

March 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

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

**Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its
Institutional Arrangements -
Questions of the EC and its Member States to the Evaluation Team**

Agenda Item 10.8.1 of the Provisional Agenda

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

Questions of the EC and its Member States to the evaluation team

10.8.1. Update from the IPPC Evaluation team — CPM-Document 2007/30

on **No. 40** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- What exactly is meant by “a priorities study”?
- What is the relationship between such priorities study and the Business Plan plus operational plan that comprise the strategic planning of the IPPC activities?
- If it is recommended that IPPC shall give priority to specific standards instead of concept standards (second bullet point) this might prejudice some results of the priorities study (first bullet point). Could the meaning of these recommendations further clarified to this respect?
- By whom, how and when shall industry stakeholders be consulted?
- If its only mentioned that industry stakeholders shall be consulted: does his imply that knowledge and expertise of contracting parties’ experts shall not be used ?

on **No. 41** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Before a Technical Panel on Biodiversity is established: how can be assured that there is no overlapping with activities undertaken by the CBD and that double-work is avoided?
- How does the recommendation to have at least one standard per year on biodiversity issues relate to previous recommendations on setting up priorities?
- Could it be clarified why it seems necessary to have at least one standard per year that should have a primary theme directed at biodiversity issues? The recommendation to better address biodiversity aspects is understood but it is not clear why this should be done through one specific standard per year.

on **No. 42** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Who shall draft the explanatory documents?
- What is the clear distinction between the proposed measures to enhance the implementation of standards and means to ensure compliance with the IPPC?
- Why is it recommended to provide for explanatory documents and not to seek for clarification and clear language in the standards itself so an explanatory document would not be necessary? Are there no other methods to improve the quality of the standards to that respect?
- Standards do not have a legally binding character. If it is recommended that each standard shall be accompanied by an implementation statement and a plan on implementation does this not contradict the voluntary nature of implementing a standard?
- What should a regional implementation plan comprise?

on **No. 43** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Does the recommendation include financing stewards?
- What recommendations are given to ensure direct funding and extra-budgetary resources as well as the commitment for in-kind contributions?

on **No. 44** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Does “full participation” refer to a specific forum or a particular stage in the process?

on **No. 45** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Why is it recommended to provide for more detailed minutes and not to seek for clarification and clear language in the standards itself or could the regional SC members or stewards play a greater role?

on **No. 70** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- How is justified that an auto-evaluation system is not in contradiction with the sovereign right of every contracting party to decide on how to fulfil their reporting obligations?
- How exactly is the issue of fulfilling reporting requirements as recommended separated from the issue of compliance? Or is it understood that fulfilling report requirements will help to avoid non-compliance with the IPPC?

on **No. 91** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- It is not fully clear why the FAO and not the IPPC Secretariat is best placed to coordinate global support for strengthening national phytosanitary capacity. Could this be further explained?

on **chapter VII.** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Why is the work of the SBDS not analysed?
- Does the evaluator have recommendations regarding a possible improvement of the dispute settlement arrangements?

on **No. 112** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Are there any administrative burden that give reason to the FAO for not considering the outsourcing of translation activities?

on **No. 113** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- What is the relationship between the “annual programme of work and related budget” mentioned and the five-year business plan that shall be adopted by CPM 2 and the annual operational plan?

on **No. 114** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Could the concept “phytosanitary status of the world” be further clarified?
- Why would FAO and not IPPC be the most appropriate institution to make this “phytosanitary status of the world”?

on **No. 115** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- Could it be further explained why a number of 14 members in the Standards Committee is recommended as the most efficient size of this group?
- Could the role of the Bureau in the selection process be further clarified?

on **No. 122** of the draft report (CPM 2007/30):

- It is not clear why the new Bureau shall finally decide on the appointment for the Full-time Manager. Could this be further explained?
