



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

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная организация  
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las  
Naciones Unidas para la  
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة  
الغذية والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

T

# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

**Hundred and Fifty-fourth Session  
Cent cinquante-quatrième session  
154.º período de sesiones**

**Rome, 30 May-3 June 2016  
Rome, 30 mai-3 juin 2016  
Roma, 30 de mayo-3 de junio de 2016**

**FOURTH PLENARY MEETING  
QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
CUARTA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

**31 May 2016**

The Fourth Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.36 hours  
Mr Wilfred J. Ngirwa,  
Independent Chairperson of the Council, presiding

La quatrième séance plénière est ouverte à 14 h 36  
sous la présidence de M. Wilfred J. Ngirwa,  
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la cuarta sesión plenaria a las 14.36  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Wilfred J. Ngirwa,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

Please submit all corrections to Room A374. Pour toutes corrections s'adresser au Bureau A374.  
Para todas las correcciones dirigirse a la Oficina A374.



mq715

---

**Table of Contents – Table des matières – Índice**


---

	Page
Item 3. Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 (continued)	
Point 3. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2014-2015 (suite)	
Tema 3. Informe sobre la ejecución del programa en 2014-15 (continuación) (C 2017/8)	1
Item 5. Report of the Joint Meeting of the 119 <sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee and 161 <sup>st</sup> Session of the Finance Committee (16 May 2016)	
Point 5. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme (cent dix-neuvième session) et du Comité financier (cent soixante et unième session) (16 mai 2016)	
Tema 5. Informe de la reunión conjunta del Comité del Programa en su 119.º período de sesiones y el Comité de Finanzas en su 161.º período de sesiones (16 de mayo de 2016) (CL 154/5)	22
Item 6. Report of the 119 <sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee (16-20 May 2016)	
Point 6. Rapport de la cent dix-neuvième session du Comité du Programme (16-20 mai 2016)	
Tema 6. Informe del 119.º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa (16-20 de mayo de 2016) (CL 154/3)	45

**Item 3. Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 (continued)****Point 3. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2014-2015 (suite)****Tema 3. Informe sobre la ejecución del programa en 2014-15 (continuación)**

(C 2017/8)

**CHAIRPERSON**

Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen, I call the Fourth Meeting of the 154<sup>th</sup> Session of the FAO Council to order.

We return to item 3, *Programme Implementation Report 2014-15*, and, as announced before our lunch break, we shall continue with the list of speakers as they appear on the screen.

**Mr Jianmin XIE (China) (Original language Chinese)**

We support Pakistan's statement on behalf of Asia, as well as Bangladesh on behalf of G77 and China. China appreciates the innovative format of the Programme Implementation Report 2014-2015, the detailed data and analysis. This is a high quality, and comprehensive Report. We support its approval.

I would like to emphasize the following three points. China notes that FAO mobilized USD 1.8 billion through the funding from South-South Cooperation, exceeding the target for the Biennium. The share coming from middle income countries has increased. We highly commend this trend. At the same time, we suggest that FAO should further capitalize on the funding from South-South Cooperation and give full play to its impacts so that more countries and regions will benefit from the outcomes of South-South Cooperation.

China also notes that FAO did not achieve its target in timely delivery of documents in required languages to Governing Bodies. At the 161<sup>st</sup> Session of the Finance Committee taken place recently, though most documents in English were delivered two weeks before the Session, some documents in Chinese were provided only three days before the meeting. I feel obliged to talk about the issue of language representation. China commends 35 percent increase of FAO's publications in working languages as well as improvement in traceability of publication process. Meanwhile, we have noted that among FAO publications, including those funded by the Programme for Chinese Publications, publications in Chinese take up only 3.7 percent, ranking the last amongst all languages. We are concerned and worried about this issue. This is detrimental to China's strategic cooperation with FAO in the views of press communication and publication. It will also negatively affect the dissemination of FAO's knowledge and vision in the region where a large population speak and read in Chinese. FAO has always attached a great importance to its publications and knowledge dissemination; therefore, China calls upon FAO to pay attention to this issue. The power of language should not and can not be ignored.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je vous serais reconnaissante de bien vouloir donner la parole aux Pays-Bas en tant que présidence de l'Union européenne, qui fera une déclaration commune.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States. The candidate countries to the EU (Albania, Montenegro, Turkey) and San Marino align themselves with this statement.

We welcome FAO's continued focus on results and improving monitoring and reporting as demonstrated by the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15. We recognise the significant change and encourage the ongoing strengthening of results-based management at all levels across the Organisation, including through the Country Programming Frameworks.

We recognise the achievement of having completed years of preparation in successfully delivering FAO's first IPSAS-compliant audited accounts, which received an unqualified opinion from the external auditor. We are also pleased to see that the USd 36.6 million of efficiency savings requested

by Conference have been achieved. We encourage FAO to continue to demonstrate Value for Money, which clearly helps to make the case for further support.

We congratulate FAO on having reached nearly 90 percent of planned outputs. At the same time, this also underscores questions related to the targets and indicators, which may need to be more specific in some cases. We agree with FAO that a number of milestones and targets for the biennium were set too low and look forward to this being amended as FAO builds on lessons learnt in results-based reporting. It would also be helpful to include information on how results are being used as a management tool.

Looking ahead to the next biennium's PIR, we encourage FAO to ensure all results framework indicators are SMART – or specific, measurable, with achievable, relevant and time-bound targets and baselines. Reflecting on the theory of change would help to make the link clearer between FAO's outputs and outcomes, and how this will lead to impact. This will contribute to the shift needed towards demonstrating impact – really communicating to the world the difference that FAO is making, beyond processes. We appreciate the challenges entailed in this, but some form of aggregation from results achieved at country and regional level, including from the highlights and examples provided, could help. In this light, we thank FAO for the overview document circulated last week that begins to address the need to communicate FAO's results in a more effective way.

It is helpful to have the results by region in the annexes but it would be even more useful to have this in a single document, with the overall results column then broken down by region. We welcome the focus throughout the report on gender mainstreaming, so essential in achieving the SDGs and Leaving No-one Behind. We commend FAO's work in supporting countries to produce sex-disaggregated data, for example, which has also helped to develop frameworks for more gender-equitable land tenure. We encourage FAO's progress through the Organisation's gender policy as well as the UN-SWAP. We also recognise improvements in the gender balance of staff, with an increase to 45 percent at headquarters, and look forward to this also becoming more balanced across grades. We encourage FAO to promote this balance outside of Rome too, where the percentage of women in professional posts is still only at 21 percent. We hope that the successful progress in terms of the gender balance of professional staff at headquarters will become equally successful at decentralised level and across grades.

We support FAO's important work on statistics, so vital for evidence-based decision-making. FAO has an important role in delivering the Sustainable Development Goals and we are pleased to note FAO's contribution to establishing indicators for the monitoring framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Highlighting progress in the Programme Implementation Report on other substantive cross-cutting priority areas such as climate change and nutrition would also be useful. We note the greater focus also on developing more strategic partnerships to deliver results. It will be interesting to consider how jointly delivered results with partners ranging from civil society to the private sector, IFIs and other UN agencies will be reported. In particular, with clear scope to strengthen more systematic collaboration with WFP and IFAD to better deliver results together, we look forward to the joint-agency paper that we expect to be presented later this year.

Once again, we thank FAO for this important report. As a number of lessons have now been gathered, it would be useful to share these with UN and other international organisations and Members through an informal workshop. This would help to maximise the opportunities for collaboration and exchange to continue strengthening results monitoring, reporting and management in FAO and beyond, as we all strive to improve our results for better, more sustainable impact in field of food and agriculture.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

This statement is made on behalf of the Nordic Countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The EU countries, Denmark, Finland and Sweden align themselves with the statement made on behalf of the EU.

We appreciate the revised format of the PIR and find several improvements from the last report. The report contains useful information on the progress FAO is making in implementing its programme of work.

We commend some major achievements of FAO in the last two years contributing to increased emphasis on food security and nutrition globally, and for playing vital role in making food security a goal in the Agenda 2030 as well as for putting agriculture on the climate change agenda. We welcome and commend FAOs contribution to the fact that the Port States Measure Agreement will enter into force on 5 June.

We taken note of the fact that FAO has reached as much as 88 per cent of the planned outputs. Also at the outcome level the reported progress has been good. In fact, for several indicators the delivery has been over-fulfilled. This may point to a need to review the targets and probably set more ambitious goals for the next PWB. We are glad to learn that the organization has been able to save USD 36 million through efficiency gain and without harming the implementation of programmes.

The report marks a large step forward on FAO's reporting on gender equality and women's empowerment. The Nordic countries are very pleased to see that gender equality has been given substantial space in the report. Gender seems to be well anchored in all the strategic objectives.

We find the table on minimum standards for gender mainstreaming very interesting. It is encouraging to see that many of the objectives have already been achieved and that most of those partially achieved can be reached within 2017. We would encourage management to look further into how you can elaborate further on the minimum standards, with an explanation of what "achieved" implies.

Despite improvements in the quality of the reporting, there are still some weaknesses in the format of the PIR.

Firstly, the report is not always easy to read. The Executive Summary is a useful guide, but in general it is difficult to grasp the full picture. The overviews of each of the SOs function well, although it takes a lot of reading to understand which indicators are linked to which goals. In addition you also have to guess what are Outputs and what are Output indicators.

Secondly, there is too much focus on what FAO is doing and too little about what is actually being achieved. To a large extent, the reporting is on outputs rather than outcomes. We understand that this is partially due to the short time-span of the reporting period – we are only in the second year of the implementation of the new Strategic Plan. We do, however, believe that it would strengthen the reporting to not only report on outputs and outcomes, but also provide insights into the actual impacts that FAO has been able to achieve and contribute to.

One of the fundamental problems with reporting on achievements is having proper baselines to measure against. At present, there is no baseline for the indicators, hence it is not possible to see development from start or from one period to the next.

We have on question for clarification that regards developments in human resources. We notice one particular trend, mentioned in paragraph 384 and Figure 9, were it is reported that the percentage of women in professional posts in offices outside headquarters has been and are significantly lower than in headquarters, and further more this percentage has been dropping since 2010. We would like to ask the secretariat if they have any explanation for this trend.

Finally, for future reports we would like to offer the following recommendations:

1. The report could be made shorter and more readily understood. UNDP's report is for example far shorter, more stringent in the way goals, results and effects are presented – and easier to grasp. In addition, we suggest that more of the supporting material could be presented in tables and annexes.
2. Web annex 5 is a good foundation for a result framework, but it should be possible to see from the report where to find relevant information in the annex. The report itself does not show clearly enough which outputs are expected to give which outcomes – this is only found in the annex.

3. The report should include - or at least refer to – an explicit Theory of Change. Only this way it can be understood how the various outputs and outcomes are contributing to what we really are looking for, impact on the various Strategic Objectives.
4. The report should include an annex on the implementation of the minimum standards and the accountability framework of the Gender Policy.

**Mr Ismail BIN HAJ BAKAR (Malaysia)**

First of all, Malaysia wishes to align our intervention with the G77 and China as well as Asia Group's statement.

Malaysia welcomes the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 and recognizes the first PIR produced under FAO's Strategic Framework which incorporates fight against hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition as pivotal part of the global sustainable development agenda. We further recognize the alignment between the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and FAO's Strategic Objectives.

We appreciate the effort made by the Secretariat to provide all Members the overview of the Programme Implementation Report, which was very informative. We acknowledge FAO's achievement for the past biennium of 2014-15 through the Programme Implementation Report.

We note that 88 percent of the output indicators were fully achieved, with about 67 percent of the targets being exceeded. We believe the commitments delivered by FAO to its Programme of Work must be lauded as it produced important and measurable impact at national, regional and global levels.

We hope that in the next Programme Implementation Report, details of the indicators achieved for example the list of policy processes and countries involved, to be included in the Appendices for our reference.

Malaysia wish to commend FAO for its achievement in efficiency savings of USD 36.6 million. In conjunction with that matter, we hope that FAO will continue giving special attention to bureaucracy, project management and budget monitoring to better implement each of its projects in the future. We encourage FAO to increase equitably representation of Member Nations in its work staff by giving special emphasis to under-represented and non-represented countries including Malaysia and Asia Region.

With regards to Asia Region, we acknowledge FAO focus of work in supporting the four Regional Initiatives. In addition to that, we hope that FAO will continue working with Member Nations, to establish Country Programming Frameworks, to facilitate collaboration on South-South Cooperation, to support save food campaign, and to develop capacity and transfer of knowledge for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals.

With this statement, we endorse the Programme Implementation Report for 2014-15.

**Sra. Alba Beatriz SOTO PIMENTEL (Cuba)**

La delegación cubana apoya la declaración del GRULAC y la del G77 y China.

Queremos felicitar a la FAO por los resultados alcanzados en la ejecución del programa. La FAO ha sido y es una organización clave en la cooperación con los gobiernos y demás sectores que participan en la lucha contra el hambre, la desnutrición y por el desarrollo agrícola y la creación de capacidades. Su cooperación fue fundamental en el logro de los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio y continuará siendo vital en el alcance de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.

Queremos destacar como muy positivo que durante el bienio se aprobaron un total de 501 proyectos del Programa de Cooperación Técnica, lo cual es comparativamente superior al bienio 2012-2013. La cuantía de los presupuestos de los proyectos ha aumentado un 11 por ciento y el número de proyectos aprobados, un 8 por ciento. Es bueno señalar que el 68 por ciento de las consignaciones presupuestarias aprobadas corresponden a proyectos nacionales.

Apoyamos el proceso de descentralización para alcanzar mejores resultados en el terreno. Entre las acciones emprendidas por la FAO en la región de América Latina y el Caribe, se destaca que en la

Tercera Cumbre de la Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños se prestó apoyo a la formulación, aplicación y posterior aprobación del Plan de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional de la CELAC mediante un proceso participativo e integrador.

Se ha respaldado el intercambio de experiencias y de conocimiento entre los países de la región, así como la promoción de la Cooperación Sur-Sur y Triangular, y la toma de decisiones basadas en hechos comprobados. Reconocemos que la política de género de la FAO está bien fundamentada y el informe recoge los avances con datos ilustrativos. Sin embargo queremos proponer que todos los documentos y propuestas sobre este tema se discutan en el marco de los órganos de gobierno.

Señor Presidente, la comunidad internacional tiene grandes retos para alcanzar los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible. No sólo debemos luchar contra los efectos del cambio climático, sino también contra los efectos de la desigual distribución de los recursos y los efectos de la guerra. La máxima de paz y desarrollo es cada vez más necesaria.

Entre los tres objetivos principales del mandato de la FAO está el impulso al progreso económico y social para todos y la ordenación y utilización sostenible de los recursos naturales. El sistema de las Naciones Unidas requiere acompañar a los países en desarrollo a alcanzar los ODS de manera flexible y dinámica. Sus programas en el terreno están llamados a responder a las necesidades específicas y al contexto nacional.

Los desafíos que enfrentamos los Estados son enormes. 805 millones de personas aún padecen hambre crónica. Sin embargo, el mundo produce alimentos más que suficientes. Recuperar tan sólo la mitad de lo que se pierde o desperdicia podría bastar para alimentar al planeta. Los ODS 10 y 12 trazan pautas en este ámbito. Agradeceremos el apoyo de la FAO en esta área.

Por último, hacemos un llamado a los Estados Miembros a cooperar para cumplir el actual Programa de Trabajo aprobado para el período. Queremos respaldar nuestro apoyo al informe presentado.

**Mr Won Chul JOO (Republic of Korea)**

First of all, the Republic of Korea fully aligns itself with the statement made by Pakistan on behalf of the Asia Group. We would like to commend FAO Secretariat for preparing this comprehensive document before us, which is the first Programme Implementation Report produced under the results framework of the reviewed Strategic Framework and Medium Term Plan 2014-17.

We commend FAO's contribution to some of the major policy developments during the last biennium, namely the MDGs, SDGs, COP21, ICN2, and encourage its continued engagement in the fora related to its mandate.

We appreciate that FAO has achieved 88 percent of the Output indicators and 77 percent of Outcome indicators during 2014-15 biennium. These numbers reflect the effort of all FAO staff under the fine leadership of the senior management and the Director General. However, we note with concern that some of the partially or not achieved indicators are related to important areas such as sustainable management of natural resources and capacity development support at all levels. In this regard, we encourage FAO to give more attention to indicators that are lagging behind to foster the achievement of the Strategic Objectives.

Moreover, we note that the geographic distribution of staff leaves room for improvement, as the number of countries that are equitably represented stood at 63 percent in December 2015, far below its initial target of 75 percent for 2014-15. We look forward to seeing FAO's increased efforts in this respect in near future.

**Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)**

Like others, we welcome the PIR 2014-15 which is the first to report on results. This is the first step in the right direction towards more effective results-based management. In particular, Canada is pleased with FAO's progress on capacity-building support for countries at international standard-setting bodies such as Codex and IPPC as mentioned in the PIR under Strategic Objective 4.

Under Strategic Objective 2, we welcome FAO's continued focused work for combatting illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, including efforts to implement FAO's instruments to prioritize this work such as the Port State Measures Agreement which will soon come into force.

In addition, Canada does recognize in the PIR FAO's work on sharing impartial evidence-based analysis on biotechnology and we would like to see more work done on this topic.

In regard to FAO's work on AMR, Canada recognizes the Organization's focus on this topic and, as reflected in the PIR, its cooperation activities within the framework of the FAO-OIE-WHO tripartite partnership under the 'One Health' approach.

As mentioned at the Programme Committee, Canada believes that FAO should use its Regular Programme budget for AMR initiatives given the importance of this topic for Members. Also mentioned at the Programme Committee on gender specifically, we welcome the effort to highlight examples of gender mainstreaming in each Strategic Objective and to report in further details in Strategic Objective 6 under outcome 6.3.

This is in line with one of the requests of the 2013 Conference that the PIR be improved to integrate an assessment of gender results being achieved. This report represents a big step forward. We can see that mechanisms are established to measure results and we strongly encourage ongoing investments to ensure that standards and targets are further met.

At the same time, like the statement delivered by Iceland, some reporting is a bit confusing. We do not agree necessarily that 11 minimum standards of the FAO gender equality policies have been achieved as it is reported when the summary of results show that, for most, they have been partially achieved.

There is an explanation about how you measured the progress status but we would encourage clearer reporting to provide a more accurate picture of the progress achieved. For example, minimum standard five provides a country-gender assessment as undertaken as part of country programming. The summary results shows over 66 percent of endorsed CPFs in all regions included a gender assessment in their situation analysis.

Over 66 percent is great progress. We just do not see why the conclusion is that the standard has been met.

We also welcome the announcement by the Secretariat today of a separate report that will provide further information about gender for the seminar that was announced by the Director-General yesterday. As many have said, the PIR could benefit from being more concise and strategic, and separate reports on other issues like gender will serve in making the PIR more digestible.

Lastly, we would recommend including some financial analysis against each Strategic Objective in order to understand where investments are increasing and decreasing. This would improve the deepening of understanding for members of the results achieved in the previous year.

#### **Ms Wimonporn THITASAK (Thailand)**

Thailand supports the Statement made by G77 and China and the Asia Group.

We would like to thank the secretariat for preparing the informative and useful document showing FAO accountability. We are pleased with the achievement of FAO during the biennium 2014 – 15. We would like to take this opportunity to thank FAO for technical assistance provided to Thailand in the last biennium. In particular the Port State Measures Agreement to fight with IUU fishing, climate change, and VGGT. It really had a positive impact at a country level.

We are glad to see that FAO tries to measure the Outcome even though it is difficult to measure. We encourage the Secretariat to continue and improve the Outcome indicators of which the data were not available. We would suggest that indicators should be evident-based and easy to measure and not take too much time and resources. We believe that reliable indicators will increase visibility of FAO, and help to attract donors to support the work FAO is doing.

**Sra. Mónica ROBELO RAFFONE (Nicaragua)**

Mi delegación se suma a la declaración realizada por Ecuador en nombre del GRULAC y por el G77. Deseamos agradecer la presentación del documento C 2017/8 y a la vez expresar la satisfacción con la ejecución del programa en 2014-2015, la cual se traduce en el alcance de la mayoría de las realizaciones previstas en el contexto de una mayor descentralización.

Agradecemos también las actualizaciones remitidas a través de las notas informativas, muy útiles para los miembros en un contexto de trabajo basado en el mutuo apoyo y plena transparencia. El nivel de ejecución de la FAO en la región durante el bienio 2014-2015 con un promedio anual de 305 proyectos por un monto total de 144 millones de dólares, destinado principalmente a la asistencia técnica, demuestra el avance de forma sostenida tanto al nivel regional como en cada uno de nuestros países, y patentiza la importancia del Programa de Cooperación Técnica para los países en desarrollo, y la lucha contra la inseguridad alimentaria y por ende, la necesidad de seguir fortaleciéndolo.

Sobre los resultados alcanzados, mi delegación desea reconocer particularmente la implementación de las iniciativas regionales en el contexto del nuevo Marco estratégico con un enfoque basado en resultados, mediante las cuales la FAO ha podido mejorar la especificidad, el impacto de su labor, especialmente a nivel nacional.

El trabajo realizado bajo las iniciativas regionales ha revelado importantes avances en la consecución de resultados, mostrando a la vez un nivel de flexibilidad para abordar los nuevos desafíos y tendencias a los que se enfrentan los países de la región. En particular el tema de la adaptación y mitigación al cambio climático, que requiere un compromiso político que vaya más allá del consenso alcanzado en París. En este sentido la FAO juega un papel fundamental en este necesario cambio de paradigma hacia sistemas agrícolas y alimentarios que sean más productivos e integradores y se adapten mejor al cambio climático.

Expresamos nuestra satisfacción y damos la bienvenida a los esfuerzos de descentralización finalizados a acercar la competencia técnica de la FAO al terreno, sin dejar de mantener una masa crítica de conocimientos especializados en la sede. Alentamos a que este proceso de actualización de la red de las oficinas se lleve a cabo asegurando una cobertura geográfica apropiada y adaptada a las tendencias y condiciones actuales.

Agradecemos los esfuerzos considerables y los resultados obtenidos por parte del Director General en la consecución de recursos mediante la obtención de ahorro por eficiencia sin afectar al Programa de Trabajo. El éxito de la medida aplicada para incrementar la eficacia ha permitido a la Organización seguir prestando los servicios que le han sido encomendados sin detrimento de su calidad.

Asimismo la gestión de los recursos humanos demuestra el cambio para la transformación, por lo cual recibimos con agrado los considerables progresos realizados en este ámbito. Queremos destacar el mayor nivel de compromiso asumido por los países mediante los fondos fiduciarios, la creciente solidaridad de la región, plasmada en una amplia Cooperación Sur-Sur y Triangular, la cual se ha convertido en una estrategia fundamental para apoyar la seguridad alimentaria, la mitigación de la pobreza y el desarrollo sostenible en la región. Cito en particular el Plan de Erradicación del Hambre y la Pobreza de Petrocaribe ALBA, el Programa de Cooperación Triangular, Seguridad y Soberanía Alimentaria y Nutricional para América Latina y el Caribe SAN impulsado por Venezuela, el Programa Mesoamérica sin Hambre, un acuerdo que se ejecuta en los países centroamericanos, República Dominicana y Colombia, con el apoyo de la FAO y la cooperación del Gobierno de México.

Con esas consideraciones, mi delegación expresa su reconocimiento a los actuales esfuerzos de la Organización para lograr una mayor eficiencia en su trabajo, en lo cual están jugando un importante papel las medidas promovidas por el Director General y refrenda el informe sobre la ejecución del programa.

**Mr Yoji MATSUI (Japan)**

Japan aligns itself with the Asia Group comments delivered by Pakistan. Japan values FAO's efforts toward further development of result-based organization, the high level achievement of outcome- and

output-level targets as well as the efficiency savings. This report will serve as a good basis for producing the revised strategic framework and new Medium Term Plan.

The findings of this report should be carefully examined to identify the areas that require further improvement and to fully utilise the lessons learnt. In this regard, Japan would like to point out the following four issues.

Firstly, it is necessary to look into the background for failing in achieving some outcomes and outputs. In particular, we would like the Secretariat to provide its analysis on why the outcome-level achievement of SO 2 are lower than the other SOs as raised by the Near East group.

Secondly, some indicators extremely exceeded the targets. We think the Secretariat needs to verify the level of the original targets and, if necessary, adjust some of them. Unmeasured indicators due to the lack of data should be reconsidered as well.

Thirdly, one of the lessons pointed out the significance of partnership with strategic partners in assisting countries for establishing policy framework. In this connection, the “Report of the CFS effectiveness” submitted to the 42<sup>nd</sup> Session of the CFS held in last October also observed low familiarity of CFS’s policy guidance instrument and CFS work in general. Learning from this lesson, raising awareness and utilizing CFS recommendations should be pursued to enhance effectiveness of CFS.

Lastly, another lesson suggested that an approach used for developing value chains and improving access to finance, with an emphasis on inclusive, private sector-driven and market-oriented food system, is difficult to be scaled up and long-term intervention with the strategic partners is necessary, while a publication of Rome-based organisations entitled “Achieving Zero Hunger” highlighted a need for massive investment to ending hunger. In order to scale up such private sector-driven activities and ensure long-term impact of the activities, we expect FAO make efforts to collect and disseminate experiences in establishing effective relationship with diverse donors, including the private sector. In the same reason, we also look forward to TCP’s catalytic role in mobilising additional resources.

**Sr. Elias Rafael ELJURI ABRAHAM (República Bolivariana de Venezuela)**

En primer lugar, quiero señalar el apoyo y la satisfacción al Programa de Ejecución 2014-2015 y dar un apoyo total a la presentación de Ecuador en nombre del GRULAC, documento donde se especifica claramente todo el apoyo a la descentralización y a la política de género.

Quisiera recalcar un punto que está en la declaración, que se refiere al cambio que estamos teniendo en relación con pasar de los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio, que eran 8, y 48 metas, a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, que son 17, 169 metas y más de 200 indicadores. Como vemos, este es un reto realmente muy importante y sí nos ha costado poder parcialmente alcanzar las metas del milenio y han podido los países recopilar estadísticas que les permiten esto. Lo que está planteado en este momento es un reto muy grande, claro, para la FAO no son todos estos indicadores, pero la FAO está involucrada en una gran cantidad de ellos. Por eso, señalaba también la importancia de que para estos indicadores que corresponden a la FAO, como lo dice el documento, haya una comunicación muy estrecha con la Comisión de Estadística y las Naciones Unidas.

Así que quiero decirles que para poder lograr estos Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio es necesario en primer lugar que logremos potenciar el desarrollo de los sistemas estadísticos nacionales, porque de nada vale que tengamos una estructura en la FAO de primer orden si resulta que no hay información para llenar todo lo que se necesita para el cálculo de los indicadores. Así que si no tenemos un sistema de estadística nacional bien estructurado y los gobiernos le otorgamos todos los recursos necesarios, realmente vamos a tener grandes dificultades para hacer el seguimiento de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.

Considero que este es un elemento muy importante que debemos tener en cuenta que por supuesto existe en países desarrollados donde el sistema estadístico nacional tiene una gran capacidad, por ejemplo Canadá. Con el sistema estadístico de Canadá, quizás se pueda ejecutar esto de una manera mucho más fácil de lo que podamos desarrollar toda otra serie de países que son países en desarrollo.

**Mr Omal BARMAN (Trinidad and Tobago)**

Trinidad and Tobago wishes to congratulate the Director General of the FAO on the overall achievement of the Organization as evidenced by the delivery of the results that were planned. Specifically as reflected in the Programme Implementation Report 2014-2015, approximately 88 percent of the Output indicators were fully achieved, with about 67 percent of the targets exceeded.

Trinidad and Tobago supports the results-based approach in implementing FAO's Programme of Work and Budget, since this approach is participative and is based on needs assessments, regional priorities and FAO's comparative advantage.

Trinidad and Tobago acknowledges that the management of the financial and human resources of the Organization has played a key role in the accomplishment of the Organization.

We note that in terms of global policy development, food and agriculture are aligned to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and FAO's Strategic Objectives are consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Trinidad and Tobago wishes to express appreciation to the FAO for its support to Trinidad and Tobago and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in our quest for food and nutrition security; development of our agriculture sector; mitigating the effects of climate change; and ensuring plant and animal health and food safety.

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago acknowledges the achievements of the outcomes and outputs under the strategic and functional objectives as measured by indicators and targets in the Programme Implementation report 2014-15.

**Ms Sagung Mirah RATNA DEWI (Indonesia)**

Indonesia would like to associate itself with the statement made by Pakistan on behalf of Asia group.

In line with FAO Strategic Objectives, Indonesia is currently drawing up an action plan for national and local level to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Matching the Goals with Indonesia National Medium Term Development Plan 2015-19, the government has found much conformity in the indicators of the goals. Therefore, Indonesia is eager to participate in FAO's hard-working in attaining the FAO Strategic Objectives.

We acknowledge that transformational change of FAO has benefited Members Nations. Through Regional Initiatives, each region could priorities on their specific needs and challenges, recognizing that one size does not fit all. In the Asia Pacific Region, Indonesia has actively shared its experience on the implementation of Regional Rice Initiatives.

Indonesia also supports many FAO programmes implemented in Indonesia including the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land rice-fish system, Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS), and animal health management. Regarding the effort on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including inheriting and developing good farming practices, such as GIAHS initiatives, Indonesia is in the effort to develop its GIAHS sites. In this regards, we call support and capacity building from FAO and other international organization/resources partners in developing GIAHS in FAO member countries.

Accomplishing sustainable food system is another issue in which Indonesia seeks support from FAO, particularly in reducing food loss and food waste.

Finally, on the issue of financial mechanism, Indonesia appreciates efforts that have been made and taken by the FAO in managing the resources to support the delivery of its programme of work.

Having said, Indonesia supports the endorsement of the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15.

**Ms Roberta Maria LIMA FERREIRA (Brazil)**

Brazil aligns itself with the statement delivered by Bangladesh on behalf of the G77 and China, as well as with the statement read by Ecuador on behalf of GRULAC. We also welcome the remarks made by

the Gender Network on this important cross-cutting issue. Brazil believes that gender must be factored into all FAO programmes and projects.

We congratulate FAO for well delivering the first Programme of Work and Budget under the reviewed Strategic Framework.

Concerning the regional results for Latin America and the Caribbean, FAO has been of great help, ensuring the implementation of three regional initiatives, namely “Support to the Hunger-Free Latin America and Caribbean Initiative”; “Family Farming and Rural Territorial Development”; and “Improving National and Regional Food and Feed Systems”.

The three regional initiatives conform to the priorities defined by our 2014 Regional Conference, including (i) eradication of hunger, (ii) food security, (iii) malnutrition and extreme poverty, (iv) sustainable agriculture, (v) livestock, (vi) forestry, (vii) fisheries and (viii) the establishment of more inclusive and efficient food systems. These are not easy challenges and the countries have the main responsibility to address them at the national level.

I would also like to mention the work undertaken by Brazil in collaboration with FAO in the project called “Strengthening the school feeding programs in Latin America and the Caribbean”, which is part of the Hunger-Free Latin America and Caribbean Initiative.

We commend FAO for its support in the implementation of the CELAC Food Security and Nutrition Plan, which will help us to promote dialogue and to improve action in this field.

Brazil appreciates FAO’s work in mobilizing parliamentarians and its support to the development of national laws on Food Security and Nutrition. Since 2010, the right to food is duly recognized by the Brazilian Constitution.

**Sr. Nazareno Cruz MONTANI CAZABAT (Argentina)**

Argentina se alinea con las declaraciones efectuadas por Bangladesh en nombre del G77 y China y por Ecuador en nombre del GRULAC. Damos la bienvenida al Informe sobre la Ejecución del Programa para el 2014-15 el cual configura el primer informe que se elabora con arreglo del marco de los resultados contenido en el Marco Estratégico revisado y el Plan a Plazo Medio para 2014-17. Creemos que representa un gran avance tanto en términos de formato como en el contenido. Acogemos con satisfacción los resultados de la ejecución del Plan de Acción del bienio precedente en particular el hecho de que en el 88 % de los indicadores relativos a las realizaciones se logró alcanzar plenamente las metas previstas de las cuales aproximadamente el 67 % se superaron. Asimismo, se obtuvieron alrededor del 72 % de los resultados relativos a las realizaciones a nivel nacional por región. Estamos convencidos de que la actualización de la cobertura de las oficinas descentralizadas y la generación de capacidades técnicas en el terreno, ha sido clave a la hora de alcanzar los objetivos planteados.

En consecuencia, alentamos a la FAO a que continúe y profundice el proceso de descentralización, incluido el fortalecimiento de las capacidades técnicas, en particular en las oficinas descentralizadas.

Señor Presidente, apoyamos el involucramiento y la labores de la FAO en aquellos temas cruciales para la agenda global. Destacamos en particular el rol de la FAO en la Agenda 2030 en el COP21 de París y la Segunda Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición. Alentamos a que la FAO siga trabajando en esta línea, incluida en la preparación del COP22 en Marruecos. Reconocemos la importancia del alineamiento de los Objetivos Estratégicos de la FAO, con los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible y alentamos a que la Organización continúe trabajando en este ámbito, en particular en relación con la alineación de los indicadores de dichos objetivos. Destacamos particularmente el rol de la FAO en dar apoyo a los países para que estos puedan implementar los ODS en particular en materia de recolección de datos y estadísticas.

La cuestión de género es de central importancia para nuestro país. En este sentido, reconocemos la importante labor la FAO en este tema, que ha sido incorporado en cada uno de los Objetivos Estratégicos y en el Objetivo número 6 como tema transversal. La igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de la mujer en cada estrategia y programa en el terreno son cruciales para luchar contra el hambre y por la pobreza. Y éste no es sólo una cuestión de principio, sino una realidad que se puede constatar fehacientemente.

Para finalizar, destacamos la importancia de que la Organización mantenga sus esfuerzos en materia de multilingüismo, en línea con la resolución 5011 de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas de 1995 tanto en sus productos como en las diversas reuniones, resaltando la importancia de contar con la traducción de documentos y servicios de interpretación. Con estas palabras, Argentina endosa el PIR 2014-15.

**Mr Mohammed S. SHERIFF (Liberia)**

Liberia fully supports statements made by Congo on behalf of the Africa Region, and Cameroon also. Liberia associates herself with the statement made by the Chair of the G77. We express thanks and appreciation to the Secretariat for the detailed presentation of the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15. While we commend the FAO for achieving 88 percent of the planned outputs indicating indeed that transformational changes undertaken at the FAO under the strong leadership of the Director-General has yielded a high degree of tangible results in many Member Countries, we would like to encourage FAO to continue its efforts in this direction in keeping focused and determined to leave no one behind and to remain on the right trajectory in obtaining greater results for food security, nutrition, and the SDGs.

Moreover, we would like to underline the importance of resilience so that unexpected crises do not undermine the progress thus far achieved such as we experienced in the West Africa Subregion during the Ebola crisis. These new threats include but are not limited to the areas of climate change, droughts, El-Nino, Zika virus, Ebola virus, disease, animal diseases, antimicrobial resistance, and others. If not taken very seriously, the continent of Africa and other regions will have devastating consequences for food security and eradication of poverty.

We commend the Director-General for the efficiency savings of USD 36.6 million during the 2014-15 Biennium. As stated earlier by other speakers, Liberia takes note of the role played by FAO within the United Nations system on global issues and also FAO's contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Liberia therefore underlines the need for continuity in this strategic direction of the Organization and the alignment between FAO Strategic Objectives and its Sustainable Development Goals.

The implementation of the TCP is also an area of particular interest to the Africa Region, and we therefore concur with previous speakers, the restoration of the TCP budget to a level of not less than 14 percent of total appropriation in the next budget as agreed in the FAO Conference in June 2015. Liberia requests FAO for technical capacity support for the Africa Region to measure progress in the implementation of the SDGs, especially in areas of statistics where many countries in Africa have limited expertise.

Considering that the issue of antimicrobial resistance is a particular interest to the subregion, as earlier mentioned, we want to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of the Five Year Action Plan on the antimicrobial resistance in the documents that were presented to us during the informal briefing. Two years ago, as you may recall, the subregion of West Africa had a catastrophic epidemic that threatened the existence of three member nations, Liberia, Guinea, and Sierra Leone, which became a real threat to the global world, leading many countries to close their borders.

Today we can say thanks to all the people, NGOs, FBOs, governments, the United Nations agencies, African Union, and many others, including the FAO, for their support. But at this point we would like to especially thank the governments of the United States of America and the People's Republic of China for the unprecedented support given to Liberia during those critical moments. The President of the United States went beyond the call of duty by sending their sons and daughters in Liberia and into harm's way to fight an unknown enemy called Ebola. Liberia is grateful to them. This dramatic situation in the subregion became an eyesore for all in the continent to have paid much closer attention to the importance of infectious disease control. This was an unprecedented global threat to human and animal health, livelihoods and our common efforts at poverty reduction.

Liberia will not forget the devastating impact of the Ebola virus disease and will therefore not relent to underline these threats wherever we are to speak. We note with interest that the Action Plan foresees four major focus areas related to public health – livestock, crops, and aquatic resources with impact on

food security, nutrition, the environment, and sustainable development. We commend FAO for this Action Plan which advocates for a programme cutting across the Organization involving Headquarters and Decentralized Offices fully embedded into the 2016-17 Programme of Work with clear milestones and expected results at global and country levels. This plan comprehensively covers the activities FAO was tasked with by Conference Resolution 4/2015.

Furthermore, we appreciate the related budget calculation, according to which FAO needs USD 2 million per year for five years to implement the Action Plan. In this context, we note that up until now FAO has secured USD 2.9 million extra budgetary resources from the United States Agency for International Development, Ireland, and the United Kingdom. In addition, we also welcome the initiated discussions with a number of other potential donors – Russian Federation, United Kingdom, France, and others – and hope other member countries can join this global effort to assist FAO.

Liberia takes the opportunity to sincerely thank the donors for their generosity and congratulate FAO for having achieved to secure these voluntary contributions. However, we have the following queries in this respect. First, we would like to know to what extent these voluntary contributions are earmarked for specific activities. And if so, whether these activities match with the FAO Action Plan on AMR? Second, we would like to know whether FAO has considered a Plan B for the funding in case the necessary amount of USD 2 million per year cannot be secured from voluntary contributions.

As a medical doctor myself, it is incumbent upon me to underline the importance of AMR in my subregion. We are not speaking on behalf of other regions. We are speaking on behalf of our people and that of the entire continent of Africa as you saw – as I said before, the Ebola crisis. Given the enormous threat which AMR constitutes for mankind, and in particular for the Africa Region where we are so vulnerable to so many epidemics as we recently saw again as I said before with Ebola, we strongly believe that FAO should be prepared to complement the voluntary contributions with resources from the regular budget even if so small as a token to make sure the Action Plan on AMR can be implemented to the fullest extent possible. Conservative estimates suggest that without urgent action, the current 700,000 AMR-related human deaths per year will rise to 10 million by 2050 with accumulative loss to global GDP of up to USD 100 trillion by then. It is important that we take note and we begin to pay attention to AMR. There is a critical need to strengthen research and action in agriculture to address what the status report has noted as the widely recognized excessive use and misuse of antimicrobials as two of the major drivers for acquired antimicrobial resistance.

We therefore request this Council to mandate the FAO to find a way to allocate some resources from the core budget, even though we are talking about zero budget, to indicate to member countries the seriousness of FAO in addressing AMR. The Africa Region is vulnerable for many human and animal disease epidemics. We cannot sit in such conferences without highlighting these threats. We want to commend the tripartite partnership engagement with WHO and OIE for its strong and effective collaboration on AMR. We note the willingness of FAO to increase the FAO's technical support staff at country level. South Africa, like China, the United States of America and others, gave support to the AMR as I stated before.

At this junction we recognize FAO Policy on Gender and we welcome the Director-General's planned seminar on gender. Africa's first elected female president is from the Republic of Liberia, and we know the efforts she has made to mainstream the Gender Policy of our government. In this regard, Liberia supports a strong FAO policy on gender equality. The FAO Gender Policy was endorsed in 2013 and we believe the FAO can do more in achieving gender equality and empowering women, which is not only the right thing but it is the crucial ingredient in the fight against poverty and hunger as our dear Director-General once stated.

We note the high vacancy rate as presented in the Programme Implementation Report which suggests to me that FAO needs to trust and delegate more authority to the Human Resources Department to fill in those vacancies so that the Organization can fully deliver in all the Strategic Objectives and to pay a special attention to the employment of more women in professional posts. We look forward to paying closer attention to the equitable representation and geographical distribution of staff.

Liberia would like to extend thanks and appreciation to Council Members for listening to these specific appeals to FAO for AMR and the other areas. And with these comments, Liberia endorses the adoption of the PIR report.

**Mr Evgeny SOBOLEVSKY (Belarus) (Original language Russian)**

The Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 attests to the successful work of FAO. Almost 90 percent of outputs and almost 80 percent of outcome indicators were received. We share the assessment of the Director-General. The Organization has duly delivered. The programme and the activities contain therein, have had an important positive impact at national, regional, and global levels.

Also of great importance is what was annexed to the report, information on guaranteeing a language balance in the Organization. In the last Biennium, in full alignment with previous decisions, progress was made in ensuring language diversity. It is particularly pleasing that the amount of Russian language publications is steadily growing and exceeded 4 percent of the total volume. We are convinced that to achieve the target of balance in language services, we still need further increases in the amount of Russian language documents in the e-repository and in the Russian terms in the FAO Term Portal.

Using Russian in the Organization every day greatly enhances effective collaboration between countries of the Eurasian Economic Union with FAO, significantly facilitating communication and exchange of experience at the expert level. We hope that the important work on achieving balance in language services will continue making a full use of languages in FAO initiatives.

**Ms Elizabeth NASSKAU (Observer for United Kingdom)**

In line with the statement made by the European Union and its Member States, the United Kingdom would simply like to reiterate Liberia's intervention, particularly on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). As the Deputy Director-General said in one of the Committee meetings, AMR represents a "silent tsunami". FAO has a critical leadership role to play on the global stage in addressing this "silent tsunami".

From this point of view, we look forward to continuing to work with FAO along with all other Member Nations to ensure that we raise awareness of this critical issue, the threat of which Liberia has so effectively highlighted. In addition, we support FAO in its work leading up to the high level event in the United Nations General Assembly to be held in September 2016 as well as at country level and beyond as FAO really steps up its work in this critical area. But if we fail to address, we really risk undermining the good work that we are carrying out in reaching FAO's objectives in achieving global food security.

**Mr Mafizur RAHMAN (Observer for Bangladesh)**

I would like to support my colleague from Liberia regarding the Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) issue. He was right when he pointed out all the importance of the AMR issue. That's the reason why we hereby request that at least a small token money from the regular budget be used by FAO to work on the AMR issue. Depending completely on the voluntary contributions is a reputational risk for FAO. It would undermine its credibility. I am strongly supporting the proposal made by Liberia and supported by the United Kingdom.

**Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)**

Firstly, we have had many comments already, very detailed comments, which a lot of them I fully agree with, but just a few comments. Firstly, just to thank Mr Boyd Haight and his team for the Report before us. Obviously it is part of the process of improving the sort of result-based information that both Management has for it to make informed decisions, but also it allows Membership to provide more informed guidance. We thank you very much for this Report. Obviously, as many have said, the first under the new Strategic Framework. As many of the comments have been made, there is appreciation for the valuable information in it, obviously it is a continuous improvement process and so some suggestions that we would support for the next version to be considered, reflected and incorporated in.

We would like to thank the Director-General and congratulate him, the Management team and FAO staff for their significant contribution during the Biennium. The list of outputs and contribution to outcomes is quite impressive as outlined in the document. I think it is clear that there is evidence that some of the changes that the Director-General has made in his tenure here are starting to have a positive impact at a country level and at a global level, so we would very much like to acknowledge that. At the same time, of course, we want to support him and encourage him to continue making the difficult decisions and pushing this Organization forward to increase the impact of its work.

I think we all would agree that there was some room for improvement and there was a need for some difficult decisions to be made. I think the Director-General and the Management team have made those decisions and will need to continue to push this Organization forward for it to regain that need to raise the premiere global, agricultural, and food knowledge Organization. I think we are seeing some positive progress in that direction and Australia would strongly encourage the Director-General and the Management team to continue down that path.

I think we have heard today there are all sorts of numerous issues and challenges facing countries around the world and clearly a desire for support to address those. I guess we would say, as Australia always has made a point to say, that FAO cannot be everything to all countries and all people and it does not have the budget nor the mandate to deliver against all of those. We would support the Organization having a clear framework for making decisions around the way it allocates resources and the things that it gets involved in and really to focus in on those few areas where it does have a comparative advantage and where it can actually make a marked difference. We agree that it is difficult, but is a necessary requirement for the Organization to make those difficult decisions as to where it can have the most impact for its limited resources.

Clearly there were some lessons learnt during the Biennium and many of those are reflected in the Report. We would encourage Management to pick up on those as no doubt they will. I think a few of those have already been flagged by countries such as Japan and others around the importance of strategic partnerships and working with others, so we would stress those as well.

Lastly, just to say I will not be here in Rome myself in two years' time but we would hope that again the next version of this report will see a continued momentum down the path that we have seen already in terms of increased transparency and accountability of the Organization and obviously the desire to have an increased impact and outcome levels.

**Mr Abreha ASEFFA (Ethiopia)**

We join others in supporting Liberia on the issue of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). I think that AMR is a problem not only for Africa but for the whole world, so it has to be taken very seriously. We also urge FAO, as some of the colleagues suggested, that at least dedicated funds could be assigned in order to carry out the objectives of AMR.

**CHAIRPERSON**

We have had 27 speakers and this shows the importance of the PIR. It means planning through the activities of this Organization, and I am very happy that what Members have been fighting for, and which was one part of the reform of FAO regarding the reporting in a results-based manner, has now been accomplished.

This is the first step and looks to be good and we hope that all the suggestions that have been made by Members will go along to approve the second report.

Regarding antimicrobial resistance, the Programme Committee will be reporting on that. It was discussed by the Joint Committee. This was an update on FAO's work on microbial resistance. So I urge you that when we come to that, then we can have substantive recommendations there. And those who have already spoken on that issue, I hope they will not repeat their statements.

**Mr Boyd HAIGHT (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)**

We greatly appreciate the careful reading of the Programme Implementation Report (PIR) and your very thorough comments on the achievements and the format. We used to say that we would think about what Mr Ayazi would say about what we are writing, but now we think about what everybody might say because you are reading the results much more carefully. We appreciate that.

We see this as a continuum in our Results Framework, what we have done in the past biennium, what we are doing in this biennium, and the lessons learnt feeding into the next biennium. So you will hopefully see gradual improvement both in our planning documents as well as in our reporting.

We also appreciate very much the guidance that you have been providing in your comments about some of the main issues. The Director-General had mentioned this in his opening remarks and we are listening very carefully to the importance that you are giving to the Sustainable Development Goals, to work on nutrition, on climate change adaptation as well as the effects such as transboundary diseases, on statistics and on areas of natural resources. So this is the kind of engagement that helps us to improve going forward.

I would like to speak just briefly about the reporting at the output and the outcome level. Let me say at the outset that we have to try to strike a balance between reporting on outputs, that is the accountability for what FAO delivers against the Programme of Work, and the outcomes which are about changes that are happening in countries that are somewhat beyond the control of FAO.

Several delegations have emphasized the importance of improving the reporting on outcomes and we would certainly agree, but this is a very difficult area to measure because there are externalities involved, changes that occur that are outside of the control of the Organization. We can report on those and you can see in the bar charts that there have been some slippages in some of the outcomes that are beyond our control. But, on the other hand, they are reality, and if we do not see capacities put in place at the outcome level, there is no hope of achieving our objectives. So I think we need to be true to that reporting.

We recognize the difficulty we have in measuring our baselines and also in setting targets at the outcome level.

As far as the outputs are concerned, we have already learnt our lesson from 2014-15. We engaged our country offices much more significantly in the middle of last year to set the targets for the current biennium, so we would hope that we will not see the same level of overachievement that we reported in the current biennium. That is not to say we will not see some variance. It is very hard, as they say, to set targets perfectly.

There was a suggestion by the European Union that we engage and share with other agencies on our processes. In fact, we have been doing this all along. We are members of the UN Strategic Planning Network which is a UN-wide group of UN experts on planning and monitoring and, in fact, in December 2013 we participated in their meeting on key lessons for developing the 2014-17 Strategic Plans and Results Frameworks and shared our experience and learned from them. There will be another meeting on a similar topic later this year which we will be participating in quite actively.

So we have this opportunity to share with our colleagues in the UN technical agencies as well as the funds and programmes.

The Chief Statistician presented our outcome assessment methodology at a meeting of the International Statistics Institute, a World Statistics Congress that was held in Brazil in July of last year and chaired a roundtable where measurement methodologies were discussed.

We have also had at a more technical level the opportunity to engage and, when it comes to sharing with members in the general public, my Deputy Director, Mina Dowlatchahi, made a presentation on statistics for food security and assessment of country capacities at one of the seminars organized at Expo Milano last summer which had, as many of you know, a very high level of participation from people throughout the world.

We are using opportunities whenever we can to share our own experiences and learn from others in measuring outcomes, as it is an area that is difficult. And I think it is important for Members – many of you have highlighted the importance of statistics and data measurement for the SDGs, and what we are learning will be of use as we move forward in preparing the next Medium-Term Plan and the relationship of our Strategic Objectives and their indicators to the SDG indicators.

There have some comments about the use of the voluntary guidelines that are coming out, particularly from CFS, and there are others that have come from FAO and the importance of ensuring that these are implemented particularly through partnerships. Working at the country level, working with non-state actors as well as governmental actors is important for getting some types of results, particularly in fishing communities or small-scale fisheries and so forth.

On the regional initiatives, the Near East and a few others have asked about an exit strategy and where are we going to do with these initiatives in the future. The current set which is the original 15 with some modifications that were made in the case of Latin America in particular will be implemented during the course of 2016-17. We will have the opportunity to gradually, in those cases where there is buy-in and interest, hand over and move on in the next Medium-Term Plan. We have listened very carefully to views on this matter in the Regional Conferences and listened again here today, remembering that regional initiatives are the way we have devised for addressing regional priorities but delivering on our outputs. They are groupings of outputs around regional priorities. So we need to ensure that, if a given regional initiative remains a priority in the region, we can also use it as a way to deliver on our outputs.

On gender, we appreciate the support for our reporting line. We look forward to the seminar later this year and to further elaborate on our achievements. The question came up from Canada, in particular about the minimum standards of the gender policy. In fact the reporting on these in terms of achievement is putting the standards in place. For instance if you look in the second paragraph of Box 1, which is after paragraph 222 in the document, we point out that when a mechanism to mainstream gender has been established, such as the one that was pointed out on country programming where gender assessment is undertaken as part of a country programming exercise, that process has been achieved. We are saying now that we have done it in 66 percent of the cases.

We are saying that a standard can be considered to be achieved when a mechanism is put in place. That is the measurement we have used and that is how we get to the 11 out of the 15 that have been achieved so far. Then we report on progress against those standards which you see in the table.

The question that was asked by Iceland I believe on employment of women professional staff in the decentralized offices – in fact the number of women has gone up by 42 percent but the number of professional staff has gone up by even slightly higher, 54 percent.

So we see since 2010, which is the period when you notice a slight percentage decline, the number of women in decentralized offices has increased from 61 to 87 on the professional staff but the number of men has gone up slightly more. Therefore the percentage of women has actually declined. We continue to try to bring in more female professionals in all locations of the Organization. I am not in a position to identify particular factors that may work for or against women going to particular duty stations but the effort is being made.

On the Technical Cooperation Programme resources, Afghanistan for the Near East, you asked that we report more by region. In fact, in the audited accounts of the Organization, we have in the past reported on both the approvals and the expenditure of TCP by country and by region. Now apparently that is not going to continue so we may need to find a way to report under IPSAS. We may need to find a way to bring that reporting in perhaps to the PIR.

On language use, we continue to try to increase the use of all languages, in particular those that are underserved, in particular Arabic, Chinese, and Russian, and to make the best possible effort to do so.

If I can now turn briefly to the final comments on the PIR format. We very much appreciate your feedback because, in the end, the report is meant for the Members. It is always a balance between details and high level so we have taken the approach this time of giving you the details which are in the official documents but also producing a more high-level brochure. We would hope to do this in the

future so that the main messages get out more clearly, but recognizing that we do have an obligation to report at a certain level of detail.

I do not want to raise too many expectations for the PIR for 2016-17, which is going to report against the same Results Framework that we had for this PIR. That is reporting on the same outcomes and the same indicators because it is a four-year framework. The main improvement, as I mentioned earlier, will be in the targets of the outputs and we will certainly make efforts to improve our collection of information on the outcomes.

Here we may be trying out an approach that focuses more on the change that takes place at outcome level rather than on setting Outcome targets because what you see in the bar charts for each objective is the level of implementation of a given indicator, and that provides some very useful information on where there is a need to have more or less intervention in a given type of indicator at outcome level. That may be one of the innovations that you see in the next PIR against the same framework.

When it comes to preparing the Medium-Term Plan 2018-21, as was discussed by the Programme Committee, we have the opportunity to sharpen our outcomes and indicators. I think this is where you are really going to see some significant change, making the indicators more SMART, as the EU said, although it is difficult sometimes to do that at the outcome level, and also to improve the theory of change and the connection between the outputs that FAO produces and the outcomes, the changes that happen at country level. So we are striving for improvements in the format.

Mr Chair, as you mentioned the AMR issue, perhaps you would take that under the Programme Committee item.

#### **CHAIRPERSON**

Thank you, Mr Haight, for presenting the report, as well as responding to the issues or questions which were raised. I understand that the Secretariat is hoping to get more clear and precise indication from Members where they need more efforts to be put.

I can now say that we have come to the end of item 3 and I would like to make my conclusions as follows:

1. The Council welcomed the Programme Implementation Report (PIR) 2014-15 and noted that transformational changes undertaken at the FAO since 2012 had led to delivery of positive results by the Organization within the reviewed Strategic Framework and Medium Term Plan 2014-17.
2. The Council:
  - a) expressed overall satisfaction at the implementation of the programme of work in 2014-15 and underlined the major policy achievements aimed at addressing hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition;
  - b) welcomed FAO's contribution to global policy making, notably through the Second International Conference on Nutrition, the UN Climate Change Conference and the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate, Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing;
  - c) welcomed the success of the International Year of Family Farming in 2014 and the International Year of Soils in 2015 and their linkage to food security;
  - d) welcomed the high proportion of results delivered at country and regional level and encouraged continued efforts focused through the Regional Initiatives;
  - e) underscored the importance of FAO's work on climate change, and on statistics for evidence policies, and looked forward to continued focus in this regard in the current and next biennium
  - f) was satisfied with the achievements in 2014-15 in relation to efforts to consolidate decentralization, and looked forward to further efforts in this regard in the current biennium and the next PWB, including strengthening of the regional and other decentralized offices to respond to their demands and challenges;

- g) appreciated the establishment and strengthening of strategic partnerships with Member governments, United Nations and other international organizations, the private sector and civil society organizations, and continued efforts in this regard;
- h) expressed satisfaction at increased efficiency including identification of USD 36.6 million in savings;
- i) highlighted the importance of undertaking further efforts in achieving balance in language services;
- j) appreciated FAO's work on statistics, noting its vital role for evidence-based decision-making and for delivering relevant Sustainable Development Goals, as well as FAO's contribution to establishing indicators for the monitoring framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
- k) stressed the importance of paying due attention to equitable representation and geographical distribution of staff;

(This is a Conference resolution)

- l) commended the positive trend in gender balance in FAO staff, particularly at headquarters, and looked forward to similar improvements at decentralized level; and
- m) appreciated the improvements shown in the new format of the PIR document, and looked forward to adjustment of indicator targets and to further refinement of reporting on Outcomes and Outputs in the next PIR.

3 With regard to the cross-cutting theme of gender, the Council:

- a) expressed satisfaction on FAO's work and results under this cross-cutting theme, and looked forward to continued mainstreaming of gender in its programmes and activities; and
- b) welcomed the Director-General's decision to hold an informal seminar dedicated to gender in 2016 and to elaborate further on FAO's work and achievements on gender in a document for the seminar.

4. The Council appreciated the positive trend of mutual trust and collaboration between the Secretariat and Members, and looked forward to its continuation.

5. The Council endorsed the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 and recommended that it be submitted to the Conference in July 2017 for approval.

**Mr Mohammed S. SHERIFF (Liberia)**

We thank you for your conclusions. I just want to note here that we did not hear any reference to our appeals. Indeed, the Programme Committee will be dealing with the AMR issue, which we agreed, but probably there is some notation in there making reference to what has been expressed on AMR in the upcoming intervention by the Chairperson of the Programme Committee.

Secondly, we also highlighted the high percentage of the vacancies existing and we call upon the Director-General to delegate more authority. We are not dictating to the Director-General, let me be clear on that, we are only encouraging him so that those vacancies can be filled, taking also into account the gender issue in the professional areas, which is also important.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Mes capacités à suivre ont été limitées à un certain moment sur le point qui était relatif, je crois, à la décentralisation, celui qui précédait la création des partenariats stratégiques. Est-ce que vous pourriez relire, s'il vous plaît, ce point-là?

**CHAIRPERSON**

I want to say to Distinguished Delegate from Liberia, I am here to guide you. But if you want something to be included, then it is up to the Members to accept and agree upon the information which you think is needed. We are going to deal with AMR under the Report of the Programme

Committee. Issues of vacancies and Human Resources, we are going to deal with them under the Finance Committee. All these issues are contained in the documents.

I ask you to accept the fact we are contributing to the issue of AMR under the substantive item which is soon coming. It is the same on this issue of high vacancies. They are all in the reports which will be presented by the Chairs of the Finance and Programme Committees. That is my advice.

Now I will repeat what France has asked me to read: (g) appreciated the establishment and strengthening of strategic partnerships with Member governments, United Nations and other international organizations, the private sector and civil society organizations, and continued efforts in this regard;

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

For point (g) we completely agree with your summary but we would suggest adding at the end a mention of the scientific community. This is a very important partner of FAO and we often suggest that we could include academies and the scientific community in relation to the approach you suggest and with which we completely agree.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Mon point était d'entendre le paragraphe juste avant celui des partenariats stratégiques que vous nous avez rappelé. Ça doit être le point f).

**CHAIRPERSON**

(f) was satisfied with the achievements in 2014-15 in relation to efforts to consolidate decentralization, and looked forward to further efforts in this regard in the current biennium and the next PWB, including strengthening of the regional and other decentralized offices to respond to their demands and challenges.

Let me check something with Russia. Did you say “academia and the scientific institutions”?

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

I think that just mentioning academia will cover it.

**CHAIRPERSON**

(g) appreciated the establishment and strengthening of strategic partnerships with Member governments, United Nations and other international organizations, the private sector, civil society organizations, including academia, and continued efforts in this regard;

**Mr Mohammed S. SHERIFF (Liberia)**

I accept that my intervention will be addressed at the appropriate time. Unfortunately, my presentation was made ahead of that, because I have already spoken with the Chairperson of that Committee.

I will be going to an urgent meeting and I may not even be here when the discussions are held. However, I just wanted to say to you I have read all the documents. I am very much aware of the content. I was only asking a question, so I think the answer should have been more appropriate.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

Could I ask you to repeat what you summarized under point 4, which was dealing with trust?

**CHAIRPERSON**

“The Council appreciated the positive trend of trust and collaboration between the Secretariat and Members, and looked forward to its continuation.”

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

We agree with your summary on point (g) and we thank you for including our concern. But we think that it is not completely correct to join together or to present the scientific community in your

summary as part of civil society. That could be the case, but it is a separate category and we would ask you to get rid of the word “including” and say “civil society and academia”.

**CHAIRPERSON**

And that is taken. I have deleted “including” and replaced it with “and”.

**Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)**

May I ask you please as well to repeat the language under point 3 regarding cross-cutting theme on gender, please?

**Mr Pierfrancesco SACCO (Italy)**

Regarding point (f) that you kindly read again, we do not see it really fit for including any reference to anything going beyond the PIR 2014-15 we are talking about. In order to avoid lengthy discussions to our view necessary qualifications what you added, the reference to strengthening Country and Regional Office in the next PWB should be dropped. Any reference to the future would not fit here.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

Thank you for re-reading point 4 of your summary. We had an extensive discussion but I did not hear anything about positive trend in collaboration and trust between the Secretariat and the Member Nations, neither looking forward to improve.

I think there is a good collaboration and there is trust between the Member Nations and the Secretariat. And if you want to maintain this, I would like to hear against what baseline this is considered and this remark is made. Otherwise, my proposal would be to make the summary even conciser to delete this point of your summary based upon the fact that there is trust between the Secretariat and the Member Nations, unless Member Nations or the Secretariat tell that there is no trust anymore.

And we support the proposal made by Italy.

**Mr Khaled M.S.H. EL TAWHEEL (Egypt)**

Just to say that we support your initial proposal and especially the same language that you proposed for point (f) which is exactly taking from the report of the Joint Meeting of the Finance and Programme Committees and making reference to the coming biennium is something that is in line with other recommendations that you read, that also ask the Organization to take action in the future.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Thank you. That is the explanation given to point (f).

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

Just a suggestion on the point regarding gender. We fully support recognizing what the Director-General announced yesterday and we support it to have it in this report from this discussion, but it is not part of the Programme Implementation Report in itself. We support it here, but we wonder if it would be better balanced also because many of us mentioned and welcomed the decision of the Programme Committee to conduct an evaluation to be presented at the Conference in 2019.

If you could just add that as a point, that would be a good balance for us.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Can you repeat it, Ambassador, please?

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

I would like to propose to add to the recommendations from the Council that many Members welcomed the decision of the Programme Committee of having an evaluation of the Gender Policy ready for the Conference in 2019.

**CHAIRPERSON**

We will get that recommendation in the item on the Programme Committee.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

I really want to work with you on that one, but let that be consequent on it and we will mention it there again.

**CHAIRPERSON**

You want me to record it twice? It was discussed in the Programme Committee and I think there is a recommendation to that in the language we are using.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

I said I am willing to work with you on that. But I also remind us that it is kind of a welcoming statement of the Director-General's good news to us he has mentioned here and we can live with that. Therefore, I was sort of thinking that it could be a good balance also to mention something more that has been decided on the same issue. But I have no good place to put the news from Director-General, so let's stick to your original summary. We will welcome it under the discussion of the Programme Committee.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Thank you for your understanding.

**Sr. Antonio CARRANZA BARONA (Ecuador)**

Quiero referirme al tema de la descentralización y apoyar su resumen e igualmente el comentario que ha hecho el delegado de Egipto, en el sentido de que el tema de descentralización fue resaltado en el Informe de la Ejecución del Programa como un elemento fundamental para haber alcanzado los avances que se han obtenido. Y es un elemento muy importante de ese Informe las enseñanzas, las lecciones aprendidas. Y de esas enseñanzas sale que se continúe con la consolidación de la descentralización. Y por esa razón consta en el Informe del Comité de la Reunión Conjunta justamente el que se continúe en esta consolidación el siguiente Programa de Trabajo y Presupuesto, por lo cual apoyamos su resumen que viene del texto de la reunión conjunta.

**Sr. Pierfrancesco SACCO (Italia)**

Creo que corremos el riesgo de que un porcentaje demasiado elevado de los trabajos de este consejo aparezca dedicado al tema de la descentralización, lo cual es uno de los aspectos de los muchos aspectos y temas que tenemos que tratar. Quiero formular un criterio de método que podemos a lo mejor verificar con el servicio jurídico.

La naturaleza soberana del Consejo, con relación a comités muy importantes, o a comités conjuntos muy importantes, que tienen un papel instructorio, preparatorio de las reuniones del Consejo, hace que el Consejo tenga que ejercer sus funciones con total y soberana responsabilidad.

**Mr Abreha ASEFFA (Ethiopia)**

We support your summary, including what was raised by Egypt about what you included on the Joint Committee Report.

**Mr Godfrey C. MACGWENZI (Zimbabwe)**

We are just taking the floor to say we support your summary, including what was said by Egypt.

**CHAIRPERSON**

I was saying that we have got two areas for which I will ask Members to be flexible about, to accept the fact that point (f) is relevant and it was also dealt with in the Joint Meeting. I hope Italy will agree with us to keep this paragraph in my conclusion.

Regarding paragraph 4, after hearing Zimbabwe, I think it was this morning, and after hearing Australia, I thought there was a positive trend of trust and collaboration between the Secretariat and the Members and looking forward to its continuation. That is the benchmark. If Members do not want it, we can put it out. It is upon you, Members.

**Mr Godfrey C. MACGWENZI (Zimbabwe)**

We would definitely want it to remain where it is. We definitely appreciate the work that we are doing with the Secretariat. Not just here at headquarters, but even in our country. In my own country, Dr. Perry is working very closely with the government, including with the President's office. As far as we are concerned, FAO is at the frontline of our combat against poverty and hunger in Zimbabwe, so we would want that sentence to remain as it is. This has to be acknowledged that we have a vibrant Secretariat and we are working very well with them.

**M. Carlos Alberto AMARAL (Angola)**

Seulement pour dire que nous sommes d'accord avec le maintien du paragraphe parce que nous suivons les réunions du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme et nous voyons qu'il y a une évolution très positive des rapports entre le Secrétariat et la Direction. Comme le Zimbabwe l'a dit, les rapports au niveau du pays sont excellents.

**Mr Abreha ASEFFA (Ethiopia)**

We agree with previous speakers that the relationship between Members and the Secretariat is very good and we want it to continue being very cooperative as much as possible. We want the statement to remain.

**CHAIRPERSON**

Thank you. I want to say that we have concluded on this Agenda Item 3.

**Item 5. Report of the Joint Meeting of the 119<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee and 161<sup>st</sup> Session of the Finance Committee (16 May 2016)****Point 5. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme (cent dix-neuvième session) et du Comité financier (cent soixante et unième session) (16 mai 2016)****Tema 5. Informe de la reunión conjunta del Comité del Programa en su 119.º período de sesiones y el Comité de Finanzas en su 161.º período de sesiones (16 de mayo de 2016)**

(CL 154/5)

**CHAIRPERSON**

We now move on to item 5, *Report of the Joint Meeting of the 119<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee and the 161<sup>st</sup> Session of the Finance Committee*, which was held on 16 May 2016, and is contained in document CL 154/5.

I wish to remind Council that the Coverage of FAO Decentralized Offices has already been discussed under item 8, and the Programme Implementation Report 2014-15 has just been considered, so Council will not re-open these matters under item 5.

I now invite Mr Khalid Mehboob, Chairperson of the Joint Meeting, to introduce the Report.

**Mr Khalid MEHBOOB (Chairperson, Finance Committee)**

Since the Council has already taken up the substantial items, as the Chairman has pointed out, these were discussed at the Joint Meeting of the 119<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee and the 161<sup>st</sup> Session of the Finance Committee under agenda items, I will report briefly on the one outstanding issue, namely Assessment of the Technical Capacity of the Organization which was considered by the Joint Meeting under agenda item *Any Other Business*.

The Joint Meeting welcomed an update by the Director-General on work already started towards the Independent Assessment of Technical Capacity of the Organization. It appreciated his assurance that an informal briefing to Members would be arranged before the report of the assessment was finalized.

There were a number of views exchanged with regard to the process of the assessment. In the end, the Joint Meeting reached consensus in recalling that the Council had requested the Secretariat to undertake this assessment. This consensus is reflected in the report of the Joint Meeting, document CL 154/5.

On the substance of the matter, the Joint Meeting recognized the complexity of assessing FAO's technical capacity in consideration of the organization's broad mandate both at Headquarters and the Decentralized Offices. The final outcome of the assessment would be shared with the Joint Meeting in March 2017 which would provide its recommendations to the April 2017 Council prior to presentation to the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Conference.

**Sr. Antonio CARRANZA BARONA (Ecuador)**

El Ecuador interviene en este tema en su capacidad nacional. Queremos agradecer al Presidente del Comité de Finanzas por la presentación del Informe de la Reunión Conjunta y respaldamos las recomendaciones de dicha reunión.

En cuanto a la evaluación de la capacidad técnica de la Organización queremos señalar que, en nuestro criterio, los importantes avances alcanzados en la implementación del Programa 2014-2015 evidencian de por sí que las capacidades técnicas de la FAO han ayudado a alcanzar esos resultados y, sobre todo, como se indica en el Informe de implementación de ese Programa, que los esfuerzos llevados adelante en la descentralización han ayudado a alcanzar esos resultados.

En ese sentido, el Ecuador alienta a la Organización a continuar trabajando en esa dirección para alcanzar resultados en el terreno. La FAO es una Organización basada en los conocimientos, pero estos no tienen valor si no reflejan en el apoyo directo a los países, es decir con una sólida presencia en el terreno. Para el Ecuador el fortalecimiento de las capacidades técnicas de las oficinas regionales, subregionales y de países contribuye al fortalecimiento de la capacidad de la Organización.

Por otro lado, queremos recordar que el mandato del 153.º período de sesiones del Consejo insta a que sea la Secretaría la que ponga en marcha la evaluación (assessment, en inglés) de las capacidades de la Sede y de las oficinas descentralizadas, a ser presentada en la Conferencia de 2017. Nos complace que el Director General haya presentado en la Reunión Conjunta información actualizada sobre el avance en esta actividad, así como su voluntad de mantener informados a los Estados Miembros sobre dicha evaluación antes de la presentación del informe a los órganos rectores correspondientes.

Finalmente, en nuestro criterio, la mejor evaluación de las capacidades de la Organización no son cuántas vacantes de profesionales llena y cuán velozmente lo hace, sino el impacto del trabajo de la FAO en el terreno, de su asistencia técnica y del apoyo al desarrollo de las políticas de los países en el ámbito de competencia de la FAO, las cuales ayudan a los Estados a alcanzar sus objetivos y afrontar sus necesidades de desarrollo. En ese sentido, cualquier evaluación de las capacidades técnicas de la Organización debe ser entendida en el contexto de los resultados que alcanza en el terreno así como en el grado de cumplimiento de su Programa de Trabajo.

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

We would also like to thank Mr Mehboob for the presentation of the Joint Meeting's results. Russia supports the conclusions and recommendations of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

In relation to what was just said by the rapporteur, we welcome the proposal of the Director-General to have a briefing for Member States to prepare the Independent Assessments of the Technical Capacity of the Organization. This initiative has already received support during the Joint Meeting.

Separately for this, we note one of the mentioned items from the meeting and this was the importance of guaranteeing translation into all languages of the meetings in a full manner, including the plenary assembly of the Global Soil Partnership (GSP). We understand the difficulties that the Secretariat has when it comes to terms and in relation to the Terms of Reference of the GSP from 2012 in relation to guaranteeing resources for this mechanism.

At the same time, FAO Member States clearly stated that they wanted to have a multi-lingualism included in partnership, included in the rules of procedure from 2013. In this connection, we are grateful to the Secretariat for guaranteeing even if it was at the last minute, interpretation last week of the fourth plenary partnership meeting. This was following discussions at the Joint Meeting.

We note that this issue has been raised a number of times in Governing Bodies at different levels and needs a long-term solution, including at the recent plenary assembly, participants of the Global Soil Partnership, including Member States, looked at this issue and referred it to the FAO Council.

In this context, we invite the Council to adopt a clear recommendation to the Secretariat on the necessity for the regular guaranteeing of translation and interpretation into all FAO official languages during the plenary assembly of the GSP. We also ask the Secretariat to include this recommendation in planning the Programme of Work and Budget for 2018-19 and into the future.

If we can resolve this issue and both in relation to the plenary assembly from 2017, we will sincerely welcome such a move.

**Sra. Mónica ROBELO RAFFONE (Nicaragua)**

Nuestra Delegación apoya la decisión adoptada por el 153.º período de sesiones del consejo, a que la Secretaría de la FAO ponga en marcha una evaluación de la capacidad técnica de la Organización, tanto en la sede como en las oficinas descentralizadas. Sin embargo, queremos destacar la importancia de que los Miembros nos concentremos más en alcanzar los objetivos fijados en el PTP y obtener resultados, en lugar de sacrificar los desafíos que tenemos con asuntos de microgestión de la Organización.

Consideramos que el Informe sobre la Ejecución del Programa, y a la vista de las Conferencias Regionales, haya puesto de manifiesto el alcance de las realizaciones planificadas con un nivel muy satisfactorio. Es consecuente que los cambios producidos por la administración no hayan perjudicado la calidad de los productos de conocimiento sobre cuestiones de importancia global tanto en la sede como en el terreno.

La documentación del PTP y las notas informativas nos brindan las actualizaciones necesarias y suficientes para que la atención de los Miembros se dirija hacia la definición de prioridades que tengan un real impacto en nuestros países. Aunque bien nos sumamos a las conclusiones adoptadas por el Comité conjunto sobre este tema, consideramos importante, a la luz de la información que nos ha brindado el Director General, garantizar que tanto la Secretaría como la Dirección General puedan contar con la confianza de los Estados Miembros para que el proceso pueda desarrollarse según la hoja de ruta y la metodología planificada de los avances del cual estaremos informados en los tiempos previstos.

**Ms Wimonporn THITASAK (Thailand)**

Thailand would like to thank the Programme and Finance Committees for the thorough and extensive review and recommendation on the PIR, the Coverage of FAO Decentralized Offices, and the Assessment of the Technical Capacity of the Organization. We would like to focus our intervention on the Assessment of the technical capacity of the Organization.

We recognize that the technical capacity has multiple dimensions, and assessment of the technical capacity is such a challenging task, but it will be useful. We would like to share our thoughts as follows:

First, the assessment team needs to identify and clarify what aspect of the capacity needs be assessed, and what kind of report is to be produced in order to make use of the results to improve the efficiency and the delivery of FAO services to members.

Second; the capacity to be assessed should be focused on the capacity needed to carry out the work as planned in the reviewed Strategic Framework and Medium Term Plan 2014 - 2017. Having said that, the period of the assessment should be between 2014 and 2017, and the period can be used as reference for an evidence-based assessment. The assessment should also project the technical capacity to carry out the future work of FAO as well.

Third, due to the growing number of partnerships, the assessment should reflect different “tiers” of technical capacity such as the technical capacity of FAO staff at headquarters, at regional offices, and of the partners.

Thailand looks forward to seeing the report in March 2017.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je voudrais remercier Monsieur le Président du Comité financier pour sa présentation très claire du rapport de la réunion conjointe et vous demander de bien vouloir céder la parole aux Pays-Bas, qui vont faire une déclaration commune.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States and the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, and San Marino.

We take note of the Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees of 16 May. On the issue of the assessment of FAO's technical capacity which is key to ensuring that FAO is able to deliver on its strategic objectives, we note that it was a serious and clear request from various members to be fully involved in the development of the Independent Assessment.

For that reason, we applaud the Director-General for his opening speech yesterday morning in which he announced that it will be a road map including a draft of the methodology and types of indicators to be presented to the Programme Committee in November.

However, because of the crucial importance of FAO's technical capacity as a knowledge organization, we propose to make one extra step which is to discuss the scope, methodology, and indicators with the membership before submitting the roadmap to the Programme Committee in November.

We believe this is in the interest of both the management and the FAO members and will help to ensure we both are on the same page. Therefore we propose to Council to request Management to organize a meeting as soon as possible but well before the Programme Committee to present and discuss the draft of the scope methodology and indicators for the assessment and its independence.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

This statement is made on behalf of the Nordic Countries, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden. The EU countries, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden align themselves with the statement made on behalf of the EU.

Allow me to repeat our support to the issue now once again raised by EU, earlier raised under item 4.3. That is the implementation of the Independent Assessment of the FAO's technical capacity as requested by the Council.

We fully support this Council request the Secretariat to make one more extra step to the road map presented by the Director-General yesterday to discuss with members the scope, methodology, and the indicators well before the next meeting of the Programme Committee.

**Mr Yoji MATSUI (Japan)**

Like other Council Members, Japan is keen to know possible impact of the recent reorganisation on the FAO's technical capacity, and considers that ensuring independence and the timeliness of the assessment is important. In this regard, we look forward to further information on the method of assessment including Terms of Reference of evaluators as soon as prepared.

We understand the complexity in assessing technical capacity, in particular, setting its definition. We are glad to hear from the Director-General's opening remarks that the roadmap of the assessment will be discussed at the next Programme Committee. We expect to discuss the definition of the technical capacity of FAO on this occasion.

As expressed in the previous Council session, Japan still has a concern over reorganisation of FAO, because we are afraid that it could generate negative impacts on FAO's technical capacity. We would like the independent assessment to address, in particular, i) whether coordination between the SO management teams and the technical departments have been facilitated efficiently and effectively; and ii) the extent of possible extra burden placed on the management of the technical departments due to additional coordination required with the SO management teams, instead of being released from their previous workload.

Japan welcomes an informal meeting before finalising the assessment and looks forward to receiving the briefing, hopefully within this year.

Conducting the independent assessment is important, but what we expect is to utilise its findings as a base to further improve FAO's technical capacity. In this connection, we look forward to receiving management responses to its findings for concrete actions.

**Sr. Mateo NSOGO NGUERE MICUE (Guinea Ecuatorial)**

La República de Guinea Ecuatorial hace esta alocución en nombre de los Países del Grupo Africano.

Visto el contenido del Informe de la Reunión Conjunta que se acaba de presentar al Consejo para debate y decisión, queremos felicitar al Director General de la FAO y su Equipo de Dirección por los resultados que han alcanzado sobre la ejecución del Programa en el Bienio 2014-2015, sobre todo por haber rebasado la cota de 88 por ciento de las realizaciones planificadas, al propio tiempo que ha logrado ayudar a los Miembros a realizar progresos en la consecución de sus indicadores de desarrollo.

Por otra parte, nos sentimos orgullosos porque la FAO ha conseguido colocar las políticas de la lucha contra el hambre, la inseguridad alimentaria y la malnutrición en el primer plano de la atención Mundial, así como la contribución de la FAO a la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible, el Acuerdo de París sobre el Cambio Climático y la Segunda Conferencia Internacional sobre la Nutrición, al igual que la celebración de los años internacionales: 2014 Año Internacional sobre la Agricultura Familiar y 2015 Año Internacional sobre la Tenencia de los Suelos

En efecto, la República de Guinea Ecuatorial elogia a la Directiva de la FAO por los éxitos alcanzados en el Bienio 2014-2015, pese a las dificultades conocidas en ese período, tales como, la fluctuación del cambio con Euros y sin olvidar la volatilidad de los precios de las materias primas.

En definitiva, apreciamos que la Reunión Conjunta haya tenido en cuenta todas las recomendaciones emanadas de las Conferencias Regionales sobre la necesidad de actualizar la cobertura de las oficinas descentralizadas de la FAO; así como todas las recomendaciones retenidas en la Conferencia Regional de la FAO para África.

Por último, la República de Guinea Ecuatorial quiere exhortar a la FAO en el sentido de seguir realizando esfuerzos orientados para la materialización de las iniciativas regionales, así como lo concerniente al Programa de Trabajo y Presupuesto para el Bienio 2016-2017; ya que se presentan muchos retos y desafíos en el contexto internacional.

Así mismo imploramos a la FAO que tenga en cuenta la cuestión de distribución geográfica y la equidad de género a la hora de contratar al personal en la Organización.

Por tanto, la República de Guinea Ecuatorial, en nombre de los Países del Grupo Africano, adopta este informe de la Reunión Conjunta Comité de Programa y el Comité de Finanza que se presenta al Consejo.

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

I also would like to join colleagues who have thanked the President of the Finance Committee for the Report of the Joint Meeting. I was present at that meeting and it was very encouraging to see the depth of the dialog between the Members of both Committees and the Director-General which lasted for almost two hours.

Of course, I understand the keen interest that the Independent Evaluation of the Technical Capacity of the Organization has risen in the minds of colleagues who have taken part in that discussion as well as the members of the Council.

I also welcome very much the contributions given by the distinguished delegates of Thailand and Japan for guiding the Secretariat in undertaking this task that was given to it.

I also would like to note that the Director-General has expressed his willingness to brief the Members of the Organization as an appropriate moment before finalizing the Report on the Independent Evaluation of the Technical Capacity of the Organization to be submitted to the Council early next year.

There is an institutional framework that conforms the governance of this Organization. The proposals made by the European Union and Iceland do not conform to the procedures that normally are followed in order to guide this Organization in the best way possible.

I would think that undertaking this course of action proposed by the EU and Iceland would undermine the competencies of the Programme and the Finance Committee. Brazil will not support that proposal.

**Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)**

I also am a bit puzzled because what Brazil says is the correct way to go about it. The Director-General has been asked to do an assessment of the technical capacity of the organization with Headquarters. It quite clearly said that he will submit to the Programme Committee the roadmap, the terms of reference, maybe even who he is going to employ to do the work.

The Programme Committee is made of members. All regions are represented in the Programme Committee. So as far as I am concerned, the Programme Committee represents membership.

Now it has been proposed to say wait, Director-General, you cannot submit to the Programme Committee unless we have seen what you will submit. That is very odd. I have never in my experience in FAO come across this. So let us follow the standard procedure. The Director-General will prepare the roadmap, and the terms of reference. If the Director-General wants to be consulted, he will consult membership. If members want to make voluntary informal suggestions to the Director-General, they are free. I am free to submit to the Director-General an informal note what is my view about this but not formally.

So the best thing would be to wait until the Programme receives something then what the Programme reaction is before it goes to the Council. The Director-General may call an informal session of the whole membership and he will explain this is what I proposed, this is the reaction of the Programme Committee, and this is how I am going to go.

If we break this legal procedure, we are going into a very dangerous area.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je voulais remercier les interlocuteurs précédents, et en particulier l'Afghanistan pour son éclairage intéressant. Dans la lignée de ce qu'a indiqué les Pays-Bas pour l'Union européenne, je voulais revenir simplement sur la question du calendrier de cette évaluation indépendante qui, comme l'a souligné le Japon mais aussi la Thaïlande, l'Islande et d'autres, cette évaluation est cruciale pour la capacité de la FAO à délivrer.

Cette question du calendrier est essentielle et il faut que, en amont de la session du Comité du Programme qui est planifié en novembre, puisse se dérouler un travail préparatoire de cadrage de cette évaluation afin qu'elle produise les résultats que nous attendons tous dans l'intérêt de cette maison qu'est la FAO et que nous soutenons.

**Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)**

We would like to support the proposal made by the Netherlands on behalf of the EU, the EU Members as well as Iceland. Likewise, we also agree with the comments made by other delegations about respecting the Governing Bodies.

Yet, I think that based on past experience, there would be value in having informal meetings before the formal Governing Bodies on important issues. Therefore, I believe that this is still consistent with the announcement of the Director-General to present a Programme Committee's roadmap and the Draft Methodology.

However, the presentation should have been made through an informal meeting, well in advance of the Programme Committee, so that the Governing Bodies can perform their functions more effectively.

**Mr Abreha ASEFFA (Ethiopia)**

We have to abide by the procedures. We agree with Brazil and Afghanistan that we should stick to the rules.

**Mr Kirill ANTYUKHIN (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

In relation to the decision taken in the 153<sup>rd</sup> Session of the FAO Council, the technical nature of the activities that we are talking about here, this is in the jurisdiction of the Secretariat. Then, in the timetable document, this refers to the middle of 2017 without any intermediary stages.

Despite this, the Director-General met Member Nations halfway. We welcome the proposal made by the Director-General to have a briefing for Member Nations on the preparation of the Independent Evaluation of the Technical Capacity of the Organization that is Headquarters and Decentralized Offices. This initiative received support from the Joint Meeting.

Our delegation agree with the recommendations made by the Joint Meeting on this issue. So, we propose to go ahead with the decisions taken in the previous Council Session, which clearly defined the role and the obligations regarding the preparation of this evaluation.

**Ms Natalie Eugenia BROWN (United States of America)**

We would like to support the Netherlands on behalf of the EU and Nordic Countries' suggestion on having a discussion prior to the next meeting of the Programme Committee. We believe regular consultation only strengthens the Organization and see great value in the informals that take place before the Governing Body meetings.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

I think there is some misunderstanding here. We were simply supporting an informal meeting of the issue. It was said by the Director-General himself that these are very complex issues, also by the Deputy Director-General under Item 4.3 and it was pointed out to me that this is very complex.

We totally agree on that. We just want to be on board with all of the Members and the Secretariat. This is an informal setting to brief Members before the Programme Committee. So it has nothing to do with anything else therefore I think there is a misunderstanding to put this into the perspective of micromanagement and it is for the Members to ask for information and we are doing that.

**CHAIRPERSON**

I would like to suggest that we take a break and come back at 18 hours sharp to continue with this item. I would like to suggest that we make a concerted effort to finish items 5, 6, 7, and 7.1 today and that we take up the remaining items on the agenda tomorrow morning.

Furthermore, presentations under item 14, Developments in *fora* of importance for the mandate of FAO, originally planned for Wednesday morning, will be made on Friday morning, followed by the briefing on field visits, after which we shall proceed to the adoption of the report.

*The meeting was suspended from 17.33 to 18.14 hours*

*La séance est suspendue de 17 h 33 à 18 h 14*

*Se suspende la sesión de las 17.33 a las 18.14*

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

I welcome the Legal Counsel to our meeting because it might be necessary as we have a legal matter before us. As it was rightfully pointed out by my distinguished colleague from Afghanistan, there are certain procedures to be followed and he stated very well upon the normal practice in this Organization. The roles of the two Committees, the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee, as well as the Joint Meeting, are a subsidiary role to the Council, which in its turn is subsidiary to the Conference.

The proposal that was made by the Observer for the Netherlands on behalf of the European Union, its Member States and the Candidate States of several regions of Europe, and supported by the Member of the Council Iceland, does not conform to the normal practice or the legal framework of governance of this Organization. It would be something like inverting the hierarchy: the Conference would come before the Subsidiary Bodies to instruct the discussions or to inform the discussions in the Subsidiary Bodies themselves. Informal consultations are not. What was requested was the involvement of the

Members of this Organization in the formulation of the Terms of Reference and the choice of the team that is going to conduct this independent evaluation, which is something that is not even foreseen at the decision taken by the Conference last year.

Of course it is possible for the Members of the Organization to be informally consulted, but the normal way of doing that is that the Members of the Finance Committee and the Members of the Programme Committee consult with their constituencies. Before I attend a meeting of the Finance Committee, I go and talk to my colleagues at GRULAC, I hear what they advise me to say at the Finance Committee meeting. That is the normal practice. Then I attend the meeting and I articulate the positions that I gather from my constituency. Each Committee is composed of Members from the different Regional Groups of this Organization, so there is not a consultative process that is undertaken in order to forward discussion at the Committees. If we do it the other way around, before the Committees meet, we should consult everyone. We are actually bringing the Conference before the Subsidiary Bodies, which is not possible.

I understand that the advice that is given by the two Committees may or may not be followed by the Council because the Committees are subsidiary to the Council. No problem with that. However, there is a degree of commitment to those who have participated in the decision-making in the Committees. I myself would feel uncomfortable if I came to the Council and said something different from what I had said at the Committees or if I went against the decision that was taken by the Joint Meeting to which I was a part of. What I see now is that several colleagues around this room have revised what was the terms of the decision taken at the Joint Meeting. I have no problem that those who have not participated in the decision-making in the Joint Session raise their points of view, but I am surprised when I hear colleagues who have taken part in the discussions in the Joint Meeting come here and support something different.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

I have been listening to Brazil's contribution and I think there is room to repeat one or two things of our statement. But at the same time, I think there is also room to consider that we are progressing our dialogue, the dialogue between Member States and Secretariat or the Director-General on this important topic. There is no doubt that all Members as well as the Secretariat and the Director-General consider this topic as an important topic. But how to conduct this is a matter of making progress in the process. As we refer to the speech that was made yesterday, the Director-General made progress in his thinking about how to conduct the independent assessment and he announced that it will be a road map including a draft of the methodology and the types of indicators. I have not heard this to be discussed in the Joint Meeting nor in one of the Programme or Finance Committees.

We are almost there to find an appropriate way of how to take on this important independent assessment. That is why we proposed to organize a meeting as soon as possible but well before the Programme Committee so that all Member States are informed, have the opportunity to respond, but not to make decision. Therefore, it is not as Brazil is stating that Council is coming before the Programme and Finance Committee. It is not the case. It is just to have transparency to build up the process and to ensure that we have a final result, a final trusted outcomewhere we all can build upon and taken as a basis for the crucial future work of FAO and the Member States.

We think it is a proposal that can be accepted by the Secretariat. We think that if you organize such a meeting around September or the beginning of October, the Secretariat has the scope, the methodology, the indicators to hold an informal briefing, and then think whether it can be improved before sending it and dealt with in the Finance and Programme Committees. It is meant to be a constructive contribution to come forward with a sound result where FAO and the Member States can build upon the future.

**Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)**

The Joint Meeting Report paragraph 8 states: "We look forward to receiving the outcome of the assessment in March 2017 prior to consideration by the Council and presentation to the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee".

So the Joint Session must receive that assessment. It does not say that the Joint Session should receive the Terms of Reference of the study. The first paragraph clearly says to recall the decision of the

151<sup>st</sup> Session of the Council urging the FAO Secretariat to undertake an Independent Assessment of the Technical Capacity of the Organization for the record. The study is given to the Secretariat but it has to be independent. The Secretariat will decide how to make it independent.

The normal practice of an Independent Assessment has been that the Director-General hires one or two or three consultants. That person, he or she, becomes the manager of the study. Prepares the Terms of Reference, arranges the work, prepares who is to be employed, how it should be done, makes the assessment of what will be FAO's demands for the next two decades, what is the implication on the services of FAO, and what is the implication of the services on staff composition by sector, by discipline, and by competence. Then the whole thing is given to the Secretariat.

The Director-General has the authority to do that. The Director-General is the manager of the Organization. He has every right to undertake an assessment, not only this assessment, but also a lot of other assessments. He either does it by staff or does it independently. We do not want to interfere in that. The only sensible thing to do is what our colleagues from Brazil said. Member Nations can express their opinion and submit it to the Members of the Programme and Finance Committees.

**Sr. Antonio CARRANZA BARONA (Ecuador)**

Queremos apoyar las intervenciones que han hecho la Delegación de Brasil y de Afganistán. Queremos señalar o recordar que tenemos ya una decisión del 153<sup>o</sup> período del Consejo con la cual se encarga la Secretaría a realizar este assessment sobre las capacidades técnicas y además una recomendación de orden conjunta sobre el tema.

Ecuador aprecia la voluntad del Director-General de que a pesar que legalmente, como ha mencionado el Delegado de Brasil, están los Órganos Rectores para conocer este tema, previo la Conferencia del 2017, y como dijo, apreciamos la voluntad del Director General en el sentido que primero como informó en la Reunión conjunta de informar de los resultados de las evaluaciones a inicio del año 2017. Valoramos esta iniciativa del Director-General y igualmente apreciamos lo que dijo el DG durante este Consejo en el sentido de su voluntad de presentar al Comité del Programa la hoja de ruta y la metodología, lo cual nos parece muy positivo y que sea a través de los Órganos Rectores competentes para conocer estos temas.

No respaldamos el que haya un Seminario informal antes de estos Órganos Rectores por cuanto estaremos restando las capacidades y la competencias que tienen estos Comités para conocer esto, si no habrá que preguntarse por qué está la existencia de los Comités de Programa y de Finanzas si se pueden hacer reuniones oficiosas con todos los Miembros para abordar los temas. Es decisivo de respetar el marco jurídico que tiene la Organización y en este sentido existen los Organos Rectores como el Comités de Programa y de Finanza para conocer este tema. Los Estados Miembros pueden participar y nada impide de que toda la membración se exprese a través de los Miembros de los Comités, sino así no vemos el valor agregado que pueda haber una sesión informal anterior estos Comités que los Miembros de estos Comités no la puedan transmitir, por lo cual nosotros apreciamos que se vayan presentar esta información de la hoja de ruta y la metodología al Comité de Programa y consideramos que no solamente es legal ese tema si no que además es muy apropiado.

**M. Carlos Alberto AMARAL (Angola)**

Je voulais éviter de parler, mais de toute façon, je pense qu'on commence à entrer dans la même discussion, le type de discussions du Comité financier et du Comité du Programme. Le Directeur Général a promis de donner des informations sur les vastes travaux, travaux qui sont basés sur une décision du Conseil. Le Secrétariat accepte ses responsabilités. Pour cette raison, je pense qu'il faut faire confiance. Nous avons dit au point précédent que nous faisons confiance à la Direction. Cela veut dire qu'il faut attendre un peu plus et laisser travailler le Secrétariat à ce sujet.

**Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)**

I guess just taking on from where Angola has left off, there and the discussion we had earlier about the positive momentum in terms of FAO's outcomes, inputs – outputs I should say. Just to say that we welcome the Director-General's proposal which he made at the start of this meeting to bring a paper forward to the November Programme Committee with a bit of a road map so the Members could

consider that, this was something that Australia had specifically requested at the last Joint Meeting, at that point, that was not something that was on the table but we are glad to see now that the Secretariat has listened to the views of some Members expressed during that Joint Meeting and that the Director-General is now willing to do that. So we greatly appreciate that. I think we would highly recommend that this Council's report welcome and endorse the Director-General's suggestion for the Programme Committee to receive a report on this matter for discussion at its November meeting. So, as I say, I think that is a positive step.

Again, that is managed by listening to the views and issues of Membership. I think here today we have heard recognition and acknowledgement of that progress, but also a desire which has been previously expressed on all matters going to the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee and Council for there to be an informal briefing providing some information to all Members about the key issues that will be discussed at the upcoming meetings. So from Australia's perspective, we would fully support that on all items. But obviously in relation to this specific item, there is a very high level of interest. It was this Council at its last session that actually formally requested the independent review. I think it is fully within the remit of this Council to also provide further guidance. I think what we are hearing here this evening is that a substantial number of Members of the Council would like to see also an early informal briefing ahead of the Programme Committee giving us equal opportunity, ample opportunity to understand what is in the proposal. We would fully support that. I guess I am just stressing that there are a number of countries and regions expressing that view and that is basically up to Management to take on board the views expressed.

**Sr. Junior Andrés ESCOBAR FONSECA (Nicaragua)**

Muy puntual sobre el informe de la reunión conjunta. Nuestra delegación quiere expresar nuestra satisfacción por los resultados alcanzados por la FAO con el tema de género, los cuales se expresan en los programas de mayor impacto en el terreno. Valoramos que el mismo esté presente dentro del informe sobre la ejecución del programa y otros documentos informativos.

Para Nicaragua, país de la región en que más se ha venido reduciendo la brecha de género entre hombres y mujeres, es sumamente importante contar con este esfuerzo de la FAO, incorporando la igualdad de género con atención prioritaria dentro de su programa y su estrategia.

**Mr Andrzej HALASEWICZ (Observer for Poland)**

I have listened to this debate with great interest. I think that the involvement of the Members are growing and the level of understanding of what we discuss is impressive. I think like many of us, I am really grateful to the contribution of Dr. Ayazi to our debate. I always listen to him carefully and I am grateful to him for his contribution. I learn a lot from him and I always listen to him really carefully. But I am afraid that today in this discussion I am not fully able to agree with our distinguished delegate from Afghanistan.

Being a Member of the Programme Committee, I do not feel the proposal presented by the Netherlands on behalf of European Union and Candidate Countries is breaking any rule or limiting my rights as a Member of the Committee. Quite the opposite. I think that proposal to have an informal discussion about important matters could contribute greatly to me as a Member of the Committee understanding what is going on. That means that the Programme Committee could give a better proposal to the Council than without such a seminar.

I have a question to the Distinguished Delegate of Brazil. What exactly is the rule broken by the proposal presented by the EU? Because you said very, very strongly that some rule is broken. I do not see that this is the case. So I would appreciate to have your explanation. What do you have in mind?

So, as an observer, I support the proposal presented by the Netherlands on behalf of EU Members and Candidate Countries and supported by Iceland on behalf of Nordic countries, supported by Australia and some other countries. I think that a really great number of Council Members are asking for an informal seminar. An informal discussion could contribute to better government of the Organization. What is wrong with this? I hope that Council will take the right decision.

**Ms Maria Helena SEMEDO (Deputy-Director General, Coordinator for Natural Resources)**

Thank you all Members of the Council for this constructive dialogue, which have shown your interest in this very important Independent Assessment of the technical capacity of FAO.

As it has been said by the Director-General, this is also important for FAO. It will give us the opportunity to measure our technical capacity, and more than that, to see if our technical capacity has been maintained or it has been improved over the years. I believe that we all agree on this point. Let's try to see what the Council requests the Secretariat to do. The Council requested the Secretariat to undertake an Independent Assessment to be presented to the Conference in 2017.

The only deadline we have is July 2017. I think that now it is up to the Secretariat to prepare to deliver what has been requested on time, that is July 2017. Please consider the importance of this process and the dialogue involved. We have said we will do an Independent Assessment. In our view, the Independent Assessment will be on the analysis, the interpretation of information to be done by independent and neutral experts.

In this regard, FAO will recruit excellent consultants to carry out the mentioned Assessment. This is how we see the process. As it has been said, the technical capacity of an Organization is a difficult concept to define and more so to measure, meaning that it is complex.

We the Secretariat will need time for us to prepare in order to deliver what has been requested. Indeed, We need time to define the terms of reference of the consultant, to recruit the consultant, and to have a discussion with the consultant in what should be the definition of the technical capacity.

I spent two days looking at the related literature. What is the definition of technical capacity? I was not able to find one which could suit FAO. Thus, we have to concur with the consultant. We have to define the methodology. We have to agree on the indicators. We have to assemble all of the information in order to prepare something to be presented to the Member Nations. So, all of this is a process and it is time consuming.

If you consider that the Director-General already agreed that we will present during the Programme Committee in November 2016, we will organize an informal briefing beginning in 2017. We have again the Programme Committee, the Council, and the Conference. You see, if you add another layer, how cumbersome will be the process. Then, I am afraid we the Secretariat will not be able to deliver our services, if you have all of those processes.

In the Programme Committee, as the consultants will be hired we agreed that we will be able, to present a proposal on the methodology, on the roadmap, on the indicators. Afterwards, you should provide your inputs, which we will present again in the informal seminar.

I am convinced that we have already enough information. We had the discussion and the verbatim during the Council. I understand you have already provided guidance on what you want. We have had the discussion during the Joint Meeting. We are having the discussion today. To us in the Secretariat, we consider we have already relevant information which will guide us towards the presentation to be done during the Programme Committee. So, this is what we would like to say.

We will be ready to discuss with you on the substance during the Programme Committee. Before that from our side, it will be difficult and we do not consider that is really necessary to have this meeting before.

Anyway, we will be able and open to receive any comment, any information from your side in order to be integrated in what will be presented to the Programme Committee. This is what I wanted to say so far and I think Antonio Tavares can complement what I have said.

## LEGAL COUNSEL

I think everything has been already said in the course of this debate, but I wish to highlight a few legal points.

I would like to address first the question of the mandate given to the Secretariat, what was decided by the Council at its last session, and then I will briefly refer to the question of the procedure that we are following.

I have here in front of me the decision of the Council of the last session which reads as follows: "The Council urged the FAO Secretariat to undertake an Independent Assessment of the technical capacity of the Organization, both at headquarters and in the decentralized offices, to be presented to the Conference in 2017".

So this is the actual decision of the Council and we are clearly in the presence of a duty assigned to the Secretariat. I think this is beyond any dispute and any doubt, and I wish to recall that Mr Mehboob, the Chairperson of the Finance Committee, when chairing the session of the Joint Meeting, clearly highlighted this point.

This is a duty of the Secretariat and it is up to the Secretariat to arrange for this assessment. I note with appreciation that Mr Matthew Worrell from Australia has intervened on this topic with a very balanced statement and he was the Chairperson of the Drafting Committee of the last session of the Council.

You may recall that we had a very interesting exchange here in this same room about whether or not a particular review had been independent and I have a very good recollection of the conclusion of the Chair of the Drafting Committee at that time that this should be a matter for the judgement of the Secretariat.

So we are clearly in the presence of a responsibility of the Secretariat and the Secretariat has to balance a number of interests. It has to balance Decentralized Offices and Headquarters. It is up to the Secretariat to balance these elements also because the initial requests had to do only with Headquarters, which in our view would have been a wrong approach to this matter because the technical capacity must be seen in its broader context.

The Secretariat will rely also on independent inputs and on the work of consultants. As my colleague Maria Helena Semedo has pointed out, the intention of the Director-General is to submit a roadmap presentation of the methodology and indicators to the Joint Meeting so, as far as I am concerned, we are clearly in the presence of a mandate given to the Secretariat.

But we are in the presence of a situation where the Members, and certainly it is their right, are now trying to call into question a very clear mandate that had been given to the Secretariat.

So that is the first point that I wanted to emphasize.

The second point has to do with the procedure for the assessment. Indeed, we have a number of institutional players in the Governing Bodies of FAO. We have a number rules in the Basic Texts which define the role of our various Governing Bodies. The intention is to submit some conclusions, some preliminary work to the Joint Meeting during its Autumn session and then to submit subsequently other conclusions to the Spring Sessions of the Governing Bodies before the Conference.

To reply to the question of the Distinguished Representative of Poland, we have very clear rules in the Basic Text regarding the statutory functions of these bodies and it is not for an informal meeting to take decisions on a number of matters. We know that informal meetings have been organized in FAO, but it is not the intention of the Secretariat to organize these informal meetings in this context.

These meetings are of an informal nature and they are not mentioned in our Basic Text. I think there is a reference to informal meetings in connection with the functions of the Independent Chairperson of the Council. I think that is the only reference to informal meetings in our Basic Text.

So indeed we have a number of institutional players and we do not intend to deviate from this approach. So I will stop here for the time being. But clearly I believe that we have a very clear

mandate which conferred upon the Secretariat a given role and we envisage the procedure under this framework while will follow and we do not envisage referral of the matter to a seminar of permanent representatives during the Autumn of 2016.

**Mr Khalid MEHBOOB (Chairperson, Finance Committee)**

In fact Afghanistan has said it all. He presented a very logical step by step process, which has always been followed in FAO. We have a governance mechanism in place. That is what I tried to put forward in the Joint Session.

The instructions from the Council are quite clear. It urged the Secretariat to carry out an Independent Assessment. The the, As Afghanistan has pointed out, the Independent Assessment has always been arranged by the Secretariat with the assistance of outside experts, outside consultants. , We have a confirmation from the Deputy Director-General that that is how they plan to proceed. The Secretariat shall, get external technical assistance in the form of consultants to carry out this review.

The result of that review is supposed to come to the Joint Session of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee, according to the Joint Session Report on which members agreed. Before that, I believe the terms of reference for the consultants, will be also cleared by the Programme Committee. The Director-General has now agreed that there will be an informal seminar, a roadmap and relevant information on the indicators.

So all of this is there. Plus, we have approved the management structure of the Secretariat. In fact, the membership is paying for that structure every two years in the form of the Regular Programme Budget. So why don't we let them carry on and do the job the way the Council has instructed? Besides, it has also been recognized that Members are free to make their comments either individually or as a group or as a region. In fact, the Deputy Director-General here now confirms that those comments will be taken into account.

So this desire for dialogue or desire to help with the views is taken care of. Then, let the Assessment process go ahead and then examine the results. If they are not satisfactory, hold the people accountable.

**CHAIRPERSON**

We had a good discussion on this agenda item. I think it has always been said and it is contained also in the Reform of FAO that the Council gives clear, precise and focused guidance. All Council Members gave guidance regarding this matter and on a follow-up to that matter. I hope from discussions going on management listening, the Director-General has been able also to come on board regarding what you had requested.

On the issue of informal seminars or consultations, I may agree with the Legal Counsel, but from my being a layman in legal issues, I would say that the Director-General may decide by himself to have an informal meeting and it does not mean that it must be written somewhere.

We have had several informal meetings and briefings. I remember in the previous biennium through my informal consultations with the Regional Groups, I asked the members to make a list to come up with proposals where they see there is a need for informal briefings from the Director-General.

There were about eight issues on the list and I conveyed this to the Director-General, but it is the discretion of the Director-General to see what he wants to brief you. It is not necessarily that he is going to make a briefing on what you have listed. The Director-General came back to brief you on some, on various issues.

So we have got several challenges whereby we can continue discussing this issue through my informal consultations. I am here to link you with the management.

This call is there but I do not think that it needs to be recorded as such given that the informal briefings and the consultations can be agreed upon by management, of course showing that Members have to be informed and to know on the progress and what is going on.

To me, I may not rule out that by the Director-General saying that he will come to a briefing or to the Joint Meeting means that he cannot call for a briefing if he sees it necessary or if he is ready to do so. Therefore that is what I can say on this.

Having said this, I want to make short conclusions on this Agenda item as follows.

- 1) The Council endorsed the report of the Joint Meeting and, in relation to its discussion on the independent assessment of technical capacity of the Organization:
  - a) recalled the guidance from its 153<sup>rd</sup> Session for the Secretariat to undertake the assessment for consideration by the Conference in 2017;
  - b) appreciated the announcement made by the Director-General that a roadmap, including a draft of the methodology and the type of indicators to be used, would be presented to the Programme Committee at its meeting in November 2016;
  - c) appreciated that an informal briefing to Members would be arranged to finalization of the report of the assessment in early 2017;
  - d) noted the complexity in assessing the technical capacity of FAO, including in terms of definition, location and the context of the Organization's mandate and objectives;
  - e) looked forward to reviewing the outcome of the assessment at its April 2017 session, prior to submission to the 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Conference.

**Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)**

Just to be clear so I understand what is being proposed, so that I can agree to what I agree, the proposal from the Director-General was for a paper to come forward to the November Programme Committee but, then I take it from the way you read out the following sub-item, that the Council would not consider this matter again until the Spring session. Is that normal practice?

Just for clarity, is the intent that after going to the Programme Committee, it would go to this Council or not in this year? What you read implied that it would not be coming back to this Council meeting after the Programme Committee's considerations. Could I just have some clarity around that?

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

We agree with your summary. The only thing we would like to underscore is that during our statement at the start of the discussion, we mentioned an issue that was discussed during the Joint Meeting and the measures that were taken as the outcome of those discussions, specific mechanisms, and during our statement at the start of the discussion we asked for our proposal to be reflected as a recommendation of the Council.

I am referring to ensuring on a regular basis the simultaneous and written translation of documents of plenary assemblies of the Global Soil Partnership. I would not raise this issue if it were not for the fact that it appears every year for three years now. We discussed it in many *fora* of the Governing Bodies and I have a feeling that the decision on this issue has already matured or it is time for the decision to be taken.

We mentioned this during my statement. I could suggest some text to include it in the conclusions, a text which I would think relevant for the Council in accordance with the recommendations. This text can of course be improved on and I would suggest the following. I will read in English.

“The Council acknowledged the imperative need to ensure regular translation and interpretation in all FAO languages at the plenary assemblies of the Global Soil Partnership and asked the Secretariat to take measures in this regard, including when preparing the PWB 2018-19.”

We understand the difficulties linked to bring the needs for 2017 as the Programme of Work and Budget has already been confirmed and adopted. We will not insist on the funding for translation and interpretation at the next session, as there is a relevant Conference decision and a proposal for the 2016-17 PWB, but we do hope the Secretariat will tackle this issue in 2017.

But we do not need to include that in the report.

**CHAIRPERSON**

I will ask the Secretariat to respond to this.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

Thank you Chair. I see a procedural issue here. There is no mention in the report before Council (document CL 154/5) about the work or the funding of the Global Soil Partnership. The Distinguished Delegate from Russia is quite right in saying that this has been an issue under discussion for some time. And I am aware that there has been recently a meeting of the Plenary Assembly of the Global Soil Partnership. I personally have not read the report of this meeting. I know it is not a Governing Body as such, and it does not report to Council.

My question here is whether Council this afternoon has in front of it enough information and even the necessary authority to adopt and approve the wording that has been read by the Distinguished Delegate from Russia. I see it as a legal issue and perhaps the Legal Counsel could help us in that respect.

**LEGAL COUNSEL**

The Global Soil Partnership has a very specific legal status, it is not a normal Statutory Body of FAO. It has a loose structure and is hosted by FAO.

We know that a number of Members are very much attached to the role of the Global Soil Partnerships. Incidentally, currently the Director-General and the Management of FAO are concerned at some of these bodies which do not have necessarily a proper legal status, and we need to determine whether they are in FAO or outside FAO. The Global Soil Partnership is to be seen in this context.

My initial reaction was to say indeed that this procedure is a bit out of order. But I am in the hands of the Council. I do not wish to take this matter further than it should be here in this meeting. I note that the concerns of Mr Gagnon are founded as this is not really a point for this item of the Agenda. But I am in your hands.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

First, we thank the Secretariat and Legal Counsel for the explanation on mandate. To us, the mandate of the Secretariat is crystal clear and we do not want in any way to undermine it. That was suggested by the Legal Office. But at last Council session we decided on having an independent assessment and when the result had to be presented. It was read out in your summary, Mr Chairperson.

Meanwhile, I wonder where it is stated in the Rules of Procedures that neither we nor the Secretariat are allowed to think about the how of to undertake. I see that we are making progress on the manner to conduct these complex assessments. We are not questioning the mandate of the Secretariat by expressing our contribution here and our desire to have an informal meeting.

Having said this, we wonder whether we would like to see point (d) in the conclusion because we all agree that it is complex but the way you read it out was a little bit confusing to us.

It reads something like: "acknowledging the difficulties of assessment". What do we mean by this? For what reason should we take a decision on this matter? So I do not see the added value of this here.

Two additional points. Under point (b) of your conclusions, we would like to add after what you read out a new sentence as follows:

"A substantial number of Member States expressed the desire to request the Secretariat to organize a meeting well before the Programme Committee meeting in November to present and discuss the scope, methodology, and indicators for this assessment".

That is what we propose.

Finally, we agree with the Secretariat and the Legal Office that the request of the Russian Federation is understandable, but the Council is not the right place to deal with this topic right now because the Global Soil Partnership is a specific entity in which FAO has a Membership. We recognize the request from Russia but it is not up to the Council to take a decision on this topic.

**Mr Pierfrancesco SACCO (Italy)**

A quick intervention to support what has just been said by the Netherlands as Presidency of the European Union. In particular, I think that the commitment that we all appreciated made by the Director-General yesterday when he committed to present a draft of the methodology and the types of indicators through a roadmap to the Programme Committee, that is not by any means violating the prerogatives of the Secretariat. That is a very important step in what is in our view the right direction, to involve and engage the Membership, exchange views and do things better together.

**Sr. Nazareno Cruz MONTANI CAZABAT (Argentina)**

En términos generales queremos apoyar las conclusiones que usted ha leído y en particular queremos apoyar la propuesta de la distinguida delegación de Rusia. En este sentido varias delegaciones, entre esas la delegación de mi país, hemos levantado la cuestión del multilingüismo durante la reunión conjunta, ya que es una cuestión que nos parece que es sumamente relevante y excede las cuestiones jurídicas aquí. En respecto de la Alianza mundial sobre los Suelos ha habido una fuerte voluntad de la Asamblea Plenaria de solicitar y de remarcar la necesidad de tener traducción e interpretación sobre todo para el futuro.

Comprendemos las restricciones que puedan existir hacia el 2017 por el período de tiempo, pero nos parece que ésta es una cuestión sumamente importante desde lo práctico y la Alianza mundial sobre los Suelos, la Asamblea Plenaria cuentan muchas veces con técnicos de nuestros países y es una real dificultad llevar estas reuniones a cabo solo en inglés como propusimos en la reunión conjunta.

Entendemos ciertas dificultades, pero también necesitamos que nos entienda, porque en realidad si se nos dice que no hay presupuesto para esto, bueno propondríamos que la reunión se vaya haciendo en distintas lenguas. Una vez en español, una vez en francés, una vez en ruso, una vez en árabe para que se entienda realmente cual es la dificultad que tenemos. Esto es un debate que este Consejo tiene que dar porque donde lo vamos a dar, si no. En este sentido, la delegación Argentina quiere apoyar la propuesta de Rusia y nos parece que es muy importante tomarlo en cuenta en este Consejo.

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

Let me start by saying that I also have the same recollection as my colleague from Argentina that this matter was brought to the attention of the Joint Meeting of the Committees and it is certainly an obstacle that challenges many Delegations which attend the GSP Meetings. I would invite the Council to look into this matter and find a solution, because the proposal made by Russia seems quite positive and forthcoming. Otherwise, the solution would be what has been proposed by Argentina and I suggest that the next meeting be held in Russian as it was their proposal and the other Delegations should bring their own interpreters.

I also would like to comment on the decision-making process of the Council. The last intervention by the Distinguished Ambassador from the Netherlands was not introduced by any Member of the Council. As far as I understand, observers do not matter into the decision-making process of the Council itself. I do understand that the proposals made by the observer Delegation of the Netherlands were endorsed by one Member of the Council. However, I have to reiterate my objection to it, I do not want to reopen the discussion as I do not think it is the appropriate moment for that. I just would like to first hear the response to the question made by my distinguished colleague from Australia, and second, endorse the language that you have proposed as the conclusions for this meeting.

**Mr Mohammed S. SHERIFF (Liberia)**

As Member of Council, we are listening to discussions that are ongoing and I have to understand the cost implication of this assessment that we are talking about because, of course, it would be paid by Member Countries.

What would be the cost of this assessment? Because in my mind it may go up to maybe USD 500,000 or USD 600,000, because you would be taking into account that you need experienced managers, many technical experts to visit the different regions, the countries, and the rest of this. You have too many things involved here.

FAO, we need to be mindful that there are people out there dying of hunger, about 800 million people are out there. So every dime or every nickel that we are going to spend, we must always be cautious of it. My question is how much is this going to cost us Member Nations? Maybe someone can be able to tell us the cost implication.

**Mr Salah AL BAZZAZ (Kuwait) (Original language Arabic)**

I would like to refer to what the Honorable Delegates from the Netherlands and from Italy said. Instead of holding a single informal meeting, perhaps a series of informal meetings would be better because we all see the complexity of the problem and we all see that there are way too many ramifications and we need extensive discussions on the matter.

I would now like to refer to what our colleague from Liberia said. I wonder what the cost will be for the assessment. Cost is of paramount importance and we need to know who will be handling this. An assessment is always interesting and the idea is a very sound one, at least in principle, because assessing our technical capacities is very important. We can see whether we are up to the task, technically speaking, and whether we still have an edge in terms of delivering on food and agriculture issues. But the cost issue is to be looked into nevertheless.

On the issue of our colleague from the Russian Federation, we fully agree with and welcome the idea and we would like to suggest to the Council to find a way of tackling this issue.

**Mr Jianmin XIE (China) (Original language Chinese)**

After listening to all the interventions, I have learnt a lot. These two issues are very important. First of all, regarding the technical capacity assessment, we agree with the conclusion made by the Chairperson. I think all the points of interest were in the conclusion.

If I am not mistaken, in point (b) the Chairperson already mentioned that starting 2016 November this issue should be given to the Programme Committee for discussion. I think everyone now is expressing their will to have an earlier meeting to be able to know more about the assessment. I think this is the will in this room. This is not in contradiction with the conclusion reached.

If a few Members are more active and have more constructive proposals or suggestions, for example, I think the Delegate from Kuwait said we can have a series of meetings instead of one informal meeting, or maybe it is not up to the Secretariat to hold any meetings of this kind. If you have this wish, or if you are ready and thinking this issue is very important and you would like to tell the Secretariat how to do the assessment, then you can make your proposals. You can propose to the Secretariat how to assess FAO's technical capacity.

I think now is not the time to think about when or where or how to discuss this assessment. The point is to have an assessment that is more realistic because this issue is very complicated. In the Organization how to assess itself has always been very complicated. I think very seldom we see an organization wanting to assess itself. It is difficult. So I propose that Members should maybe take the initiative to study this issue and make proposals to the Secretariat to do a better assessment. If you have already concrete ideas, you can make your proposal tomorrow. The Chair also was thinking about how and when to do it, so Members having ideas can make their comments or proposals to help out. I think that is a constructive way. Therefore, the conclusion reached by the Chair is already quite comprehensive.

Secondly, regarding the Global Soil Partnership and the use of languages, I agree with the Russian Delegation. In the past, when discussing issues related to this, we already expressed China's opinion. Currently, once again, I would like to point out that in FAO's publications, language is not balanced.

The GSP is very important. Language is very important to disseminate FAO's knowledge and vision and can play an important role. We should all be on the same side. We can take concrete actions. Russia's proposal is very concrete. We can take steps and have very tangible measures or make really concrete proposals so we can dwell on these.

**Sr. Antonio CARRANZA BARONA (Ecuador)**

Queremos referirnos brevemente a dos temas. El primero con relación a la propuesta que ha hecho los Países Bajos en el apartado (b). Nosotros consideramos, que como ha sido enfatizado siempre en este Consejo, los informes del Consejo están centrados en las decisiones que toma. Es decir donde existe el consenso. Y este es un tema en el que claramente no hoy consenso. Y si no, nos tocaría agregar otra frase que diga que otros países consideraron, que no están de acuerdo, y consideraron que se debe presentar en el Comité. Es decir los informes del Consejo están centrados únicamente en las decisiones.

Por otro lado queremos, con respecto a la propuesta de Rusia, para mi delegación es fundamental el tema del multilingüismo y la respaldamos. Quizás para no entrar en el tema legal en cuanto a la jerarquía de la Alianza, se podría dejar la propuesta de Rusia en algo más general. Es decir asegurar la interpretación en las reuniones que tienen lugar en la FAO.

Y posteriormente cuando obviamente se discuta el siguiente programa de trabajo, podríamos insistir en el tema específico de la Alianza.

**Mr Pierfrancesco SACCO (Italy)**

Just a couple of points. The first one is to complement what some interventions have highlighted, in particular the intervention by the distinguished Chinese colleague about the usefulness of informal occasions to exchange views and to get better results together. My observation is that in modern legal orders what is not explicitly prohibited is normally allowed.

The second quick observation is unfortunately to transmit at this late time of the day a sense of sadness because I have heard a little bit legalistic – allow me to use this word – consideration about an intervention made by the Netherlands as a President of the Council of the European Union and, as everybody knows in this room, the European Union and its Member States, apart from being the first donor worldwide, is the staunchest supporter of FAO precisely in that fight against hunger and malnutrition that has been highlighted by some colleagues discussing the costs of the assessment.

**Mr Spydon ELLINAS (Cyprus)**

I want to echo what Italy just said and also to add that, when the Netherlands takes the floor, it takes it on behalf of the Presidency and actually on behalf of one of the Council Members belonging to the EU unless otherwise stated by themselves.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je ne voudrais pas prolonger trop longtemps la discussion parce que j'ai l'impression que nous arrivons au bout de ce processus. Je crois que sur ce point-là, l'un des messages clés que nous avons dans notre déclaration commune a été entendu, à savoir associer les Membres, et le Directeur général l'a dit hier, dans le processus. On souhaitait avancer un petit plus loin dans le type de consultation mais sans forcément être trop prescriptif sur la méthode, mais je crois que l'essentiel a été dit, et c'est là le principal.

En ce qui concerne les dernières propositions formulées par les Pays-Bas qui comme l'a indiqué Chypre exercent la présidence de l'Union européenne, je crois qu'effectivement on peut peut-être regarder s'il est nécessaire — et on peut éventuellement soutenir la demande de suppression concernant la prise de note sur les difficultés techniques —, et puis s'agissant de l'ajout d'un paragraphe, peut-être que comme l'a indiqué la Chine, il faut voir si la valeur ajoutée de ce paragraphe est là. Pour cela je m'en remettrai, Monsieur le Président, entre vos mains.

**Mr Khaled M.S.H. EL TAWHEEL (Egypt)**

First of all we support your initial proposal and we are concerned about the lengthy process we are following. Your proposal was supported by many. There was one substantial amendment to your proposal that received some support but was not supported by consensus. As we said before, Egypt strongly supports the Independent Evaluation as a tool that will lead to certain results. These results as we envisage it are to determine any areas that need improvement in technical capacity in the headquarters and decentralized offices.

Ergo we believe that this long drafting exercise we are undergoing now will not really lead to any positive effect on the outcome of this Evaluation. We would strongly support adopting your initial proposal with no changes.

**Mr Jón Erlingur JONASSON (Iceland)**

I am taking the floor as Iceland but having been involved in the discussion so far, and my position has been clear, I would like to say the following. I take the answer from the Deputy Director-General as acceptable for me. It was coming from the Secretariat having listened to the Members, so I listened to that.

But for me, this can never be and never was a legal issue. So I did not have to listen to any legal explanation on if I as a Member and I have full right as a member of the Council to be among those who ask for dialogue among ourselves or dialogue with the Secretariat.

Having said that, I can accept the summary made by the Independent Chair on this issue. I might say that probably we are in the situation that, if I understand right, the Director-General listened to voices in the Programme Committee and he decided to do it this way. So he is listening. So I also listened and I hope and I expect the Director-General is listening to the voices here today. He might decide to have an informal briefing. He may even decide, well, let us have the briefing. I decide it will be in January. I might have it before. So there are options. So he is listening and I am happy with that.

Then I have also the option I can invite myself to a briefing on the same issue and I can decide to invite Members who I am very interested to have dialogue with. It will prepare myself to follow the Programme Committee and the issue so that is also open. I will consider that of course as an option.

I have one more thing on the language issue coming from Russia. I think having gotten guidance from the Secretariat and the Chair earlier that my interventions would be better placed somewhere else on the agenda, so I wonder if as much as financial issues about the language could be taken up in the report of the Finance Committee. At least I do not see any difficulty that this Council should say that the issue was mentioned in Council and the Council encouraged the Finance Committee to take up the issue.

It is for the Conference to decide what we use our resources for and there is definitely a debate around what we use the resources for. Should it be for the language or should it be for this? If Conference decides that we would like to have translation and interpretation on the Global Soil Partnership Plenary Assembly, it is a decision of the Conference. But I would expect that the discussion would start in the Finance Committee. This is a substantive discussion but I understand and I throw this out as an idea then if the Council could somehow put the phrase around that it is for the Finance Committee to discuss the issue. From there it goes through.

So those were my final words on this issue.

**Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)**

We are at a dilemma. I think most Members will not be happy, including members of the EU, to have a separate sentence in the report saying some Members want this. That will show that the Council is divided and we do not want that. The Council should decide a decision unanimously.

Now in order not to have a sentence, we have to find a way to satisfy the EU and other Members, Australia. Let me explain. This assessment is done by the Secretariat. The Secretariat arranges for the methodology and the terms of reference. It does it by hiring consultants and the Deputy Director-General made that very clear.

The Programme Committee is briefed on the terms of reference. The Programme Committee does not consider the terms of reference. The members of the Programme Committee know very well all of the corporate evaluation conducted; they do not approve the terms of reference. The terms of reference are agreed, approved by the Director of Evaluation. The Programme Committee does not even see the inception report. The only thing they see is the final product.

At some stage where the methodology is prepared with the consultants, the Director-General will brief the Programme Committee.

Mr Chair, you could consider a way yourself of that before the Director-General briefs the Programme Committee. The Director-General may find it useful to have a dialogue with the Membership on this matter.

We do not tell the Director-General you must do it. We leave it to him. He may feel that the dialogue is unnecessary. This could be a compromise.

**Mr Vimlendra SHARAN (India)**

It is pretty late in the day and all I will be doing is reiterating certain views already expressed, but let me take this opportunity to just put on record that I think Iceland in its last intervention actually brought us very close to what could be a way out when he says the Director-General is listening and to leave it to the Director-General's good sense of listening and allow him to call for an informal seminar or any other mechanism through which he would like to interact with the membership at an appropriate time to deal with this issue.

I would think that that would be the appropriate way forward and also on the language issue, I appreciate fully what Russia has said and many others have supported. I think Iceland has rightly pointed out that this has a financial implication and the discussion is best started in the Finance Committee and perhaps from there it will take its route onwards.

I would urge that Ecuador's intervention also be kept in mind that Council decisions should not come with some members or a substantial number of members. That wording would not be, in my mind, be appropriate for a Council decision.

**Mr Zoltan KÁLMÁN (Hungary)**

Sorry for taking the floor at the late hour and I really do not want to prolong the discussion. I would like to make a short intervention on three points. First of all I would like to confirm that I fully align with what was said by the EU statement by the Netherlands and also by what was said by my fellow EU colleagues.

My second point is that we should agree. I think there is a consensus in this room that informal consultations are very useful. It was demonstrated several times in our own experience successfully, that informal consultations are very useful and beneficial for both parties, both for the membership because we feel that we are being involved and we feel that we can have our voices heard, and it is beneficial also for the Secretariat because they will understand better the situation. This is a really complex issue.

My third point is that it was very interesting to hear the intervention of the Distinguished Delegate of China and later on my neighbour from Iceland. These informal consultations could be – should not necessarily be driven and called by the Director-General himself, they could be informal consultations also initiated by the members.

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

As the previous speaker pointed out, we do not want to drag on this discussion. I would like to thank Mr Gagnon and Mr Tavares for the explanations on procedural issues and legal matters.

As regards the status of the Global Soil Partnership, maybe there is a bit of a gray area. Then, if we look at the rules of procedure that were agreed by the FAO's Member Nations, it is written "composed by FAO technical and administrative staff. These were indeed presented as an addendum to the report on the Committee on Agriculture and then went through the Council too. Those rules of procedure refer to Rule X in particular.

FAO itself is not a partner in the framework of the Global Soil Partnership (GSP) which appears to be logical if it is the Secretariat.

In respect of the report and whether this is to be discussed in the Council, perhaps there is a precedent. Yet, we think that it is something to discuss in the Council because there is Rule X of the Rules of Procedure of the GSP which says that the GSP shall report to the Committee on Agriculture and there

is also a recommendation about issues that affect policy matters. These recommendations can also be viewed by the Council.

In addition, FAO was mentioned in the recommendation of the plenary of the GSP, which took place on 27 May, that is to say last week. Funding is not a new issue. If we remember proposal 8 in the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) for 2016-17 that was adopted by the Conference last June, it was not amended in December 2015.

Specific funds were allocated. I am not going to give you the exact figures. You can refer to the relevant documents. However, specific amounts were allotted to provide interpretation and translation in the six languages during the GSP Plenary Assembly. Yet, this has not been done. I am sure that the Secretariat cannot do everything and I understand the workload. Nevertheless, we wanted to help the Secretariat by drawing its attention to this matter, because this is an issue we keep bringing up but we have not reached a solution yet, unfortunately.

What is happening? As far as I know, the report of the Plenary Assembly, is still not accessible on the website, but it will be available for the Committee on Agriculture in September 2016. That I can promise you.

Then in December or at the end of November 2016, there will be the 155<sup>th</sup> Session of the FAO Council. On its provisional agenda, there is an item that is the Report of the Committee on Agriculture. I can assure you that this issue will be raised again at the Council meeting in December 2016. The Secretariat is also about to prepare a new Programme of Work and Budget. We just wanted to provide early warning to the Secretariat about the fact that this issue is going to require attention.

It was meant to be a helpful comment for the Secretariat. We see no problem with mentioning this point on the report on this item, because it was discussed during the Joint Meeting. Then, I would like to hear those who wish to say something about this subject, expressing their views again. Maybe after my comments they would have a new opinion. I would also like to hear a reply from the Secretariat.

**Sr. Porfirio PESTANA DE BARROS (República Bolivariana de Venezuela)**

Para ser lo más breve posible dada la hora, sencillamente queremos expresar nuestro pleno apoyo a lo expresado en la última intervención de Ecuador.

**M. Carlos Alberto AMARAL (Angola)**

Nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition de la Russie. Peut-être que la question peut être étudiée par le Comité financier. En ce qui concerne la tenue d'une réunion informelle, nous en avons déjà parlé. Je pense que si le Directeur Général fait le point sur la situation et donne des informations, c'est une bonne occasion pour dialoguer et pour les Membres de poser toutes les questions qu'ils souhaitent.

**Mr Andrzej HALASEWICZ (Observer for Poland)**

I would like to support what has been said by the European Union and its Member States. For the sake of time, I will only refer to one issue and the proposal made by the Russian Federation. I am surprised to notice that our colleague, who is taking care of legality and for whom the formal aspect of our discussion is of the utmost importance, accepted this proposal so easily. As far as I am concerned, when I am looking very carefully at the Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees, I did not find any reflection on this issue.

Furthermore, as a member of the Programme Committee, I have a problem to recall the intensive debate about this issue. I could imagine quite easily that the language issue could be roused by the Russian Federation. Actually, our distinguished colleague is advocating this position at any occasion. From this point of view, I would like to strongly support what has been said by the Secretary General: any decision in this regard cannot be made by the Council. We fully agree to say that it is important to have a balance of languages. However, so far, the United Nations have adopted other official languages.

There are many other Nations and many other languages. They are not official languages. Fortunately, our experts had already been prepared to speak in foreign languages. Let me draw your attention to

one more aspect, the financial aspect. If we recognize a new official language, we will have to pay for it. Is it really what we want, in light of our current operational context and budget?

Thus, I strongly believe that this proposal should not be considered.

**Ms Maria Helena SEMEDO (Deputy-Director General, Coordinator for Natural Resources)**

We do not have a clear idea because we haven't done a budget yet. However, it is possible to say, based on the previous evaluations or kind of assessment, that it will not be less than USD 500,000. We would have to hire a consultant for one year and eleven months. We would have to pay some other expenditure, such as travel costs.

I would like to make one more comment. I am sure you would agree to say that the Director-General has been listening to what has been said by the Council, the Programme and the Finance Committees. He did accept to organize a meeting on gender issues, another point discussed in the Programme Committee. Beginning of 2017 would be fine for us, taking into consideration our agenda and the related high workload, in particular the technical committees to be held this year.

I believe that you would agree to say that the Director-General has been flexible, constructive, and listened carefully to you. This is why we hope that you would agree on this provisional schedule. If we want to carry out a high level assessment, and to produce quality and transparent results, it would not be reasonable to plan the meeting prior to this date.

**Sr. Nazareno Cruz MONTANI CAZABAT (Argentina)**

Vamos a ser muy breve porque es muy tarde, pero realmente estamos sorprendidos con algunas intervenciones en relación a multilingüismo. Sabemos que esta no es una cuestión que ha arrancado aquí, la cuestión de multilingüismo se debate en las Naciones Unidas desde hace mucho tiempo y, a este respecto, tenemos la resolución 5011 de 1995 de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas. Esta resolución fue impulsada por varios países en América Latina, China, Rusia y muchos países europeos, podríamos mencionar Francia, España, etc. y por esto que ciertos argumentos con respecto a las cuestiones relativas a cuales son los idiomas y las opciones de las Naciones Unidas nos parecen que están fuera de lugar en este contexto.

Queremos reafirmar que existe una resolución, existen lenguas oficiales de las Naciones Unidas, son las que son, y en este sentido deben respetarse las lenguas oficiales que tenemos en las Naciones Unidas. Comprendemos las dificultades que tienen los técnicos, comprendemos nuestras propias dificultades y nos parece que entrar en este debate relativo al multilingüismo que ha sido zanjado hace varios años en la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas, no es provechoso.

Queremos terminar aquí pero una vez más reafirmamos la importancia de lo que ha dicho Rusia. Esto tiene que ser abordado en este Consejo. Nos dedicamos horas y horas a intentar solucionar la cuadratura del círculo. Cuestiones abstractas de todo tipo de índole, y cuando tenemos algo muy concreto, algo muy claro. No vamos a tomar una decisión...bueno realmente pasamos muchas horas aquí simplemente haciendo ejercicios intelectuales al final.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je voulais simplement dire que cette question du multilinguisme est bien évidemment une question très importante. Le deuxième point, c'est que, il y a des résolutions qui sont prises au niveau des Nations Unies et il y a des principes qui s'appliquent à nous tous. Troisièmement, nous sommes bien conscients qu'il peut y avoir des conséquences et juridiques et financières. Je voulais simplement rappeler que cette question est évidemment importante pour la qualité de nos travaux.

**CHAIRPERSON**

As I said earlier, we need to be flexible but not for the sake of being flexible. We need to understand one another and we need to work as one, as a Council. And from all the discussions I have heard, I would like to read again my conclusions on this Agenda item, having incorporated some of your views to the extent which I think would form a consensus.

1. The Council endorsed the report of the Joint Meeting, and in relation to its discussion on the independent assessment of technical capacity of the Organization:
  - a) recalled the guidance from its 153<sup>rd</sup> Session for the Secretariat to undertake the assessment for consideration by the Conference in 2017;
  - b) appreciated the announcement made by the Director-General that a roadmap, including a draft of the methodology and the type of indicators to be used, would be presented to the Programme Committee at its meeting in November 2016, and in this regard Members expressed the desire to request the Secretariat to arrange an informal meeting ahead of the Programme Committee;
  - c) appreciated that an informal briefing to Members would be arranged in early 2017 prior to finalization of the report of the assessment;
  - d) noted the complexity in assessing the technical capacity of FAO, including in terms of definition, location and the context of the Organization's mandate and objectives; and
  - e) looked forward to reviewing the outcome of the assessment at its April 2017 session, prior to submission to the 40<sup>th</sup> session of the Conference.
2. The Council acknowledged the need to ensure regular translation and interpretation in all FAO languages at the Plenary Assemblies of the Global Soil Partnership and requested the Secretariat to take measures in this regard, for consideration by the competent Governing Bodies of FAO when preparing the PWB 2018-19.

**Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)**

It is just to come back to my earlier question that I asked earlier, just to clarify that it would come to the Programme Committee and then Council in the Autumn session and then it will come back to the Council in the spring session before it goes to Conference. I might have missed your words that you might have put in the summary.

**CHAIRPERSON**

No. It will come to Council in November. Yes, what you have said. You know, I was telling somebody that when you say spring, summer, I get confused because where I come from, we have got only two seasons. So, please, mention the months.

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

Could I benefit from a re-reading of letter B? I also would like to know how you are going to reflect your reply to Australia's question in a draft.

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

I would like to have clarity about the meaning of informal meeting in this context. Informal meeting of the Council, informal meeting of the Committee, or informal meeting of the Conference, it is not really clear. Perhaps you may wish to use another expression instead of informal meeting.

**CHAIRPERSON**

I think this is a generally used word here and it is understood by many. Maybe if you have got a better word, please.

**Mr Antonio Otávio SÁ RICARTE (Brazil)**

Normally when you have an informal meeting, it is referring to a Body. In this case, what you may wish to use and it would be more appropriate is an "informal briefing".

**Mr Ivan G. KONSTANTINOPOLSKIY (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)**

And I thank you for your efforts to quickly incorporate our proposal despite the disagreement.

And regarding point – could you please re-read point (b) of paragraph 1?

**CHAIRPERSON**

(b) appreciated the announcement made by the Director-General that a road map, including a draft of the methodology and the type of indicators to be used, would be presented to the Programme Committee at its meeting in November 2016. In this regard, Members expressed their desire to request the Secretariat to arrange an informal briefing ahead of the Programme Committee.

**Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)**

Just in relation to point (a), could I suggest then that you please include, where we talk about the recalling the guidance from the 153<sup>rd</sup> session, the word “independent” ahead of “assessment” to be consistent with the decision from the last Council meeting?

**CHAIRPERSON**

It reads: (a) recalled the guidance from its 153<sup>rd</sup> Session for the Secretariat to undertake an independent assessment for consideration by the Conference in 2017.

**Mr Andrzej HALASEWICZ (Observer for Poland)**

I would like to help our colleague from Brazil to have clarity about this informal meeting. So I suggest that it be “informal briefing for Members”.

**CHAIRPERSON**

We always take issues brought by the Members of the Council and the Members of the Council have already agreed to this. I can say it is decided.

**Item 6. Report of the 119<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee (16-20 May 2016)****Point 6. Rapport de la cent dix-neuvième session du Comité du Programme (16-20 mai 2016)****Tema 6. Informe del 119.º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa (16-20 de mayo de 2016)**  
(CL 154/3)**CHAIRPERSON**

We will now continue with Item 6, *Report of the 119<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee*. The document before Council is CL 154/3.

I invite Ambassador Claudio Rozenwig, Vice-Chairperson of the Programme Committee, to introduce the Report.

As you have noted the Chairperson of the Programme Committee, Ambassador Tomasi, has not been able to be here with us because he is not very well. We pass him our consideration and wish him a quick recovery.

**Sr. Claudio ROZENWIG (Vice-Presidente del Comité del Programa)**

Presidente, me imagino que va a ser breve desde el punto de vista de las discusiones sobre estos temas que se han sucedido durante todo el día. *I hope so*. Señor Presidente, miembros del consejo, es un honor para mí presentar este informe de las discusiones del 119.º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa, la cual tuve el placer de presidir en nombre del amigo y excelente colega, el embajador francés Serge Tomasi, que lamentablemente por problemas de salud no le ha sido posible presidir y que esperamos que rápidamente esté entre nosotros.

El comité trabajó en una forma armoniosa y constructiva a lo largo de la sesión con un gran espíritu de consenso, otorgando orientaciones efectivas al Secretariado en diversos temas relacionados con el planeamiento de programas y evaluaciones. En el marco de la revisión del Marco estratégico y de la preparación para el próximo plan de medio plazo, el comité realizó una revisión técnica de los *inputs* recibidos de las Conferencias Regionales del 2016. El comité enfatizó la necesidad de continuidad en la dirección estratégica de la Organización, tomó nota de las tendencias regionales y desafíos identificados y apoyó la importancia del alineamiento del Marco estratégico de la FAO con los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.

El comité también apoyó todas las iniciativas regionales para 2016-2017 como así también el trabajo interregional en cambio climático, nutrición y *bio-growth*. El comité manifestó también su satisfacción con la evaluación del trabajo de la FAO en recursos genéticos para la alimentación y la agricultura, tanto con sus conclusiones positivas como con la respuesta de la Administración.

El comité también hizo suya la hoja de ruta para la estrategia de la FAO en cambio climático y discutió así mismo el informe en temas transversales de género, nutrición y cambio climático. Específicamente en relación al tema género, hubo un consenso entre las diversas delegaciones sobre la relevancia de este tema. El comité apreció el comprensivo informe provisto y la información en el informe sobre la ejecución del programa 2014-2015. Hubo acuerdo, como dije, en la necesidad de prestar la debida atención al tema género en las evaluaciones futuras sobre los Objetivos Estratégicos.

El comité también solicitó una evaluación completa del trabajo de la FAO en género para ser sometida a la Conferencia de 2019. Y también hubo consenso en que se presentara la información sobre género a través de los correspondientes mecanismos de la FAO. Sobre este tema entonces debo decir que hubo un gran consenso sustantivo sobre la importancia de avanzar en el tema género en todos los órganos de la FAO.

Relativo al tema resistencia antimicrobianos, el comité apreció el progreso realizado por la FAO. Así mismo apoyó el Plan de Trabajo que se nos propuso sobre este tema y dio la bienvenida a las actividades del Secretariado relativas a la resistencia a los antimicrobianos dentro del Programa de trabajo y presupuesto.

El comité también manifestó su satisfacción con las donaciones, con aquellos donantes que ya han comprometido o realizado contribuciones voluntarias, y urgió a conseguir financiamiento para desarrollar actividades en este tema de resistencia antimicrobianas y también solicitó a los miembros y a otros *partners* a proveer recursos extrapresupuestarios para alcanzar los 10 millones de dólares en contribuciones voluntarias necesarios para la ejecución del Plan de acción.

Por último entonces, deseo reiterar la armonía y el gran consenso en los temas sustantivos que se alcanzó en el Comité del Programa. Muchas gracias Señor Presidente.

#### **Ms Sri SULIHANTI (Indonesia)**

I am honoured to provide this cross-regional statement stressing the crucial role of FAO's work on gender equality and women's empowerment, on behalf of the following Council Members: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, European Union, France, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, San Marino, Spain, South Africa, Turkey, United States of America, Zimbabwe. Altogether this is 25 Council Members. In addition, 58 observers support this statement.

We would like to highlight the importance of gender equality in FAO's work and appreciate highly that FAO is planning a seminar on gender, as announced yesterday morning by the Director-General. We consider that FAO's Policy on Gender Equality, endorsed in 2013, is a strong instrument which gives excellent guidance on how to reach FAO's gender equality goals and objectives, especially in the framework of the Agenda 2030. We consider this information of paramount importance for the upcoming discussions on the next Mid-Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget.

We appreciate the improved reporting on gender issues in the Programme Implementation Report. We are pleased to see that a lot of important work is being done by the organization as reflected in the Programme Implementation Report, which shows ongoing efforts to mainstream gender throughout the FAO's five Strategic Objectives and the Program of Work and Budget.

We welcome the recommendation made by the Program Committee to the Council to conduct an Evaluation of FAO's work on gender, within existing resources, to be submitted to the 41<sup>st</sup> Conference in 2019 and look forward to it.

We are very pleased to learn today that a report on gender will be produced for the informal seminar later this year. We anticipate that the report will update Members on progress achieved on the implementation of FAO's Policy on Gender Equality in its entirety, including its accountability

framework and further information on its minimum standards, in line with the decisions of the 2013 Conference and with the FAO Policy on Gender Equality.

As said by Director-General on 8 March 2012, achieving gender equality and empowering women is not only the right thing to do; it is also a crucial ingredient in the fight against poverty and hunger. We very much appreciate FAO's commitment to promoting gender equality and women's empowerment and that FAO's Management sees gender equality as central to FAO's mandate and essential to achieve the Agenda 2030.

Mr Chairperson, we look forward to working jointly with you to fully achieve gender equality by 2030, which, as pointed out by UN Secretary General, is fundamental for achieving a zero hunger world.

**Sr Antonio CARRANZA BARONA (Ecuador)**

El Ecuador realiza esta intervención en nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. Queremos agradecer al Embajador Claudio Rozenzwaig por la presentación del Informe así como por haber presidido eficientemente las sesiones del Comité, en ausencia del Embajador Serge Tomasi, a quien deseamos una pronta recuperación.

El Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe respalda las recomendaciones del Informe del Comité y quiere realizar los siguientes comentarios.

En cuanto a la "Revisión del Marco Estratégico y el Plan a Plazo Medio 2018-2021: prioridades regionales", queremos ante todo reiterar el apoyo que la Conferencia Regional de América Latina y el Caribe dio a la continuidad en la orientación estratégica de la FAO y el reconocimiento de la alineación existente entre los ODS y los objetivos estratégicos contenidos en el Marco Estratégico de la FAO.

Respaldamos la identificación de las últimas novedades mundiales, entre ellas: el reto que significa para los países la implementación de la Agenda 2030 y rol de la FAO en apoyo a dicha implementación; el Acuerdo de París resultado de la COP21; la Segunda Conferencia Internacional de la Nutrición y la Década de Acción para la Nutrición 2016-2025; y, como se menciona en el Informe del Comité del Programa, también la III Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre vivienda y el desarrollo urbano sostenible, que se realizará en Ecuador, en octubre del año en curso, por las implicaciones que los resultados de esta Conferencia tendrán en temas como la urbanización, el desarrollo rural, la migración, la agricultura y la seguridad alimentaria.

Apoyamos el que se haya incluido en el documento de revisión del Marco Estratégico y del Plan a Plazo Medio las tendencias y los desafíos regionales identificados por las Conferencias Regionales. Respaldamos la importancia de un mayor trabajo de la FAO en temas como la migración por las implicaciones que tiene para el sector rural, la agricultura y la seguridad alimentaria. Éste, y los otros desafíos identificados en el documento, además del cambio climático y la nutrición, ya incorporados como temas transversales, y la implementación de la Agenda 2030 son los temas de fondo en los que queremos que la Organización se centre y que nosotros, los Representantes Permanentes, prestemos mayor atención y hagamos el seguimiento adecuado.

Con relación a la Evaluación de la labor de la FAO en materia de recursos genéticos para la alimentación y la agricultura, queremos resaltar que este es un tema clave para la FAO y apreciamos que la Administración haya acogido las recomendaciones de la evaluación, entre ellas la necesidad de desarrollar las capacidades técnicas de las oficinas descentralizadas, ya que este es un factor indispensable para apoyar adecuadamente a los países en la conservación *in situ* de los recursos genéticos.

En cuanto a las cuestiones de género como el tema transversal, queremos expresar nuestra complacencia por la detallada información y los significativos avances de la FAO en este tema, recogidos en el Informe de Implementación del Programa 2014-2015. Para la región de América Latina y el Caribe la igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de la mujer es fundamental y buscamos que ese enfoque se incorpore en todos los programas y proyectos relacionados con los Objetivos

Estratégicos de la Organización, y nos complace que esto se vea bien reflejado en el Informe de Implementación del Programa.

La FAO ha apoyado a los países de la región tanto con proyectos y programas que abordan las cuestiones de género cuanto en el trabajo que lleva adelante en esta materia la Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños (CELAC). Como ya lo expresó la Conferencia Regional, queremos reiterar nuestro reconocimiento a la FAO por el apoyo brindado en este ámbito.

La FAO ha conseguido resultados significativos en materia de género en el bienio 2014 y 2015 y alentamos a continuar trabajando en esa dirección.

Finalmente, con relación al trabajo de la FAO sobre la resistencia a los antimicrobianos, el GRULAC da la bienvenida al Plan de Acción elaborado por la Secretaría para este tema y resaltamos la necesidad de movilizar recursos extrapresupuestarios para la ejecución de dicho Plan.

**Mme Ségolène HALLEY DES FONTAINES (France)**

Je vous remercie tout d'abord pour les mots que vous avez eus à l'intention de l'ambassadeur Serge Tomasi. Je remercie également Claudio Rozencwaig, le Président du Comité financier, ainsi que l'Équateur, et je saisis l'opportunité pour remercier tous ceux qui ont exprimé ses mots et ses pensées pour l'ambassadeur. Je suis certaine qu'il y sera très sensible. Je souhaite également saluer le travail fructueux effectué par le Comité du programme sous la houlette de son président au cours de cette session, l'ambassadeur Rozencwaig, et je vous prie de bien vouloir donner la parole au Pays-Bas pour une déclaration commune de l'Union européenne.

**Ms Gerda VERBURG (Observer for Netherlands)**

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States. The candidate countries to the EU, Albania, Montenegro, as well as Turkey and San Marino align themselves with this statement.

We commend the work of the Programme Committee at its 119<sup>th</sup> Session and welcome its conclusions.

We welcome the review of FAO's Strategic Framework and preparation of the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 – Regional Priorities as an important element in the production of the MTP. The trends and challenges identified by the Regional Conferences are well reflected and can be used for revision of the outcomes, outputs and indicators in relation to the Strategic Objectives. In this context, enhancing sustainability, in line with the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement, should be fully taken into account.

We note the work in progress on FAO's roadmap on climate change. The conceptual framework and overarching outcomes have now been proposed. But we would like to see a more concrete strategy on how FAO will support countries as they implement the deliverables of the Paris Agreement in the fields of agriculture, food and other areas related to FAO's mandate, including through initiatives under the Lima-Paris Action Agenda. In this respect, we expect the roadmap to clearly outline how FAO will capitalise on its technical expertise in order to disseminate knowledge on the links between climate change, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and food security.

We also look forward to a report that incorporates the contribution of FAO's technical committees to the Climate Strategy and Plan of Action. That contribution should come as a response to well formulated guiding questions to the Committees, covering all aspects, from adaptation to mitigation of climate change.

We would again stress the importance of cross-cutting themes, including nutrition, climate change, gender and governance. Therefore we look forward to receiving appropriate reports and evaluations on these aspects of FAO's performance. Taking into account the Programme Committee's request for an evaluation of FAO work on gender which will be considered by the Conference in 2019, we would ask the Secretariat to present a progress report on FAO's Gender Strategy to the 121<sup>st</sup> Session of the Programme Committee in May 2017, including how it is mainstreamed in all its Strategic Objectives.

We note the update on FAO's work on Antimicrobial Resistance and encourage FAO to strengthen its result-oriented cooperation with other Agencies. We look forward to a full-fledged Action Plan in the

next PWB with a further allocation, clearly defined resources from FAO's regular budget as well as from voluntary and in-kind contributions, and with well-defined objectives, outputs and outcomes, also taking into account the UN General Assembly Resolution on AMR.

With these remarks, requests and recommendations, we support the approval of the Programme Committee's report.

**M. Marc Mankoussou (Congo)**

Permettez-moi de souhaiter une prompte guérison à Son Excellence Monsieur Serge Tomasi, Ambassadeur de France auprès de la FAO et Président du Comité du Programme.

La République du Congo intervient au nom du Groupe Afrique.

Le Groupe Afrique félicite le Président de la 119<sup>ème</sup> session du Comité de Programme, Ambassadeur Claudio Rozencwaig, pour avoir conduit de main de maître cette session, ainsi que pour la bonne présentation de son rapport. Il félicite également les membres du Comité du Programme pour la qualité des avis techniques et des conclusions soumises à l'attention du Conseil.

Le Groupe se réjouit du fait que le Comité ait examiné à sa session plusieurs questions relatives à la planification des programmes et à l'évaluation, qui constituent le substrat fondamental pour les travaux futurs de l'Organisation. Il approuve les conclusions du rapport.

Dans le cadre des questions de planification, le Groupe Afrique note que le Comité a débattu de quatre questions importantes.

Du "Cadre stratégique de la FAO et élaboration du Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021- Priorités régionales". Le Groupe Afrique prend note de l'examen des évolutions mondiales, notamment le Programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030 et le Programme d'action d'Addis-Abeba pour sa mise en œuvre, l'Accord de Paris sur le Changement climatique, la deuxième Conférence internationale sur la Nutrition et le Sommet mondial sur l'action humanitaire, ainsi que la troisième Conférence mondiale des Nations Unies sur la réduction des risques de catastrophe et la troisième Conférence des Nations Unies sur le logement et le développement urbain durable. Le Groupe Afrique exprime le souhait de voir toutes ces questions traitées dans les travaux futurs de l'Organisation.

Le Groupe Afrique est satisfait du fait que les tendances et les enjeux régionaux identifiés pendant les Conférences régionales aient fait l'objet d'un examen approfondi, notamment sur des thèmes fondamentaux pour la région Afrique comme l'emploi des jeunes, l'urbanisation, la migration des populations, l'innovation technologique, la résilience et le financement suffisant au développement ainsi que les priorités régionales exprimées par les Conférences. Le Groupe Afrique appuie la recommandation du Comité relative à l'intégration des initiatives régionales pour la période 2016-2017 et des activités interrégionales relatives au changement climatique, à la nutrition et à la croissance bleue dans le Cadre stratégique de la FAO, ainsi que leur prise en compte dans l'élaboration du Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021.

Le Groupe Afrique se félicite de l'alignement des objectifs stratégiques de la FAO sur les objectifs de développement durable (ODD). Il souligne la nécessité d'établir des liens entre les indicateurs des ODD et le cadre de résultats du Plan à moyen terme (PMT) 2018-2021. Le Groupe Afrique demande à l'Organisation de formuler des conseils sur les politiques à l'intention des Membres et de renforcer leurs capacités en s'appuyant sur le travail normatif de la FAO. Il apprécie la méthode participative entreprise dans l'élaboration et l'examen du projet de Plan à moyen terme (PMT) 2018-2021, notamment en prenant en compte les conclusions des Comités de l'agriculture, des pêches, des forêts et des produits.

De la "Stratégie de la FAO en ce qui concerne les activités de l'Organisation relatives au changement climatique". Tout en mettant en avant ses avantages comparatifs, le Groupe Afrique invite la FAO à jouer un rôle plus important pour aider les Membres à s'adapter et à atténuer l'impact du changement climatique. Il prend note du cadre conceptuel et des trois résultats globaux proposés pour l'élaboration de la stratégie et appuie la proposition du Comité relative à la feuille de route établie. Il souscrit aux recommandations du Comité de prendre en compte les réalités nationales et locales dans la mise en œuvre de la stratégie et de son plan d'action, ainsi que le rôle des bureaux décentralisés. Le Groupe

Afrique attend d'examiner la stratégie et son plan d'action dans le cadre de mécanismes existants au sein de l'Organisation.

Concernant "la parité hommes-femmes, le Groupe Afrique note les avancées accomplies par l'Organisation sur cette question, dans le cadre que nous avons examiné dans le rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2014-2015. Il appuie les recommandations du Comité de prendre en compte la parité hommes-femmes dans l'ensemble des activités de la FAO et qu'il soit fait rapport à ce sujet par le biais de mécanismes existant au sein de l'Organisation. Le Groupe Afrique est favorable à l'évaluation des activités de la FAO en matière de parité hommes-femmes, que la Conférence examinera en 2019.

En ce qui concerne les "activités de la FAO dans le domaine de la résistance aux antimicrobiens" Le Groupe Afrique se félicite des progrès accomplis par l'Organisation dans les activités sur cette question et demande qu'elle continue à bénéficier de l'attention souhaitée. Nous apprécions l'attention que le Secrétariat a apportée aux activités liées à la résistance aux antimicrobiens dans le cadre du Programme de travail et budget, ainsi que des ressources extrabudgétaires promises et mises à disposition jusqu'à présent par les partenaires. Le Groupe Afrique se félicite également de la collaboration qui existe entre la FAO, l'Organisation mondiale de la santé (OMS) et l'Organisation mondiale de santé animale (OIE).

Le Groupe approuve le plan d'action quinquennal de la FAO, les domaines prioritaires ainsi définis par l'Organisation et les mécanismes de mise en œuvre envisagés par les équipes chargées des programmes stratégiques. Il appuie la proposition du Comité d'augmenter le financement des activités portant sur la résistance aux antimicrobiens, tout en exhortant les Membres de la FAO et d'autres donateurs potentiels à fournir des ressources extrabudgétaires supplémentaires, afin de réunir les 10 millions d'USD de contributions volontaires nécessaires à la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action.

Concernant les évaluations, le Groupe Afrique note que le Comité a examiné, notamment, l'Évaluation de la Contribution de la FAO à la conservation et à l'utilisation durable des ressources génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, le Groupe Afrique appuie les conclusions et les recommandations du Comité et note que la Direction a pris des mesures importantes pour donner suite aux recommandations formulées par l'évaluation. Le Groupe Afrique souscrit aux recommandations du Comité sur l'importance de renforcer les capacités dans les bureaux décentralisés et d'entretenir une collaboration étroite entre la FAO et les instances du Traité international sur les ressources phyto-génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture. Connaissant la complexité de la conservation de la biodiversité, nous pensons que cette question nécessite la participation de toutes les parties prenantes. Il serait donc important de trouver des formes novatrices de partenariats et de nouer une collaboration étroite avec d'autres parties prenantes dans ce domaine en vue de mobiliser plus de ressources.

En ce qui concerne le Rapport de suivi sur l'évaluation des bureaux régional et sous-régional de la FAO pour l'Asie et le Pacifique et le Rapport d'évaluation du Bureau régional et des bureaux sous-régionaux de la FAO pour l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes", le Groupe Afrique souscrit aux recommandations formulées par le Comité. Il appuie la demande du Comité de fournir davantage d'informations sur l'impact de la mise en œuvre des recommandations acceptées et des informations actualisées sur les recommandations rejetées. Il appuie également la recommandation du Comité qui encourage l'Organisation à continuer à prêter attention aux défis que doivent relever les pays insulaires du Pacifique et souligne l'importance de sa collaboration avec les organisations régionales de l'Asie et du Pacifique.

S'agissant du Rapport de suivi sur l'évaluation du rôle de la FAO à l'appui de la production végétale, le Groupe Afrique appuie les conclusions du Comité. Il est favorable à la mise en place d'une plateforme neutre permanente pour débattre de thèmes tels que l'agro-écologie et les biotechnologies.

Monsieur le Président, à la suite de ces commentaires, le Groupe Afrique adopte le Rapport de la 119<sup>ème</sup> session du Comité de Programme.

#### **CHAIRPERSON**

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. You have worked very hard and I hope we will continue tomorrow. This brings us to the end of this meeting. The Council will resume its work tomorrow morning at 9:30 sharp with Item 6 and we will continue with the list as it appears now on the screen.

*The meeting rose at 21:02 hours*  
*La séance est levée à 21 h 02*  
*Se levanta la sesión a las 21.02*