

March 2006

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

First Session

Rome, 3 – 7 April 2006

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

Agenda Item 12.5.1 of the Provisional Agenda

1. See Annex.

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

Information Note:**Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and its Institutional Arrangements****Executive Summary**

The purpose of this information note is to i) provide an update on FAO's response to the request of the April 2005 Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) for an evaluation of the IPPC and on the steps taken since that date, and ii) seek the cooperation from the Contracting Parties to the IPPC and National Plant Protection Organizations to support the workings of the evaluation team.

Substantial progress has been made since the request. The scope of the evaluation has been established and work has started. The evaluation will provide recommendations and considerations on the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of all dimensions of the current IPPC framework, and if indicated by the evidence make suggestions for alternative approaches in meeting future needs. To begin the evaluation, initial papers were prepared – a preparatory desk study and an approach paper. In early March, a workshop of stakeholders and experts was convened to further clarify and discuss evaluation issues, to review the desk study and approach paper, and to define evaluation modalities. Afterwards, a core evaluation team of five technical and evaluation experts was formed and has begun its work. The team has discussed the design for the country and institutional visits and has decided to administer questionnaires and commission special desk studies. In June, the evaluation team will begin its first country visits. As an integral part of the evaluation process, a preliminary findings and issues paper will be available to obtain feedback from the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) at its meeting in April 2007. The final report, together with an FAO management response, will be available in good time for consideration of the CPM at its April 2008 session.

I. Request for the Evaluation of the IPPC

The seventh session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in April 2005 requested an evaluation to be carried out which would provide:

- “an input on future policy, organizational structure, funding negotiations, strategy and management of the IPPC”; and
- “an analysis of the current administrative and working structures of the IPPC, their functioning and output in relation to existing goals and their suitability to implement the strategic plan of the IPPC”¹.

It was further stated that the “evaluation shall have considerations for the future on an examination of past performance, current and emerging challenges and innovative ideas. It shall also determine if IPPC activities and administration are satisfactory to meet the needs of surveyed members”.

At its meeting in May 2005 the FAO Programme Committee agreed that, as part of its regular programme of in-depth independent evaluations, the Evaluation Service would carry out an evaluation of FAO's Strategic Objective B.1: *International instruments concerning food, agriculture, fisheries and forestry, and the production, safe use and fair exchange of agricultural,*

¹ ICPM-7 (2005)/REPORT APPENDIX XIV

fishery and forestry goods. This evaluation includes the International Plant Protection Convention and work related to the Priority Areas for Inter-disciplinary Action (PAIAs) on Biosecurity for Agriculture and Food Production and Climate Change.² The evaluation of the IPPC³ will thus generate findings for consideration by contracting parties to the IPPC and will also provide one of the cases studied in detail for an overall evaluation of FAO's work on international instruments.

II. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will provide recommendations and considerations for the future on the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of all dimensions of the current IPPC framework, and if indicated by the evidence make suggestions for alternative approaches in meeting future needs. The evaluation is not a compliance audit on any aspects of the IPPC or the Contracting Parties concerned. It is formative, basing considerations for the future on an examination of past performance, current, and emerging challenges and innovative ideas.

III. General Issues to be Included in the Evaluation

The evaluation will examine issues including, but not restricted to those indicated below.

- The relevance and adequacy of the scope of the Convention of the international activities and outputs of the IPPC and its current strategic directions in the context of evolving challenges (while the relevance of the scope of the Convention will be reviewed, the emphasis will be on implementation, rather than immediate changes in the Convention itself);
- Quality and adequacy of IPPC work (including policy dialogue, standard setting, information exchange, technical assistance, and support to regional plant protection organizations);
- Efficiency and effectiveness of IPPC institutional structures and processes, including comparison with other bodies fulfilling similar functions (bench-marking) and identification of bottlenecks; and
- Use made of IPPC outputs and their impact (including policy dialogue, standards, dispute settlement, information and technical assistance).

IV. Conduct and Management of the Evaluation

Evaluation Methodology: The evaluation will be carried out in a consultative manner and will include, but not be restricted to, the following methodology. To begin the evaluation, papers were prepared including an approach paper and preparatory desk study. After this initial work was done, a stakeholder consultation was then convened in early March to better define issues and modalities for the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will now oversee the finalisation of the terms of reference which meet evaluation standards, are technically sound, and satisfy the needs of interest groups.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team may include information gained from:

- Documentation review;
- Stakeholder workshop(s);
- Desk study(ies);
- Questionnaire(s);

² Report of the Ninety-third Session of the Programme Committee Rome, 9 - 13 May 2005 (para. 56)

³ This includes all activities and structures associated with the implementation of the Convention.

- Issues and observations submitted by the Contracting Parties, stakeholder organisations, and other interested parties;
- Office and field interviews;
- Country visits to a representative sample of countries and other stakeholders; and
- Follow-up telephone conferences to questionnaire replies and country visits as necessary.

Composition of the Evaluation Team: The evaluation team consists of a core of five people who can draw flexibly on technical resource persons (subject to budget):

- i. one senior team leader with wide experience of the overall IPPC context;
- ii. two team members with relevant technical experience of which one is from the southern hemisphere;
- iii. two team members from the FAO Evaluation Service including one senior evaluation manager (and economist) and one trade economist; and
- iv. regional resource consultants, particularly from developing countries, on such issues as private sector interests, information technology and environmental issues.

See annex 1 for core team bios.

Evaluation Reporting and Timetable

Reporting: The evaluation team leader will oversee the evaluation report's preparation and finalisation in conformity with evaluation quality standards. The core team is fully responsible for its independent report, which may not necessarily reflect the views of FAO or of the CPM. It is envisaged that a working findings and issues paper will be available to obtain feedback from the CPM at its meeting in April 2007 as an integral part of the evaluation process. The final report will be available, together with an FAO management response, in good time for consideration of the CPM at its April 2008 session.

Indicative Timetable: The evaluation was launched with a desk study, initial approach paper, and a stakeholder workshop in March 2006. The indicative timetable is as follows:

- Technical cooperation desk review (April 06 – May 06)
- First core team meeting and initial country visits (May 06 – June 06).
Deliverables include:
 - a) country visit checklist and country aide memoire outline;
 - b) questionnaire survey; and
 - c) final terms of reference and evaluation implementation plan.
- Continue country visits (July 06 – Mar 07).
Deliverables include:
 - a) aide memoires; and
 - b) notes on each technical cooperation project (GCP, UNDP, UTF, and TCP) reviewed including relevance, design, implementation efficiency and quality, outcomes and impacts (building on outlines prepared for each project to be visited through a desk review).
- Analysis of questionnaire responses (July 06 – Sept 06)
- Preliminary findings and issues paper (Feb 07)
- Stakeholder workshop(s)
- Final evaluation report - (June 07)

V. Summary

Substantial progress has been made in the preparation for and the initiation of the IPPC evaluation as requested by the ICPM in 2005. The evaluation team looks forward to strong participation from and contributions by Contracting Parties to the IPPC and stakeholders who will be contacted and those who would like to contribute their issues, observations, or views. Any observations can be submitted to the IPPC Evaluation Secretariat (Erin.Holleran@fao.org).

Annex 1 IPPC Evaluation Core Team

Team Leader

Dr. Hubert Zandstra (Canada) has extensive experience in the application of science to development, at the community level, within developing country national institutes, and at an international level. Most recently, he was Director-General of the International Potato Center (CIP) in Lima, Peru from 1991 – 2005. Before joining CIP, he served as Deputy Director General for Research at the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in the Philippines and as Director of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences Division of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Canada. Dr. Zandstra has published widely on tropical soils, small-holder agricultural development, multiple cropping, and farming systems research. He has contributed extensively to the structuring, management, and Governance of Agricultural Research Institutes at national and international levels.

Core Team Members

Dr. John Mumford (United Kingdom) is an authority on economic, decision, and policy analyses for pest and resource management risks. Currently, he is a Professor of Natural Resource Management at Imperial College London in the United Kingdom. He works at the interface of applied ecological management and socio-economic management of environmental research and development projects, for tropical and temperate agricultural pests and in the development of environmental management systems. He has been responsible for implementation and evaluation of integrated pest management programmes, in cocoa, coffee, rice, cotton, fruit and other crops and for migratory and other public sector pest control programmes such as eradication, suppression and quarantine. Dr. Mumford's teaching covers the interactions of economics and ecology in many aspects of applied resource management, environmental risk, and pest management.

Mr. Kevin Nalder (New Zealand) has specialised in plants biosecurity, international phytosanitary affairs, and market access negotiations. Currently, he is Chief Executive Officer for the New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers Association. Previously, he worked for 16 years in New Zealand's Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry which included experience in some of the following: international agreements, obligations and standards including the IPPC; development and implementation of Import Health Standards (i.e., import regulations) and associated technical and operational standards for imports of fresh produce and cut flowers into New Zealand; audit and approval of export certification systems; practical application of domestic biosecurity legislation and application of broader trade and biosecurity policies; and negotiating and implementing quarantine arrangements with 20 trading partners.

Ms. Rachel Sauvinet-Bedouin (France) has extensive experience in evaluations with FAO. As Senior Evaluation Officer at FAO, she has major responsibilities for strategic, thematic and programme evaluations of FAO's Global, Regional, and related Field Programme activities. She has managed and/or contributed to several key FAO evaluations including the FAO/WHO Evaluation of Codex and Food Standards Work, FAO Cross-sectoral Strategy: "Promoting Partnerships and Alliances", FAO decentralisation, and FAO Strategic Objective A3: "Preparedness for, and Effective and Sustainable Response to Food and Agricultural Emergencies". Ms. Sauvinet-Bedouin has worked for FAO for 11 years. She is an economist with significant expertise in food security.

Dr. Erin Holleran (United States of America) is an Evaluation Officer with FAO. She is an agricultural economist with a specialty in international trade and development. She has served as a U.S. Foreign Service Officer with the U.S. Agency for International Development in Africa and Latin America focusing on strategy development, policy formulation, and project management. Dr. Holleran has worked as an agricultural economist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Regional Specialists

The work of the core team will be supplemented by regional specialists from developing countries.