IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation: follow up

(Discussion paper for SPG, October 2015, from Japan)

1. Background

The report of the IPPC Secretariat enhancement evaluation was presented and discussed in the CPM-10. The Bureau and the Secretariat have discussed the comments submitted by the CPs and started working for possible immediate improvements (as captured from the Bureau report and the Chair’s communication), and the CPM-11 discussions are supposed to conclude this issue based on the development throughout the year.

Echoing the concerns expressed in the CPM-10 and other occasions regarding some recommendations including SPG abolishment, Japan presents this document, linked with Japanese intervention in the CPM-10 and its submission to the Bureau. More specifically, the document is to propose a complimentary brief analysis of the 2014 evaluation in relation with the 2007 evaluation. The 2007 evaluation provided 61 recommendations to improve the IPPC activities broadly covering eight areas. Out of the 61 recommendations, 50 were agreed by the CPM-3 and expected actions were specified for all the agreed recommendations. While the Secretariat was recognized as one of the responsible units for 26 recommendations, only 7 (one fourth) were covered in the annexed table of the 2014 evaluation report.

With this somehow incomplete situation, an additional but not-lengthy piece of elaboration may be needed to supplement and add values to the evaluation exercise, which help reasoning some concerns expressed and identifying the clear direction of the IPPC.

**2. Findings from preliminary analysis (in comparison between the 2007 and 2014 evaluation exercises)**

A preliminary analysis compared the table of Appendix 2 of the CPM-3 report (2007 evaluation) with the table of Annex 5 of the 2014 evaluation report). The 2007 evaluation developed 61 recommendations under eight areas, including “standards and standard-setting process”, “information exchange”, “technical assistance”, “dispute settlement”, “governance”, “secretariat”, “IPPC’s financial resources” and “regional plant protection organizations”.. With the SPTA discussions and responses made to all the 61 recommendations, the CPM-3 made decisions (50 recommendations were agreed or partially agreed; 12 disagreed) and finally concluded the actions with responsible units specified (Annex2). Out of the 50 agreed recommendations, the Secretariat was assigned as one of the responsible units for 26.

In Annex 6 to its report, the 2014 evaluation covered 17, in which two of them had not been agreed by the CPM3 and another eight not assigned to Secretariat, leaving only seven relevant. In the table, the remaining 19 recommendations were considered “out of mandate of the evaluation”, according to the evaluation report. The claim - out of its mandate - is questionable when looked closely at those unlisted recommendations (while it should be noted that some of these are actually, at least partially, discussed in the main body text of the 2014 evaluation report).

As the Annex (in a tabular format) is useful to capture the whole evaluation results at a glance and may be referred to later, complimentary efforts are needed to conclude the evaluation. In other words, this Annex should be further elaborated to show the overall picture with the clear conclusions of the CPM for all the previous recommendations, as a basis for discussions towards 2020 and further future of the IPPC. Particularly, such a summary table will be useful for the next evaluation occasion in several years.

3. Proposal

Japan proposes that a simple analytical summary table should be developed, covering all the action items identified/agreed and assigned to the Secretariat by the CPM-3. Just as a start, the draft table format is shown below (Attachment). The table can be endorsed by the CPM-11 when it concludes the evaluation issue.

Japan believes that this attempt should not hamper/block the already-started good improvement efforts by the Bureau and the Secretariat by now, but should contribute to strengthen the logical decisions to be made by the CPM-11.

Also, a similar table can be developed at a certain point of time, summarizing the CPM-11 decisions for all the recommendations made by the 2014 evaluation, which will be a useful and clear basis for the next evaluation exercise (in 2020, for example).

Attachment: Analytical table for 2007 recommendations and later progress/achievements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No****\*1** | **2007 Recommendations** | **A/****PA/****D\*2** | **SPTA comments and actions agreed by the CPM-3** | **Sec. responsible** | **Progress and achievements by 2014** | **Actions to be discussed in the CPM-11** |
|  | *(to be copied/pasted from the Appendix 2 of CPM-3 report)* | *(to be analyzed prior to the CPM-11 discussions)* |
| **1** | **Standards and Standard-setting Process** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Quality and usefulness of standards** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Environmental and biodiversity concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 1.7 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 1.9 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Implementation of standards** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.10 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 1.11 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 1.12 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Maintenance of the current level of standard setting** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.13 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Participation of Contracting Parties** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.14 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Transparency of the standard-setting process** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.15 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 1.16 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 1.17 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
| 1.18 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
| 1.19 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| **2.** | **Information Exchange** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Assistance to Contracting Parties** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 2.2 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Evaluation of obligation status** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 2.4 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Increased availability of information** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.5 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 2.6 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
| 2.7 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.8 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 2.9 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Professional support** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.10 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 2.11 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| **3.** | **Technical Assistance** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Coordination of Global Support** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 |  | D |  | Yes |  |  |
| 3.2 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Organization of Technical Capacity** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 |  | D |  | Yes |  |  |
| 3.4 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **IPPC Technical Assistance** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.5 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
| **4.** | **Dispute Settlement** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 4.2 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| **5.** | **Governance** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **CPM Programme of Work** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | **CPM’s Cost** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Information** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Structures and Transparency** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 5.5 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Effective management of the work to be undertaken by the Standards Committee** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.6 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 5.7 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Staffing** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.8 |  | PA |  | Yes |  |  |
| **6.** | **Secretariat** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.1 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 6.3 |  | D |  |  |  |  |
| 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Technical Assistance** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 6.6 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
|  | **Selection of staff** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.7 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 6.8 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Structure and number of Professional Secretariat Staff** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.9 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
| **7.**  | **IPPC’s Financial Resources** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.1 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 7.2 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| 7.3 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 7.4 |  | A |  | Yes |  |  |
| 7.5 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
| 7.6 |  | PA |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Regional Plant Protection Organizations (Suggestions)** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Para 189.  | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Para 190. | A |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*1 6.1 indicates the action item was covered by Annex 5 of the 2014 evaluation report. Numbers with no rectangular shapes (such as 5.1) indicate “not covered”.

\*2 A=agreed, PA=partially agreed, D=disagreed by the SPTA/CPM-3