parties to consider as soon as possible the practicality and policy implications of the IPP as an information exchange mechanism.

18. FAO Management welcomes the evaluation team's suggestions (*para 100*) to develop and follow a strategy to access more information through electronic links and data harvesting. This should take into account the existence of Regional Plant Protection Organizations' (RPPOs') databases and cooperation with other information exchange programmes that exist at the World Animal Health Organization (OIE) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). FAO Management agrees with the report that basic infrastructure for such cooperation exists through the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) (*para 100*).

Technical Assistance

19. FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team that there is a great need for technical assistance, particularly in phytosanitary capacity building (*paras* 126, 127). FAO Management also agrees that FAO's support to build Members' capacity in implementing the IPPC should not be limited to the IPPC Secretariat. FAO Management wishes to point out that the report's characterization of reduced project effectiveness (*para 118*) based on a desk study does not seem to be supported by the results produced from country visits, questionnaires and statements from countries indicating positive outcomes (*para 119*). FAO Management considers that TCP assistance in particular helps countries to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their plant protection infrastructure, and helps to address specific, clearly identified problems. FAO Management agrees that TCP projects should be followed up with larger, longer-term projects; that is one of the core functions of the TCP programme, to support Members assess and articulate their development needs in a technically sound manner so as to attract more substantial cooperation support. FAO Management considers that the phytosanitary capacity building programme has made an important contribution by increasing the numbers of Members that have clear strategies for developing phytosanitary capacity to implement the IPPC and protect their own plants. It also considers commendable the networks of regional phytosanitary experts engaged and strengthened as an intentional component of the capacity building strategy. On the question of partnerships with other donors (*para* 127), FAO Management wishes to point out that the operational field project cooperation with Japan for South East Asia region is well developed, and that planning with the USA and with the EU, both in relation to Eastern and Southern Africa, is advancing.

20. As mentioned in Section A *para* 10, FAO Management agrees that a wider range of FAO's units should be engaged in phytosanitary capacity building, and will likely execute most of those projects rather than the Secretariat. Management does not agree with the separation of technical assistance for "core activities" and national phytosanitary capacity building (*paras 130-131*). FAO Management considers that the Secretariat not only has important expertise among its staff, but more importantly, as pointed out by the ESPTA report, the Secretariat has unique access to the expertise in the CPM. A catalytic and coordinating role, guiding rather than executing technical assistance for phytosanitary capacity building, would be a more efficient functional arrangement.

21. FAO Management welcomes evaluation team's emphasis on the importance of exploring capacity building and related resource mobilization strategies among donors and recipient countries (*para 128*), taking into account the country-driven nature of such assistance. Rather than establishing a new stand-alone Consultative Group, FAO Management would prefer to strengthen its role in and the overall usefulness of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). This provides a forum for a number of donors, and a data warehouse that in principle is the most

complete stockpile of information on SPS-related, including IPPC-related, field projects. In this respect, FAO's regional and sub-regional officers could work with FAO representations, countries and local representatives of donors to better understand donor policies, priorities and programmes and recipient countries' needs.

Governance, Management and Funding of the IPPC

22. FAO Management notes that the report does not fully address governance in line with the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, under which the IPPC was concluded. Accordingly, the IPPC and the CPM and its subsidiary bodies are clearly placed, and exclusively operate within the framework of the Organization, as indicated in the Basic Texts under Part R (Principles and Procedures which should govern Conventions and Agreements concluded under Articles XIV ..... of the Constitution). In this respect and in response to *para 167*, FAO Management notes that the Convention in its revised text carefully follows Article XIV.

23. FAO Management agrees with the evaluation team that the CPM has addressed the various activities within its mandate in an effective manner (*para 146*). Parts C and D contain detailed comments on the recommendations, taking into account that the IPPC is an "Article XIV Convention" categorized as not having an autonomous budget (Part R- Appendix *paragraph 33b*). FAO Management considers it important that the programme executed through the CPM and IPPC Secretariat is owned by the Members of FAO and is not perceived to be an "independent Organization." (In the Executive Summary, *para*. xxi erroneously describes the IPPC as "an autonomous Organization").

24. In addition "Article XIV Conventions" are inextricably linked to FAO. Their text does not entrust them with a legal personality, *i.e.* a capacity to hold rights and obligations of their own, and therefore they have to act through the Organization and drawing on the legal capacity of FAO, which has to respond for any liabilities arising from the activities of any "Article XIV Convention", for instance, in connection with arbitration proceedings, and provide privileges and immunities. The Secretary and the staff are officials of FAO, appointed by the Director-General and are subject to the Staff Regulations and Rules of the Organization as well as to the disciplinary authority of the Director-General. In this respect, it would be useful to consider the Report of the 77th Session (October 2004) of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal matters (CCLM) and paragraphs 90 to 98 of the Report of the 127th Session of the Council (November 2004).

25. FAO Management recognizes that the Secretariat is understaffed (*paras 160-168*), often causing Secretariat staff members to work far beyond the call of duty. Management wishes to express its thanks to those countries that have made generous operational contributions particularly to a wide range of standard-setting activities either in cash or in staff and to those individuals who have contributed their personal time.

26. FAO Management is concerned that the report's statement "the IPPC Governing Bodies and the Secretariat are to a certain extent disconnected and do not fully engage the responsibilities of the Contracting Parties" (*para 166*) is not substantiated by a thorough analysis of the reasons and effects of the perceived disconnection (see also Part A, *paras* 6 and 7). Management also wishes to point out that the Secretariat has discussed the budget, expenditure and financial situation in detail with the Bureau and SPTA and incorporated many suggestions in revising the budgets every year since 2001 (*para 167*).

27. FAO Management recognizes the evolving composition of the IPPC's overall resource envelope and requirements, but also stresses the severe limitation of resources in its Regular Programme as indicated in *para 180*, despite increased allocations over recent biennia.

28. It is implied by *para 181* that the FAO-provided Secretariat is fully responsible financially to the Bureau. It seems to FAO Management that this would not be in line with Article XIV of the FAO Constitution and is in contrast to the role of the Bureau in other treaties both within and outside FAO. FAO Management accepts that the Secretariat should continue to

provide the CPM, the Bureau and the SPTA with detailed financial information and to make them aware of possibilities and limitations.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE WORKINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

C. Response to the Recommendations of the Evaluation, and D. Action Plan for Follow-up to the Evaluation

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
1. Standards and Standard-setting Process					
Quality and usefulness of standards					
1.1. As the existing concept standards cover already many fundamental international plant quarantine and inspection functions, there should be a greater balance in the selection of standards in favour of specific standards;	Agree; Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM[2]) issue	FAO Management agrees that there should be an appropriate balance between concept and specific standards. This issue has been addressed by the *ad hoc* informal working group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and the CPM.	CPM consideration	Continuing	IPPC Secretariat
1.2. Industry stakeholders should be consulted and their knowledge and experience used at an early stage of the standard-setting process, particularly for specific standards on the basis of the Codex model (as explained in paragraph 56), and the necessary safeguards should be set up;	Partially agree; CPM issue	The instances where this would be useful, and the mechanism and the necessary safeguards would need to be decided by the CPM. Most consultations with industry stakeholders occur at national level and these are then reflected by Parties in CPM meetings.	CPM-3 consideration	April 2008	IPPC Secretariat
1.3. Greater efforts should be put into	Agree;	The present system of priority setting was decided by the CPM, and priorities are	CPM-3	July 2007/	IPPC Secretariat

[1] Where the issue is primarily a CPM responsibility, Management gives a view and therefore uses the term “agree”, “partially agree”, or “mostly disagree”. Where the issue is in part or completely an FAO Management responsibility, Management “accepts”, “partially accepts”, or “rejects” the recommendations.

[2] Governing Body of the IPPC

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
prioritization of standards, using existing criteria and weighting their importance as well as taking into account available resources;	CPM issue	considered by the SPTA and the CPM at each session. The Secretariat in consultation with the Bureau then makes further choices, based on the availability of financial resources, expertise and opportunities. This system should be revised in view of the large number of priorities that still exist. The CPM Focus Group on Standard Setting met in July 2007 and made recommendations to expand the criteria for selecting topics and in particular developed a shorter list of "core" criteria that must be met for a topic to be considered.	consideration	April 2008	
1.4. Priorities should also be based on maintaining an average number of three to four standards per year at least in the next three to five years (an increased number of standards may be envisaged where greater efficiency is gained in the process). The process through which priorities are established should be made clear to Contracting Parties;	Agree; CPM issue	This average annual target is less than the CPM-approved Business Plan which aims at five standards per annum. Both figures are, however, based on historical data and assumptions that do not necessarily hold for the future: the number of standards will depend on their nature, size, etc.	CPM-3 consideration	July 2007/ April 2008	IPPC Secretariat
1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;	Partially agree; CPM issue	RPPO standards are already widely used as starting points for International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), in particular specific standards.	CPM-3 consideration	July 2007/ April 2008	IPPC Secretariat
Environmental and biodiversity concerns					
1.6. A Technical Panel on Biodiversity should be established to review standards from the point of view of environmental impacts, biodiversity threats, and invasive species pathways that could be given accelerated priority and that could be included in the CPM work programme;	Mostly disagree; CPM issue	At national level, individual countries have asked their NPPOs to facilitate the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and this may be a good subject for case studies, e.g. in a paper for CPM discussion. At the level of the IPPC, substantial efforts are already made to cooperate with the CBD Secretariat and with the CBD Conference of Parties (COP) and its Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), and with the Ozone Secretariat. The recommendation seems to undervalue those efforts and proposes to use a mechanism - Technical Panels within Standard Setting - which was not designed for collaboration among Multilateral Environmental Agreements. It is not clear what the terms of reference of such a panel would be, neither is it clear whether this would be a cost effective operation or, if action is required, what other types of action were considered.	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
1.7 Some standards should have a primary theme directed at biodiversity issues;	Partially agree; CPM issue	This is a matter of priority setting, which is the responsibility of the CPM.	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat
1.8 The Expert Working Groups, Technical Panels and Standards Committee should incorporate bio-diversity and environmental considerations into their work so that all standards address these concerns, not just the standards coming from the Technical Panel on Biodiversity. All standards should have a statement regarding their biodiversity impact;	Agree; CPM issue	Biodiversity and environmental considerations are often addressed in the development of standards, where appropriate. However, considerations on this matter could be formalized as part of the standards setting process.	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat
1.9. An Environmental Liaison Officer position should be created in the IPPC Secretariat with responsibility for environmental content in standards, information and training, and for leading the Technical Panel; and she/he could also carry out liaison functions with other international organizations for the Secretariat such as the Convention on Biodiversity;	Partially accepted	There is certainly a need for an officer to function on a broader basis as a liaison with relevant international and regional organizations. Such responsibilities should be clearly identified. The addition of a position depends on the availability of resources.	Budget consideration	PWB after IEE	AGD, AGP, PBEP, IPPC Secretariat
Implementation of standards					
1.10. A procedure for monitoring implementation and impact of standards should be developed by the CPM, and used to inform both revisions of standards and the priorities and processes for developing new standards;	Partially agree; CPM issue	It may be desirable to have data on the cost effectiveness of standard setting. It is doubtful whether this is the most cost effective manner to achieve the purpose “to inform both revisions of standards and the priorities and processes for developing new standards”. This would imply a substantial cost to the Secretariat.	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat
1.11 Each standard should have an implementation statement indicating the expected timeframe for implementation, an estimate of the potential impacts and costs and benefits of implementation, and a plan on how implementation could be achieved and monitored;	Partially agree; CPM issue	In a few cases, considerations about the expected timeframe for implementation, an estimate of the potential impacts and costs and benefits of implementation, and a plan on how implementation could be achieved and monitored might have been helpful (ISPM 15). For many ISPMs an implementation statement would be impractical and irrelevant. Apart from these general considerations, this would have a substantial cost to the	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
		Secretariat.			
1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs;	Accepted	New workshops on implementation would need to be targeted carefully and would require additional funding. The workshops to review draft ISPMs are all currently dependent on extra-budgetary funding.	CPM consideration Budget and resource mobilization consideration	CPM-3 PWB after IEE	IPPC Secretariat AGD, AGP, PBEP, TCAP
Maintenance of the current level of standard setting					
1.13 The CPM should ensure that there is both sufficient direct funding either from the FAO Regular Programme or extra-budgetary sources, to recruit expertise in standard setting to facilitate the work of stewards and to be able to recruit the necessary expertise not provided on a voluntary basis and when needed;	Partially accepted; CPM issue	At the present staffing and funding level of the Secretariat by the FAO Regular Programme and with the uncertainties of extra-budgetary funding, it will be difficult even to maintain the present level of activities both in standard setting and in other activities. It is unclear how the CPM can "ensure" as it does not have the means to raise funds. For the responsibilities on funding see Sections 5 and 7.	CPM consideration Budget and resource mobilization consideration	CPM-3 PWB after IEE	IPPC Secretariat AGD, AGP, PBEP, TCAP
Participation of Contracting Parties					
1.14 Sufficient financial and technical support should be directed at active participation of experts from developing countries in the SC, and EWGs and TPs (this will mean the active search and financial support of experts from developing countries);	Accepted	Additional funding required.	Budget and resource mobilization consideration	PWB after IEE	AGD, AGP, PBEP, TCAP, IPPC Secretariat
Transparency of the standard-setting process					
1.15 Minutes of standard-setting committees (EWGs, TPs, SC) should provide sufficient	Agree	The CPM Focus Group on Standard Setting that met in July 2007. Specified that reports of the standards committee, technical panel and expert working group meetings should	CPM consideration	CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
Division) will recommend a candidate for Secretary to the Director-General following a transparent and competitive selection process.		open, transparent process, which involves presenting the D-G with a short-list of suitable candidates. If a future budget enabled the creation of the Secretary (D1) position, the Organization will advertise the post widely as well as seek nominations from the CPM for the pool of qualified applicants to be considered by the D-G.			
6.8 A similar procedure will be followed for the selection of the professional staff of the IPPC Secretariat. Such staff would not be eligible for consideration as internal candidates for posts elsewhere in FAO.	Rejected	Professional appointments will be considered by the Professional Staff Selection Committee (PSSC) before a short-list is presented. For identification of the most qualified candidates for the short-list, the positions will be widely advertised and nominations will be sought from relevant institutions and organizations, including the CPM. Once appointed, under FAO Staff rules, any staff member must be eligible for consideration as an internal candidate for posts elsewhere in FAO.	No further action		
Structure and number of Professional Secretariat Staff					
6.9 Based on the analysis in the previous chapters, changes proposed regarding the structure and the number of professional staffing of the Secretariat are as follows: - D-1 IPPC Secretary (Manager) - 1 P-5 Senior Environmental Liaison Officer and Coordination with other international organizations - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Standards Officer - 3 P-4 Standards Officers - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Information Exchange Officer - 1 P-4 Information Officer - 1 P-3 Programmer - 1 P-2 Webmaster;	Partially accepted	The recommendation only refers to professional staff, whereas the CPM Business Plan refers to both professional and general staff. Also the number of Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) in the recommendation does not include contracted staff (especially in the standards setting process) and the voluntary in-kind contributions of particularly the stewards, again in the standards setting area. The Business Plan recognises that voluntary in-kind contributions are not sustainable and includes these FTEs plus the contracted assistance (estimated total of 3 FTEs). The Business Plan also includes the General Service staff (estimated 2) and an estimated 3 FTE s for Technical Assistance requirements. If Recommendation 6.9 was to include extra resources to replace the voluntary stewards and contracted assistance (estimated 3 FTEs), the necessary general services staff (2 FTEs) and maintain the Technical assistance capacity (estm. 3 FTEs) the adjusted figure would be **18** FTEs, which is one less than the Business Plan requirement of 19 FTEs.	Budget considerations; Further workload analysis of the Secretariat	PWB after IEE	AGD, AGP, PBEP, IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
7. IPPC's Financial Resources					
7.1. FAO should preferably ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM's expanded Bureau and FAO;	Partially accepted	Management recognizes that there are basic difficulties in reconciling FAO's budget with that of the expectations of the CPM. Management agrees that solutions need to be found, for example in-kind and extra-budgetary resources.	See 5.1 and 7.2	2008 continuing	PBE, TCAP
7.2. The annual budget and programme should be defined by the expanded bureau.	Partially accepted	A clear way forward is required to define realistic budget requirements. FAO and the IPPC Secretariat should prepare a paper on how to achieve this. The paper should also take into account the biennial nature of the FAO budget and the nature of the IPPC, the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat in relation to Article XIV of the FAO Constitution.	Prepare document for consideration by CPM-3 and FAO Governing Bodies	First discussion at CPM-3	IPPC Secretariat, AGP, AGD, PBEP, LEG, ODG
7.3. The Secretariat should be fully accountable to the expanded Bureau and should provide detailed and clear financial reports;	Partially accepted	According to the Convention, the Secretary is responsible for implementing the policies and activities of the Commission and carrying out such other functions as may be assigned to the Secretary by this Convention and shall report thereon to the Commission. In such a situation the Bureau can only have an advisory function unless the CPM decides otherwise. Furthermore, this can only be seen in the context of the CPM as an Article XIV body of the IPPC, which does not include financial responsibility for FAO's Regular Programme funds. FAO Management accepts that the Secretariat should continue to provide the CPM, the Bureau and the SPTA with detailed financial information and to make them aware of possibilities and limitations.	Prepare financial reports for consideration by CPM and FAO Governing Bodies	Continuing	IPPC Secretariat,
7.4. The Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilization strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding;	Accepted	FAO Management now welcomes innovative strategies and partnerships that obtain extra-budgetary support. The CPM and Bureau will need to be involved in this issue. FAO will have a corporate role in the resource mobilization for FAO strategies B1 and B2, including resource mobilization for the IPPC Secretariat and capacity building.	Develop further	2008-09	TCAP, IPPC Secretariat

Recommendation	Acceptance by Management[1]	Management Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
			Action	Timing	Unit responsible
7.5. Donor Contracting Parties should make an effort to tie their contributions to the IPPC's annual planning cycle;	Accepted	FAO Management notes that FAO's Regular Programme planning cycle is biennial. Donor funds would also contribute to improving the efficiency of the Secretariat by reducing uncertainties related to inflation and other unprogrammed costs.	IPPC Secretariat and CPM coordinate with donors	2008 continuing	IPPC Secretariat
7.6 More innovative approaches of funding such as cost-recovery schemes will have to be systematically and carefully considered in the future;	Accepted	FAO Management agrees but notes that this issue has been discussed at length over several years and little progress made. This modality would especially be of importance to new initiatives, where a measurable service was delivered by the IPPC Secretariat and CPM (e.g. recognition of pest free areas).	For discussion at SPTA and CPM	2007-08	IPPC Secretariat