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Back Ground

1. At CPM-7, the CPM established the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) to provide guidance on the IPPC capacity development activities. The CDC was established as a technical committee to be an oversight activities, but not as a new subsidiary body (like Standards Committee and Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement).
2. In establishing the CDC, the CPM also decided that the status of the CDC would be further discussed after the review to be conducted in two years based on the development and function during the period.
3. In its meeting in June 2013, the Bureau agreed that the review should cover the full two-year period, taking place after the CPM-9(March-April 2014) and its result would be presented to the Bureau in October and to the CPM-10 in March, 2015.
4. CPM-9 noted the Bureau decision that the review of the CDC will be presented to CPM-10 (2015) instead of CPM-9 (2014), with the CDC continuing its activities in the meantime;
5. Work plans(TOR) for the review was formulated based on the consultation between the Bureau and the Secretary in May 2014.

# Objectives of the review

* To help the CPM to decide the status of the CDC. More specifically, the CPM will discuss in its 10th Session (March 2015), whether the CDC would become a subsidiary body, stay as a technical committee, or should be considered otherwise.
* At the same time, the review exercise should include the summarization of the overall experiences from the initial period of CDC activities as a basis for the review

# Review arrangement

1. Review was tasked with agreed work plan to the group of six volunteering people, as follows:
* Ms Renata Clarke (FAO staff, Food safety unit)
* Mr Masato Fukushima (Japan): lead reviewer
* Mr Francisco Gutierrez (Belize)
* Mr Ralf Lopian (Finland)
* Ms Parul Patel (US)
* Mr Sankung Sagnia (FAO staff, FAO Sub-regional Office in Central Africa)

# Tasks of reviews

* Collect the information regarding CDC to have the overall picture, with proper help of the Secretariat.
* Identify the elements or criteria to consider what would affect the CPM decision on the CDC status.
* Also identify the potential advantages, drawbacks, and implications of converting the CDC into a formal subsidiary body, which the Secretariat would help in getting FAO legal views as well.
* In reference to the strategy and work plan approved by the CPM, review the process established for CDC related activities, the actual discussions, activities and achievements of the CDC.
* Plan and conduct interviews with the stakeholders. This may include the member of the Bureau, CDC, CPM Subsidiary Bodies, donors.
* Summarize the findings and develop recommendations based on the findings.
* Share the draft review report with the Secretariat and the Bureau for comments.
* Finalize the reports and submit to the Secretary, who will present it to the Bureau meeting in October for discussion.

# Questions for interview

*Identification questions*

1. What is your relation with the IPPC?
2. Have you been involved in CD activities of your country or other international organizations? If yes, specify.
3. Have you been involved in IPPC organized CD activities? If yes, specify.
4. What is the most outstanding issue you can associate with the CDC activities?

*General questions*

1. Please tell me briefly the roles which the CDC has played in its 2.5 years-of existence, in the IPPC CD activities and the overall framework of the IPPC. Mentioning the associated specific achievements would be helpful.
2. Please tell me the positive aspects of the CDC functions. Tell me the aspects to be improved if any.
3. Please tell me the positive aspects of the CDC process. Tell me the aspects to be improved if any.

*General questions*

1. What is your view on the CDC efforts to have and extend strategic partnership outside of the IPPC community since its inception?
2. Do you think that the resources allocated to the CDC related activities by the IPPC Secretariat (human, financial, etc.) are adequate for it to effectively carry out its activities/functions?
3. The major purpose of this review is to help the CPM make a decision on the status of the CDC. In addition to this, what other aspects do you think this review exercise should look into to enable the CDC to better fulfil its functions?

*Questions specific to the status issue*

1. What is your general view on the status issue under the current “Technical Committee status”?
2. What pros and cons do you see with the two options, i.e. maintaining the “Technical Committee” status, and changing to make it “a Subsidiary Body”? Are there any changes of your views between two years ago and now?
3. Do you think a CDC body has equal importance with the SC or SBDS?

*Questions specific to the status issue*

1. After the review, if the conclusion is staying at Technical Committee, what would you make “additional points to take into account”? What would you for the different conclusion making it as “a Statutory Body”?
2. Do you have any observations on the sustainability, resources, transparency, expectation, operational difficulties involved in the CDC activities?
3. How do you think the work programme should be developed, for example, should be determined by the CPM or by the Secretariat?

Progress

1. The review has been conducted based on the work plan although it is in certain delay. The collection of the relevant documents and information (with the help of the IPPC Secretariat) has been done while additional information is occasionally requested. The analysis on the collected documents and information among others has been the core basis for developing the review report.
2. The interviews with the CDC members and two Bureau members have been completed, and further interviews are being and will be conducted either by face-to-face meetings or by the questionnaire. In addition to the CDC members and the Bureau members, the interviewee to be covered will include:
* SC chair, SBDS chair
* STDF Secretariat (as a donor)
* Beneficiaries: not yet identified as almost all the activities in past years under CDC is of global nature, but could be suggested by the Secretariat, e.g. certain RPPOs.
1. The initial draft was circulated recently to the reviewers for comments and for discussions. Once the draft is revised based on further interview results and the reviewers’ comments, it will be circulated to the Bureau members and the Secretariat for their comments.

Time line

* End of November: Share the draft Report with Bureau and Secretariat for comment
* End of December: Delivery of Final Report to the Secretary
* 2015 January: Present the Report as CPM-10 document