



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

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE CONFERENCIA

Forty-first Session - Quarante et unième session - 41.º período de sesiones

**Rome, 22-29 June 2019
VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II
OF THE CONFERENCE**

**Rome, 22-29 juin 2019
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES DE LA COMMISSION II
DE LA CONFÉRENCE**

**Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019
ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISIÓN II
DE LA CONFERENCIA**

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE
CONFERENCIA

Forty-first Session - Quarante et unième session - 41.º período de sesiones

**Rome, 22-29 June 2019
VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II
OF THE CONFERENCE**

**Rome, 22-29 juin 2019
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES DE LA COMMISSION II
DE LA CONFÉRENCE**

**Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019
ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISIÓN II
DE LA CONFERENCIA**

Table of Contents – Table des matières – Índice

FIRST MEETING OF COMMISSION II PREMIÈRE SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II PRIMERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II (24 June 2019)

	Page
Item 22. Programme Implementation Report 2016-17	
Point 22. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2016–2017	
Tema 22. Informe sobre la ejecución del programa en 2016-17	3
<i>(C 2019/8; C 2019/8 WA6 ; C 2019/8 WA7 ; C 2019/LIM/2)</i>	

SECOND MEETING OF COMMISSION II DEUXIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II SEGUNDA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II (24 June 2019)

	Page
Item 23. Programme Evaluation Report 2019	
Point 23. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2019	
Tema 23. Informe sobre la evaluación del programa en 2019	17
<i>(C 2019/4)</i>	
Item 24. Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 (Draft Resolution on budget level)	
Point 24. Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021 et Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget)	
Tema 24. Plan a plazo medio para 2018-2021 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2020-2021 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto)	31
<i>(C 2019/3; Information Note 1; C 2019/3-WA11; C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.)</i>	

THIRD MEETING OF COMMISSION II TROISIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II TERCERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II (25 June 2019)

	Page
Item 24. Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 (Draft Resolution on budget level) (continued)	
Point 24. Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021 et Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget) (suite)	
Tema 24. Plan a plazo medio para 2018-2021 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2020-2021 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto) (continuación)	46
<i>(C 2019/3; Information Note 1; C 2019/3-WA11; C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.1)</i>	

**FOURTH MEETING OF COMMISSION II
QUATRIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II
CUARTA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II
(25 June 2019)**

Adoption of Report
Adoption du Rapport
Aprobación del Informe
(*C 2019/II/REP*)

Page

64

CONFERENCE CONFERENCE CONFERENCIA

Forty-first Session Quarante et unième session 41.º período de sesiones
Rome, 22-29 June 2019 Rome, 22-29 juin 2019 Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019
FIRST MEETING OF COMMISSION II PREMIÈRE SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II PRIMERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II
24 June 2019

The First Meeting was opened at 11:24 hours
Mr Bommakanti Rajender,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La première séance est ouverte à 11 h 24
sous la présidence de M. Bommakanti Rajender,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la primera reunión a las 11:24
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Bommakanti Rajender,
Presidente de la Comisión II

Item 22. Programme Implementation Report 2016-17
Point 22. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2016-2017
Tema 22. Informe sobre la ejecución del programa en 2016-17
(C 2019/8; C 2019/8 WA6; C 2019/8 WA7; C 2019/LIM/2)

CHAIRPERSON

I am honored to have been elected as Chairperson of Commission II and very much appreciate the trust you have placed in me to achieve consensus in our discussions. We have an important task ahead of us. I also take this opportunity to record our heartiest congratulations to the newly elected Director-General of FAO, Dr Qu Dongyu, and wish him all the success in his new assignment. I am sure he will take FAO to new heights.

I also welcome two Vice-Chairpersons of Commission II elected by the Conference with the first Report of the General Committee: Mr Inge Nordang of Norway and Ms Jeanne Dambendzet of Congo.

I also welcome the Deputy Directors-General on the podium, Mr Laurent Thomas, Deputy Director-General Operations, Mr Dan Gustafson, Deputy Director-General Programmes, and Ms Maria Helena Semedo, Deputy Director-General Natural Resources.

In our work, we will also be supported by the Secretariat of Commission II, Mr David McSherry and Mr Ahmed Jilani. Together with the team of the Secretariat, we will do our utmost to ensure the smooth running of the work of the Commission. Upon consultation with various Regional Groups, I have received the following nomination for the Drafting Committee:

The Chairperson: Mr Thomas Duffy (United States of America).

The Members: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Costa Rica, Finland, Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sudan, and the United States of America.

May I take it that the Commission agrees on the proposed Membership and Chairperson of the Drafting Committee?

It is so decided.

The timing of the meeting of the Drafting Committee will be announced later. In order to make the best use of the time at our disposal, may I appeal to you to keep your interventions as brief and focused as possible and not to rush your interventions.

The quality of interpretation will be improved if interventions are made at a reasonable pace. Furthermore, I would like to remind you that to ensure a great interpretation of statements, timely production of verbatim records and re-posting on the Conference website, delegations are kindly requested to send the notes to the Secretariat in electronic form or give hard copies to the messengers.

Following the discussions of each of the Agenda items, I will draw conclusions to facilitate the drafting of the Report. Finally, I may remind you that in the interest of good time management, it is important that we start each meeting on time. Today we started late because of the lack of quorum but now we have a sufficient number. Please ensure that you are here in the Red Room at the times indicated in the order of the day.

We will start with the Item 22, *Programme Implementation Report 2016-17*. Please ensure that you have document C 2019/8 in front of you. I now invite Ms Beth Crawford, Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management to introduce the item.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

The Programme Implementation Report (PIR) is FAO's accountability document. It informs the Membership about the work carried out by the Organization over the previous biennium for all sources of funds.

It is retrospective in nature, reporting on what the Organization has achieved in terms of programmatic results and financial performance compared to the targets set out in the Programme of Work and Budget 2016-17 (PWB). The achievements and lessons learned are contained in the main PIR

document C 2019/8 and two web annexes. We have also published a short brochure to convey the main results which includes overviews at Strategic Objective outcome and output levels and is available at the document desk.

Today, I will focus briefly on the salient points of the PIR 2016-17. This is the second PIR under the reviewed Strategic Framework and Medium Term Plan 2014-17. It presents results against a results chain which comprises the five Strategic Objectives, the 17 Outcomes, which are the changes in capacities needed at country level and globally to achieve these objectives, and the 48 Outputs which are what FAO delivers with its results, measured by indicators and targets.

The PIR also includes enabling functions for improved corporate performance which are measured by Key Performance Indicators. This includes Objective 6 on technical quality, statistics and the cross-cutting themes of gender, governance, nutrition and climate change as well as the four functional Objectives and three special chapters that provide the internal enabling environment for FAO's work.

The PIR document outlines major policy developments and FAO's role in keeping hunger, food security and malnutrition at the forefront. Our work on emerging threats and opportunities is also highlighted in our contributions to Fall Armyworm, Antimicrobial Resistance, Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS), Biotechnology and Agroecology.

Throughout the document, we demonstrate how the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is a unifying element for FAO's work which drives action in countries and underlies our measurement of progress. FAO is also the custodian Agency for 21 SDG Indicators and a contributing Agency for an additional four.

Furthermore, this PIR uses a more robust target-setting, monitoring and reporting methodology for results at outcome and output level with roles and responsibilities more clearly laid out and country offices more significantly involved in the process from early stages.

Let me outline the measurement of results at the three levels of Strategic Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs.

The 2016-17 PIR is the first PIR that reports on trends and progress at the level of the Strategic Objectives. This was done by aligning the FAO Results Framework to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by identifying and exclusively using the SDG indicators that relate to each FAO Strategic Objective.

Outcomes reflect changes at country level and/or in the global enabling environment needed to foster the achievement of the Strategic Objectives. Movement in Outcome indicator values are the results of policies and programmes implemented by all key stakeholders; FAO, Member States and development partners. In 2016-17, 82 percent of the measured Outcome indicators show progress with targets met.

The Outputs are FAO's contributions in terms of processes, products and services to the Outcomes. That is what FAO is accountable to deliver. The Output Indicators measure the delivery of results at country, regional or global level. In 2016-17, FAO reached 82 percent of the Output targets, showing FAO delivered assistance to Members as committed in the PWB.

In addition to the reporting at the various levels of the results chain, the PIR presents integrated reporting on gender, governance, climate change and nutrition as cross-cutting themes. All nine measurable Key Performance Indicators under Objective 6 were achieved, showing the progress in creating an enabling environment for improved performance. This is done through the provision of necessary tools, standards, guidelines and training of staff and partners implementing the Strategic Programmes.

Throughout the PIR document, we have identified the key programmatic and operational lessons learned in delivering the Programme of Work. Key lessons include the importance of cross-sectoral and multi-sectoral dialogues and approaches which are instrumental to addressing the 2030 Agenda. This includes broadening partnerships, widening the range of stakeholders with which we collaborate and further strengthening collaboration across programmes and offices within the Organization.

We have also seen how improving the engagement of country offices in the planning stages provides better information on needs for FAO assistance and ensures that the required support and resources are properly foreseen. Additional lessons learned are included across the document.

In the final section of the document, the PIR shows how FAO has benefitted from improved means of delivery resulting from the transformational changes. We have met 81 percent of the targets which measure performance in the functional Objectives and special chapters.

FAO's overall expenditure for 2016-17 was USD 2.6 billion with extrabudgetary expenditure at USD 1.6 billion or 4 percent higher than in 2014-15.

Resources mobilized during the biennium for ongoing and future work increased by 16 percent to USD 2.1 billion, of which 79 percent are for country, sub-regional and regional projects.

The Organization also achieved USD 37 million in recurrent efficiency savings during the 2016-17 biennium.

This concludes my introduction of the Programme Implementation Report for 2016-17 which is for consideration and endorsement by the Conference.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

Afghanistan is making this statement on behalf of the Near East Group and limits its intervention to the following six points.

Point number one: The 82 percent of rigorous target-setting fully achieved is indeed commendable and is similar to the one achieved in 2014-15.

Point number two: All the five Strategic Objectives have performed well in terms of Outputs produced, especially Strategic Objective 2 and 5. With respect to Outcomes, performance is shown as optimal for Strategic Objective 5 and Strategic Objective 3. This is not the case with respect to Strategic Objective 1 and 2.

Point number three: Objective 6 which complements qualitatively the other five Strategic Objectives, has performed very well, both in 2016-17 and 2014-15.

Point number four: USD 2.1 billion extrabudgetary funds raised in 2016-17 is 16 percent higher than that of 2014-15. This is indeed a very good sign.

Point number five: The under-recovered administrative and operational costs amounted to USD 18.4 million in 2016-17 which is a 10 percent increase over 2014-15. Subsidizing administrative and operational costs from the Regular Programme budget is not sustainable. This needs to be corrected and we are glad that the Secretariat is trying to resolve this issue.

Final point, number six: On 31 December 2017, the female staff at grade D1 and above was 26 percent compared with 22 percent for the same date in 2015. Female professionals reached 43 percent of total professional staff compared with 20 percent in 2014-15. So some progress has been made but equality still remains an objective.

With these observations, the Near East Group endorses PIR 2016-17.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States.

We welcome the Programme Implementation Report that shows that FAO delivered 82 percent of its planned Outputs and Outcome indicators in the 2016-17 biennium. Nonetheless, we urge the new Director-General to consider FAO work in the light of evidence that the world is not on track to achieve the food security and nutrition targets of the Agenda 2030.

As highlighted by the State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World (SOFI) Report, global hunger and food insecurity driven by conflict, climate change and protracted crises have recently worsened. We encourage the new Director-General to review how FAO, in collaboration with all other relevant

stakeholders, can better contribute to Zero Hunger (SDG 2) helping to eliminate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition.

As custodian or contributing Agency for 25 SDG indicators, it is particularly important that FAO support countries in data collection and monitoring and use data gathered to advocate globally for greater progress on the SDGs.

We recognize FAO's work in developing the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), an important tool for monitoring progress on SDG indicator 2.1. We note that national statistics agencies will need capacity building support to collect and analyze data. We reiterate the Council's request that this be prioritized by FAO. We also encourage FAO to use its analysis based on the data gathered to advocate for national evidence-based and impact-gathering policies aimed at achieving Zero Hunger and to support Members in policy implementation.

We note with concern that the Output indicator targets for Output 4.1.1 on international standards for food safety and quality and plant health was only partially achieved. In this regard, we therefore reiterate our request that FAO provide, under the PWB 2020-21, additional funding from its core budget for the WHO/FAO Scientific Advice Programme and for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

We encourage FAO to strengthen its work on the mainstreaming of climate, biodiversity and gender. We also support stronger Rome-based Agency (RBA) collaboration and joint programming in strategic partnership with other relevant stakeholders including the private sector.

Looking ahead, we expect FAO to strengthen its management building on lessons learned. We note that the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) identified room for improvement and that an evaluation of the FAO's Strategic Results Framework is underway. We request that this evaluation and management's response thereto be presented to the next Council Session.

Lastly, we wish to acknowledge that the positive results so far could not have been achieved without the dedicated work of all people working in FAO, both staff and consultants.

With these remarks, we endorse the Programme Implementation Report.

Sr. Benito JIMÉNEZ SAUMA (México)

Voy a ser bastante breve en aras de tiempo. Nos complace que el cumplimiento de los objetivos programados en su generalidad en el informe vaya bien. No obstante eso, se puede notar que hay margen para mejorar. Apoyamos la armonización del marco de resultados de la FAO con los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible realizado en el Informe sobre la Ejecución del Programa 2016-17.

A la luz del aumento del hambre en el mundo, solicitamos a la FAO que redoble sus esfuerzos para que se pueda alcanzar el Objetivo de Desarrollo Sostenible de Hambre Cero. La FAO podría aprovechar de las lecciones aprendidas, incrementar su eficiencia, colaborar tanto en las sedes como en el terreno con otros organismos tanto a nivel global como regional. Además la FAO podría mantener alta la visibilidad política sobre el tema del hambre y de la malnutrición. También invitamos a la nueva administración a reforzar las acciones para eliminar el hambre.

Apoyamos las acciones de descentralización llevadas a cabo por la FAO, además del reforzamiento de las actividades de estadística, monitoreo y difusión de la información pertinente respecto al tema del hambre y de la malnutrición. Agradecemos también la información proporcionada respecto a la utilización del saldo del bienio anterior (2016-2017), sobre la transferencia de 3.9 millones de dólares al Fondo especial para actividades de financiación al desarrollo.

Por último, viendo hacia el futuro, respaldamos que, en la ejecución de programas, se dé mayor énfasis a la cuestión de diversidad biológica, a los trabajos del Codex Alimentarius y a la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria. Con estos comentarios, apoyamos el Informe sobre la ejecución del programa 2016-17.

Mr Anton MINAEV (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)

We welcome the 82 percent achievement of the planned results and practical implementation of FAO's concept of working as one and strengthening of FAO's actions. We positively note FAO's efforts focusing on the SDGs and the provisions in line with the Climate Change Agenda.

We support the Organization's work on balanced nutrition. I would like to express our positive view of the improvements in the trust fund and the partnership programmes as well as the fact that the FAO Secretariat has managed to mobilize more than USD 2 billion in voluntary funds.

We call upon FAO management to continue its work to ensure maximum effective use of its financial resources. At the same time, I would like to underscore that economic limitations should not be a pretext for limiting the use of languages in FAO or their arbitrary use within FAO settings. I also agree with the conclusions of the 159th Session of the Council for the need to ensure sustainable financing for the regulatory standard-setting work of FAO, including as part of the Codex Alimentarius, WHO/FAO work and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

We underscore in a positive light the work of FAO with non-state actors and believe that FAO should continue to increase its cooperation with academia and the business world. We support the work of FAO to increase sustainability and resilience in the light of crisis situations. This work is undertaken as part of Strategic Objective 5. At the same time, we express concern in connection with document C 2019/8 and the contents of Paragraph 197 (h) to the effect that the FAO Framework to support peace in the context of the Agenda 2030 is to become the basis of the work of FAO against the backdrop of the UN Secretary-General's efforts aimed at conflict prevention, peacebuilding work and overcoming such situations to promote development.

As far as we know, this framework was not agreed by FAO Member States in the course of the 160th Session of the Council. We did not receive, unfortunately, clear responses from the Governing Bodies that called upon the FAO Secretariat to prepare that document and act upon it. Nor did we hear clear information about the sources of financing for such work. In this connection, I would call upon the FAO Secretariat, in the course of its work *inter alia* as part of Strategic Objective 5 to be guided first and foremost by the intergovernmental documents and carefully take into account and heed the positions of Member States as indicated in the overall FAO Programme of Work.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

I would like to thank the Secretariat for the Programme Implementation Review. It is a useful initiative and a good way of getting an overview of the achievements of the Organization in a digestible form for a wider audience which is particularly important in light of the comments made by the Director-General Elect this morning about what he referred to as vitamin M, for money. These sorts of documents are a good initiative in that regard.

We endorse the comments of a number of other colleagues highlighting the importance of the sustainable funding for standard-setting work. I have a more detailed comment about that but I will save that for Agenda Item 24 on the Programme of Work and Budget.

I wish to mention a couple of things from the Report this morning, as well as the discussion that the Council had on this issue. The first thing is to appreciate and recognize the good work that the Secretariat is doing around improving the programme delivery and governance.

Through the Finance Committee, in particular, we have seen a lot of discussion and work on internal controls both within headquarters and in the regions. I think that was referred to in the MOPAN Review as well. It is referred to here in the papers but, in front of a wider audience, I just wanted to recognize that work and also to say I think it is a continuing effort and as management said, it is an ongoing effort, to continually improve the operations of the Organization and the programme delivery. I wanted to put that on the record.

I also wanted to briefly comment on the reference to the carry-over of the unspent balances from the 2016-17 biennium. Again, I am not sure if we should deal with that here or in the Programme of Work and Budget, Agenda Item 24. But I will comment here and we can either talk about it here or during

the discussion of the other item. As other delegates may remember, the unspent balance is a product of the biennium. The way the small amount of money that is left over at the end and the way that we had that discussion in 2017 was, perhaps we could have done it in a better way. A lot of people at the time said that it excessively politicized a small funding discussion when there were really much bigger funding issues at stake. I know in November and December 2017, the Governing Bodies requested to see a proposal for a more systematic handling of the unspent balance. A more regular, standardized way of doing that which creates more consensus-driven discussion in the Governing Bodies. I would be interested, either here or in Agenda Item 24, to hear more about what process we might use in the future to deal with the unspent balance.

Mr Don SYME (New Zealand)

Thank you to the FAO Secretariat for presenting this Programme Implementation Report.

New Zealand welcomes FAO's monitoring and evaluation processes. We consider that regular evaluations provide important accountability and transparency to the Members and supports continual FAO improvement and effectiveness of delivery of its Outcomes across the range of the Strategic Objectives.

Recognizing the difficulty in attributing work to Outcomes, it is important to continue to strive for improved data and attribution of Outputs to Outcomes in order to assess the effectiveness of FAO's work on the ground. We welcome the adjustments made to the reporting framework to better reflect where Outputs have been achieved.

As others have said, the results in this Report are pleasing, with 82 percent of planned Outputs under the more rigorous approach. We support other statements on FAO's work on the collection of data on the SDG indicators and we recognize the importance of this data being used to support national efforts to implement the SDGs. We strongly support the finding that FAO needs to better prioritize its partnerships with state and non-state actors to improve mobilization of resources and to leverage its comparative advantages.

Given the ever-increasing number of work programmes, we support the efforts to strengthen the capacity of the Decentralized Offices Network including the review of the country office staffing models. As others have said, we also strongly support FAO's international standard-setting role, specifically the food safety Scientific Advice Programme and the IPPC and, as we have consistently reiterated in all the Governing Bodies over the last two years, we strongly support the comments of others on the need for a greater core funding for this important work area in the PWB.

With these comments, we would endorse the Report.

Mr Jun LI (China) (Original language Chinese)

China thanks the Secretariat for the Report produced. China is satisfied to see and appreciates FAO's efforts in prioritizing partnerships and leveraging its comparative advantages including through South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC). This is crucially important to help developing countries realize the 2030 Agenda on time and to ensuring global food security.

China has always emphasized that it hopes FAO will maintain its vital leadership in South-South Cooperation (SSC) in agriculture globally. China, at the same time, will always be a steadfast supporter and advocate for SSC.

Mme Jeanne DAMBENDZET (Congo)

La République du Congo prend la parole au nom du Groupe Afrique. Nous remercions le Secrétariat de la FAO pour l'élaboration et la bonne présentation du Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2016-2017.

Nous accueillons favorablement les recommandations formulées par le Conseil à sa 159ème session et nous entérinons les différentes conclusions. Nous nous félicitons de la mise en œuvre du Programme de travail 2016-2017. Les résultats obtenus sont probants. Nous notons que 82 pour cent des produits prévus ont été réalisés.

Nous sommes préoccupés par l'augmentation du nombre de personnes souffrant de l'insécurité alimentaire dans le monde du fait du changement climatique, de la multiplication des conflits et du manque d'investissements dans l'agriculture sur trois années consécutives. Des actions urgentes doivent être entreprises.

Nous demandons donc à la FAO de tirer parti de l'expérience acquise et d'adapter ses activités de telle sorte que les résultats puissent contribuer davantage à l'accomplissement des objectifs de développement durable (ODD). Nous nous félicitons du taux de dépenses de 99,6 pour cent des crédits budgétaires ouverts, et de l'efficacité accrue des fonds fiduciaires et du Programme de coopération technique (PCT), ainsi que de la mobilisation de plus de deux milliards d'USD en ressources financières, conjugués à des gains d'efficacité ainsi que des économies de 37 millions d'USD.

Nous apprécions la priorité accordée par l'Organisation au recours à des partenariats, tant sur le terrain qu'au plan de la direction de l'action, qui devraient permettre de tirer parti de ces avantages comparatifs, en particulier dans le cadre de la coopération Sud-Sud et de la coopération triangulaire.

Nous encourageons les progrès réalisés en matière d'équité, de représentation géographique du personnel et de parité hommes-femmes au sein du personnel du cadre organique et des catégories supérieures. Cependant, nous souhaiterions que plus de femmes soient employées à des postes de direction de la FAO.

CHAIRPERSON

I now give the floor to Ms Crawford and the Secretariat to address the questions raised by the delegations.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

I would like to thank you for your detailed feedback and comments. I always highlight what an important document the Programme Implementation Report is.

We are just looking at the one for 2016-17. We have also already prepared a Mid-Term Review for 2018 and these documents are very important to take stock of how we are doing, to learn lessons and to incorporate those lessons as we move forward and prepare our Programme of Work for the next biennium which is another topic on the Agenda today.

We have taken note of your many comments including on areas such as the importance of sustainable funding for standard-setting and Scientific Advice for Codex Alimentarius and the IPPC, the importance of partnerships, South-South and Triangular Cooperation and statistics.

You will notice in the PIR 2016-17 that we identified very clearly, lessons learned under each Strategic Objective and as we move forward, for example, for the Mid-Term Review 2018 and then in the Programme of Work and Budget, we try to build on those lessons learned and showcase how we are adjusting to continuously improve.

Some of the comments I think will be relevant, as some of you have also mentioned, for the discussion later today on the Programme of Work and Budget. I will mention one point that the distinguished delegate of Australia raised which was on the carry over.

We would, indeed, foresee that conversation normally taking place under the Medium Term Plan, Programme of Work and Budget Item. That is document C 2019/3 and we have posted an Information Note, in case you have not seen that. There is an Information Note posted on the proposed use of the carry over. We hope that we can take that up together with the Item on the PWB this afternoon.

I believe that there were not many other specific questions. I would like to thank the delegates again for their very detailed and important feedback that we will certainly take into consideration as we move forward.

Mr Daniel J. GUSTAFSON (Deputy Director-General, Programmes)

This Item is always an interesting one and it does, as you have highlighted, reflect the Report on our work in 2016 and 2017. The Report for 2018 and 2019 is underway and we are now looking forward to what we do next. As Ms Beth Crawford mentioned, all of the issues that you have mentioned relate not only to those areas where you thought we did well or did not do well in 2016 and 2017 that we are very cognisant of that and we will take those forward in line with your comments. I do not believe that there are other specific questions that I should respond to at this point.

CHAIRPERSON

Now I am going to read the conclusions.

The Conference:

- a) Endorsed the findings of the Report of the 159th Session of the Council and the Programme Implementation Report 2016-17;
- b) Expressed satisfaction with the implementation of the Programme of Work in 2016-17 and welcomed FAO's important work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
- c) Welcomed FAO's result in reaching 82 percent of the planned Outputs under a more rigorous target setting and measurement approach;
- d) Noted with concern the rise of global hunger as a result of climate change and increasing number of conflicts and called on FAO to build on lessons learned and adjust activities where necessary, so that the results could make greater contribution to the achievements of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
- e) Expressed satisfaction of the net budgetary appropriation expenditure at 99.6 percent, the higher delivery of Trust Funds and Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) and the resource mobilization figure of over USD 2 billion;
- f) Welcomed the alignment of FAO results framework to the SDGs;
- g) Encouraged FAO's work related to the collection and analysis of data, in particular to support national efforts to monitor and achieve the SDGs;
- h) Noted the progress made since the issuance of the document in achieving equitable geographical representation of staff and gender balance at professional and senior levels;
- i) Appreciated the priority given by the Organization to the use of partnerships to enable it to leverage its comparative advantages, including through South-South and Triangular Cooperation;
- j) Encouraged the continuing efforts to strengthen the capacity of the decentralized offices network, including through review of country office staffing models; and
- k) Endorsed the Programme Implementation Report 2016-17.

Any comments?

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

In our statement on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States we requested that the evaluation of FAO's Strategic Result Framework and the management response to be presented during the next Council session in December. We would kindly request that you include this request of ours to be reflected in your conclusions.

Mr Anton MINAEV (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)

A couple of comments from my side: Firstly, in paragraph (i) which concerns partnerships, would it not be possible to mention the point I raised in my statement that FAO should continue to increase its level of partnership with academia and the business world? I wonder if there might be some way of reflecting that in the conclusions.

Secondly, I also mentioned in my statement, specifically to the FAO Secretariat, that there is a need to be guided by inter-governmental documents and heed the position of Member States in the implementation of work. This was a comment that was made in connection with the so-called FAO Framework to support peace building activities as part of the Agenda 2030.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

We are talking about Programme Implementation 2016-17. In 2016-17, there was no implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). So, the Programme Implementation Report for 2016-17 does not cover SDGs. SDGs came later. Comments concerning linking FAO's Strategic Objectives, with what the SDGs are actually for, should be addressed when we are discussing the next item – which is Programme of Work and Budget. It is not the place here. The Evaluation Report should be submitted to the Council. It should be discussed in the next item, which covers the Annual Evaluation.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

The main point that we are making in the Programme Implementation Report for 2016-17 is that at the Strategic Objective level of FAO, so the highest level of our five Strategic Objectives, is that they are fully measured by SDG indicators. We take your point that this is very early in the process to be measuring. You will also see that for some of the SDG indicators that had been chosen to be measured at that Strategic Objective level, there was not yet data available, but where there was data available, we have presented that in the document of the Programme Implementation Report 2016-17.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We kindly wanted to ask you to read the second Paragraph (b) regarding SDGs.

CHAIRPERSON

Expressed satisfaction in the implementation of the Programme of Work in 2016-17, and welcomed FAO's important work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Is it clear?

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

It is clear. We perhaps wanted to build on that Paragraph. We were hoping to emphasize at the end of this paragraph that we call the new Director-General to review how FAO can better contribute to SDG 2 on Zero Hunger, and we would like to add that to this Paragraph.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

It is our idea that FAO's Strategic Objectives which link with the SDG's, are all covered in the Agenda Items discussed in Commission I. I will appeal to my colleague from Romania that he raises these issues in Commission I and not here for the Programme Implementation Report.

Ms Lieselot GERMONPREZ (Belgium)

As it was mentioned in your intervention and also by many other states and also by the Director of Strategy in her summary, we would also like to have in the conclusions reference to the importance of FAO's standard setting-work and the work of the products and IPCC.

CHAIRPERSON

So, I will read the conclusions again.

- a) Endorsed the findings of the Report of the 159th Session of the Council and the Programme Implementation Report 2016-17;
- b) Expressed satisfaction of the implementation of the Programme of Work in 2016-17 and welcomed FAO's important work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and encouraged FAO to review how it could continue to provide important contribution to this work too;
- c) Welcomed FAO's results in reaching 82 percent of the planned Outputs and a more rigorous target setting and measurement approach;

- d) Noted with concern the rise of global hunger as a result of climate change and increasing number of conflicts and called on FAO to build on lessons learned and adjust activities where necessary so that results could make greater contribution to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals;
- e) Expressed satisfaction of the Net Budgetary Appropriation Expenditure of 99.6 percent. The higher delivery of Trust Funds and Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) and the resource mobilization figure of over USD 2 billion;
- f) Welcomed the alignment of FAO Results Framework to the SDG's;
- g) Encouraged FAO's work related to the collection and analysis of data, in particular to support national efforts to monitor and achieve the SDG's;
- h) Emphasized the importance of FAO's standard setting work and the work of the IPPC;
- i) Noted the progress made since the issuance of the documents in achieving equitable geographic representation of staff and gender balance at professional and senior levels;
- j) Appreciated the priority given by the Organization to the use of partnerships to enable it to leverage its comparative advantages including, *inter alia*, with academia, the private sector and through South-South and Triangular Cooperation;
- k) Encouraged the continuing efforts to strengthen the capacity of the Decentralized Offices Network, including through the review of country office staffing models;
- l) Noted that the evaluation of FAO Strategic Framework and the management response would be presented to the Council at its decision in December 2019; and
- m) Endorsed the Programme Implementation Report 2016-17.

I hope all your points have been covered.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

Just briefly in your item about the standards setting work, you referred as standards setting and then the IPPC. I think a number of people referred to both IPPC and the Scientific Advice Programme supporting Codex Alimentarius. As there were quite a few interventions that cited both, I wonder if it is worth including both of those terms?

Mr Anton MINAEV (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)

Chairperson, thank you for heeding one of my comments. With regard to the second, perhaps it was missed. It would have been much more useful to have this up on the screen. It is quite difficult to follow in this format. Perhaps it went by the by.

My apologies if I missed it. I would once again like to go back to the point to call on the Secretariat to heed the petition of Member States, and for the design of the Programme of Work to be guided by international documents, intergovernmental documents and if that is not something which you can incorporate into the comments, I would be happy to provide wording to that effect. I am sure that can fit in somewhere, I hope it can.

I could offer some wording.

“Requested the Secretariat to work on inter-governmentally agreed documents and take into consideration the position of Member States on these issues”, something along those lines but we can work on it.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

I am just picking up on the Russian Federation's comment. I want to make sure that was not binding, that the language did not say the Secretariat could only consider intergovernmental documents. I think the Secretariat can and should consider whatever documents it needs to.

I understand the Russian Federation's point and their concern, but we should not instruct the Secretariat to only consider intergovernmental documents. Maybe some wording can be sorted out in the Drafting Committee. I just wanted to make that point.

CHAIRPERSON

Thank you for your comments. We will send these conclusions to the Drafting Committee.

Mr Don SYME (New Zealand)

I just wanted to support the first Australia intervention regarding the standards setting work and to reflect on a couple of the comments that were made in the statements. I would like to propose adding "and the need for sustainable funding in the core budget."

CHAIRPERSON

It is incorporated. Thank you, with this we have concluded Item 22. We will adjourn for lunch and reassemble at 14:30 hours.

I request all of you to please be on time so that we will complete before 18:00 hours.

The meeting rose at 12.37 hours

La séance est levée à 12h 37

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.37

CONFERENCE CONFERENCE
CONFERENCIA

<p>Forty-first Session Quarante et unième session 41.º período de sesiones</p>
<p>Rome, 22-29 June 2019 Rome, 22-29 juin 2019 Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019</p>
<p>SECOND MEETING OF COMMISSION II DEUXIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II SEGUNDA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II</p>
<p>24 June 2019</p>

The Second Meeting was opened at 14:50 hours
Mr Bommakanti Rajender,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La deuxième séance est ouverte à 14 h 50
sous la présidence de M. Bommakanti Rajender,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la segunda reunión a las 14:50
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Bommakanti Rajender,
Presidente de la Comisión II

- Item 23. Programme Evaluation Report 2019**
Point 23. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2019
Tema 23. Informe sobre la evaluación del programa en 2019
(C 2019/4)

CHAIRPERSON

We will resume our business and move on to Item 23, the *Programme Evaluation Report 2019*. Please ensure that you have Conference Document C 2019/4 in front of you.

Mr Thomas M. DUFFY (Chairperson of the Drafting Committee)

I am speaking in my capacity as the Chair of the Drafting Committee and I have to confess that I found the discussions this morning on the report text a little confusing, and I expect this will cause some difficulty for the Drafting Committee. We had discussed in one of our meetings with the Independent Chairperson of the Council (ICC), putting text up on the screens as we have been doing for Council.

We had an inconclusive discussion in the meeting with the ICC but, as the Chair of your Drafting Committee, I would like to propose that as we look at report language in this Session, much like Council, we go ahead and put that text up on the screen so that we have a better sense of the text which will enable us to have a much more accurate Drafting Committee.

CHAIRPERSON

In the past, in the Council, it took a lot of time for small things for correction such as full stops or commas and it was taking hours and hours but, now there is no problem and we will put it on the screen. Please ensure that you have document C 2019/4 in front of you. I now invite Mr Masahiro Igarashi (Director of the Office of Evaluation) to introduce the item.

MR MASAHIRO IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

I am delighted to be here today to present to you our biennium Programme Evaluation Report which provides you with highlights from evaluation findings. In the 2017 and 2018 biennium, the Office of Evaluation finalized a total of almost 70 evaluations of which there were 48 projects and 14 Country Programme Evaluations. The Office also completed a series of evaluations of FAO's Strategic Objectives over the biennium.

Let me highlight some salient findings. In general, the Strategic Objectives approach created the model that gradually permeated through the Organization. This approach introduced holistic and inter-sectoral concepts, such as the food systems approach, to address major development challenges. Translating these concepts into concrete activities in the field, however, proved challenging. Traditional sector-based approaches often continued to dominate the dialogue with the partners, for example, on value chain improvements instead of the food systems approach.

On sustainable agriculture, forestry and fisheries, FAO provided significant contributions to the formulation of national strategies and plans to promote sustainable agriculture. At the same time limited progress was made on implementing practices and cross sectoral approaches at scale, and in a way that ensured their longevity.

FAO needs to better integrate analysis of potential trade-offs between sustainability and productivity into its initiatives. FAO should step up efforts to promote sustainable food and agriculture principles and formulate clear guidelines to help implementation, explaining concrete models and approaches.

On inclusive and efficient agriculture food systems, there is potential to expand the uptake and the scope of FAO's agriculture and food systems concept, and build on Strategic Programme synergies. FAO has a comparative advantage in the formulation of standards, data provision, fostering enabling environments for value chain development and so on. Capacity gaps emerged, however, in areas such as agribusiness and investment support.

FAO has the positioning and the profile to be the lead Agency in the range of food chain crises from regulatory frameworks, standards and on-the-ground early warning and emergency response systems.

FAO's emergency interventions and resilience programmes in fragile contexts were more effective when they were delivered through pre-existing institutions and community level organizations.

Also, the introduction of risk-based approaches, of risk-based adaptive design to the country programme and projects strengthened the humanitarian-development nexus and equipped FAO and its resource partners with the flexibility they needed to select the best possible course of action in the face of crises.

Now, coming to cross-cutting issues, gender and nutrition were the subject of evaluations. In general, FAO's greatest contribution to gender equality and nutrition were at the policy and strategy level. The challenge was to translate them into concrete actions at the field level, although some good examples were found in interventions at the community level, aimed at women's economic empowerment and in the promotion of crop and diet diversity.

FAO's policy on gender equality from 2013 provided the framework for FAO to integrate gender into its work. It should now be updated to reflect the new developments of the 2030 Agenda and emerging work such as climate change or migration.

On Country Programme Frameworks, we evaluated that framework as the instrument for delivery and we recognize the evolution of country programming since 2014. But the guidance did not always translate into desired actions and products at the country level. Many programmes lacked results chains linking activities to higher development goals.

The framework lacked governance to make it an effective results accountability tool. Following our recommendations, management is now working to enhance the effectiveness of the next generation of Country Programme Frameworks. There are several elements that are affecting the environment in which the evaluations operate.

UN reform; in 2017 the Secretary-General of the United Nations announced a Reform Agenda of the United Nations Development System at the country level to have a more coordinated and efficient system.

The UN evaluation system also needs to adapt to the Sustainable Development Agenda and in this context FAO is working together with other UN Agencies and with the United Nations Evaluation Group to address system-wide accountability and evaluation capacity needs, in support of the countries' efforts towards their achievements of the Sustainable Development Goals, in 2018, and in collaboration with other Rome-based Agencies, WFP and IFAD, FAO's Office of Evaluation established a Community of Practice on evaluation for food security, agriculture and rural development called Eval-forward.

This initiative responded to the 2014 UN General Assembly Resolution calling on the entities of the United Nations Development System to help strengthen the evaluation capacity of its Members. An important aspect of this work is to support capacity building efforts and policy development for evaluations at the global, regional and country levels. The initiative is targeted, in particular, at those engaged in evaluations in ministries and agencies. It facilitates knowledge sharing on key topics related to evaluation practices and approaches, provides access to updated information and resources and fosters networking within the evaluation community. Today this Eval-forward, the Community of Practice, counts over 400 Members from 84 countries.

In closing, let me also introduce our website where you can find a number of evaluations that were summarized in this Report and listening to your conversation this morning we acknowledge your interest in discussing the Strategic Results Framework evaluation more in depth that will be submitted this autumn to the Programme Committee. If you all decide, we would be very pleased to submit it to the Council.

We also heard a lot of interest in looking more in depth into how FAO contributes to SDG 2. I am pleased to inform you that next year we will have two evaluations on FAO support to SDG 2, one in the Spring focusing on FAO's work and one in the Autumn on UN system support and FAO's strategic positioning within that framework. Finally, we also heard interest expressed in private sector

partnerships and I am pleased to inform you that we plan to submit an evaluation of FAO's strategy on private sector partnerships in the Autumn to the Programme Committee.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I am honored to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States.

A strong and independent Office of Evaluation is essential to assess and learn from FAO's work at a national, regional and global level. It is essential to develop and learn from evidence so that FAO can improve its performance and achieve a greater impact together with other partners. We welcome this Report which summarizes the main findings from the evaluations conducted in 2017 and 2018.

We particularly welcome the inclusion of findings which highlight what has worked as well as findings on what is not working. The Voices of the Hungry project is a good example of a successful initiative. It has developed a robust and cost effective indicator for measuring food insecurity, the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES). It has been adopted as an indicator to measure SDG 2.1.3. Twenty-two countries have already adopted it for their national surveys and we encourage Member States to adopt FIES. We are concerned that Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs) have not been used effectively. We note that many country programmes are not linked to FAO's Strategic Objectives and that there is no country level system to monitor implementation and results.

We call for a review of the CPF guidelines to ensure that they are systematic, including the context of the UNDS Reform, and that CPFs are linked with and feed into FAO's Corporate Strategic Objectives Framework. Annual progress Reports to measure results should also be published on the FAO website together with the CPFs. We reiterate our request that the evaluation of FAO's Strategic Results Framework and management's response be presented at the next Council Session.

We note the overview of progress with the Strategic and Action plan by the Office of Evaluation. We welcome the collaboration between FAO's Office of Evaluation and the evaluation unit of other Members of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

We look forward to joint evaluations such as the one planned for SDG 2. The UN Secretary-General Reform of the UN Development System includes a joint evaluation system and we request that FAO reviews and updates its evaluation policy to facilitate that collaboration in the future.

We would like to conclude by reiterating our full support for the work of FAO Office of Evaluation and stressing the importance of identifying lessons to be learned from FAO's work both positive and negative, so as to deliver better results.

Mme Jeanne DAMBENDZET (Congo)

Nous remercions le Bureau de l'évaluation pour l'élaboration et la présentation du Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2019. Nous accueillons favorablement les conclusions de ce rapport, et nous nous félicitons des enseignements tirés de ces trois grandes évaluations, des objectifs stratégiques 4, 1 et 2.

Les observations ont permis d'identifier les moyens par lesquels la FAO pouvait contribuer à la réalisation de ses objectifs stratégiques. Nous notons que le cadre stratégique de la FAO a introduit une nouvelle conception globale et intersectorielle. L'évaluation fait rapport sur la difficulté de mettre ces concepts en application sur le terrain et au niveau interne. Cela se traduit par des difficultés à transmettre les nouveaux concepts au personnel travaillant sur le terrain.

Nous encourageons la FAO à œuvrer pour l'exécution de ces concepts sur le terrain et au renforcement des capacités du personnel de terrain. Nous apprécions les alliances parlementaires promues par l'Organisation. Elles jouent un rôle important dans le processus d'adoption des lois sur la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle, et dans l'établissement de partenariats avec les autorités locales et les communautés économiques régionales. Nous apprécions les progrès accomplis dans l'établissement de partenariats au service d'une agriculture, de forêts et de pêches durables.

Ces trois secteurs sont au centre du mandat de la FAO. Nous encourageons la FAO à redoubler d'efforts, afin de mobiliser les ressources des partenaires sur le plan financier et en termes de compétences, de réseaux, de communication et d'investissements. Nous apprécions le rôle clé que la

FAO joue dans le renforcement de la résilience face aux crises de la filière alimentaire. Nous encourageons le renforcement de l'interface entre aide humanitaire, développement et paix, en recourant à une bonne pratique qui consiste à adopter une conception adaptative et fondée sur les risques pour les interventions relatives aux programmes de pays et aux projets.

La politique sur l'égalité entre les sexes de la FAO demeure pertinente au regard du mandat de la FAO et de ses objectifs stratégiques. Cependant, compte tenu des nouveaux domaines d'activités que sont le changement climatique, la migration, le renforcement de la résilience et la protection sociale, elle devrait être mise à jour. Nous appuyons la proposition d'accompagner cette politique d'un plan d'action permettant de guider sa mise en œuvre et de suivre les progrès accomplis.

Nous apprécions les activités menées par la FAO dans le domaine de la gouvernance alimentaire. Nous demandons à l'Organisation de partager l'expérience acquise dans les différentes régions sur les programmes d'alimentation scolaire, les systèmes alimentaires et la prévention de l'obésité, ainsi que l'intégration de l'enjeu nutritionnel dans les plans d'investissement nationaux en faveur de l'agriculture et de la sécurité alimentaire.

Nous nous félicitons qu'en 2018 la FAO ait pu mobiliser des contributions volontaires à l'appui du Cadre stratégique pour un total de 978 millions d'USD, conformément à son objectif biennal. Nous encourageons les Membres à verser leurs contributions pour permettre l'exécution du Programme de travail de l'Organisation. Nous apprécions les bons résultats obtenus par la FAO en matière de renforcement des capacités dans les zones rurales, en particulier l'approche des écoles pratiques d'agriculture.

Nous encourageons l'Organisation à affirmer le rôle de premier plan qu'elle a à jouer en matière de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles. Nous notons que la gamme des partenariats de la FAO, s'est considérablement développée et diversifiée. Nous encourageons donc la coopération avec d'autres organismes des Nations Unies. Le processus de réforme lancé par le Secrétaire général des Nations Unies devrait apporter une contribution dans ce sens. Avec ces commentaires, Monsieur le Président, le Congo approuve le Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2019.

Mr Abdul Razak AYZI (Afghanistan)

We thank the Director of the Office of Evaluation for presenting this very good Report. The Near East Group, of which I am speaking on their behalf, appreciates the structure of the Evaluation Report into four parts; delivering on Strategic Objectives, addressing cross country topics, leveraging key instruments for delivery and evaluating FAO's work.

We think within this structure the Report is a snapshot of findings of the evaluation conducted by the Office of Evaluation during 2017-18. This Evaluation Report, however, does not make recommendations. I did not find any feedback from evaluation to programming.

On the question of evaluating FAO's work, I think the Near East Group would like to know what the number of the established posts in the Evaluation Office is. Is it gender balanced and geographically balanced?

Secondly, the Office of Evaluation uses many consultants in implementing its Programme of Work. Membership would be interested to know the percentage of consultants employed by the Office for field work on the basis of developed and developing countries, as well as the percentage of national consultants on the whole.

Finally, we would like to add a few additional words on what progress has been made with respect to building capacity for evaluation in developing countries, and this in cooperation with the two other RBAs.

With these observations, the Near East Group approves the Programme Evaluation Report 2019.

Mr Don SYME (New Zealand)

New Zealand highly values the work of the FAO evaluation team and this is a very useful summary Report, and that was a very useful presentation from the Director. It directs Members' attention to priority areas for future FAO Work Programmes. Overall, New Zealand is pleased with finding that

FAO's work remained highly relevant across all of its Strategic Objectives. However, despite the overall positive findings, there are some areas for future improvement.

We note the finding that the profusion of actors' initiatives approaches and knowledge products in the food and nutrition security space has led to a confusion and competition at the country level. We also note the finding that FAO has struggled to implement integrated and holistic approaches on the ground, often reverting to sector-specific approaches.

Both findings indicate that the further implementation of integrated approaches will require meaningful partnerships to ensure buy-in and coordination across all actors in-country, which is a first priority for FAO attention of food systems and other integrated approaches are recommended and promoted by FAO. There will also need to be further capability building of, and resourcing to, regional FAO's staff to address the identified gaps.

This also applies to the implementation of cross-sectoral sustainable forestry, fisheries and agricultural approaches under Strategic Objective 2. We agreed that an analysis of potential trade-offs between sustainability and productivity is a key element of advice to governments in implementing these approaches.

Finally, mainstreaming of gender issues across all FAO Work Programmes is a priority for New Zealand, and it is useful that the evaluation highlights areas for further FAO attention and should be based on recognized FAO strengths such as in rural development.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

We welcome this Report and the work of the evaluation unit generally. It is a very good governance practice to ensure the Organization is continuing to learn, to see where we are doing well and where we can keep improving. We are very pleased to see this Report.

We appreciate the recognition of the need to conduct a review on the private sector engagement, I think that is a good initiative. The private sector is critical of course, whether we are talking about smallholders, family farms or all the way up to multi-nationals. They are all, in many definitions, the private sector. And the question for governments is, how do we enable private economic activity that lifts people from poverty and improves incomes, which is really the crux of addressing food insecurity? And then here in FAO it is about what is the role of FAO in helping governments to do that? Again, private sector engagement is critical.

We are glad to see the recognition of that and see that FAO is looking to continue improving in that regard.

We also note the comment from the Director and in the Report about the need to improve agribusiness and investment support. Obviously that is particularly critical as the current funding environment is changing. We endorse the comments in the Report about looking at how to access partner resources other than financial resources, probably like other developed economies. I am sure for Australia, we have experts scattered all over the place in all sorts of different Organizations, we have networks, we are engaging on agriculture in all sorts of different forums. There must be more ways governments like Australia, and like so many others, could leverage that existing investment in pursuing the FAO mission.

I think that is definitely a good thing to be looking at. We would be interested to hear the management reactions to that recommendation and what sort of ideas they might have about responding to that. Finally, we appreciate the ongoing work with the other RBAs and your engagement in the UN System-wide work on evaluation.

It is very critical in ensuring that we are having an impact.

Ms Akiko TABATA (Japan)

Japan would like add a few points. First of all, Japan would also like to express our sincere appreciation to the FAO Office of Evaluation team who dedicated its efforts on a comprehensive

Evaluation Report. It is very helpful for us to understand our achievements and challenges for future progress.

Regarding Paragraph 22, investment in mechanisms to institutionalize gender mainstreaming, such as placing gender officers in regional offices and bolstering the gender focal points network. Japan supports FAO's work on gender. For future progress, we would like to ask FAO to review our achievements and challenges through these investments as well.

Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)

Our appreciation to the Secretariat for the very useful presentation. We would like to echo all the comments made about the importance of evaluation for accountability as well as monitoring progress and results based management. I would like to focus our comments on two points.

The first one about gender. We would like to support what Japan and New Zealand mentioned about how to enhance the capacity of FAO to effectively mainstream gender. The evaluation had shown that the capacity of technical offices should be enhanced and the gender equality policy should be updated with an Action Plan operationalized with targets and indicators. We are looking forward to that.

The second point would be about resource mobilization. We would like to support what was said by Australia and also add that we think that innovative financing and other resource mobilization and strategic approaches to investment would be very useful for FAO in the future.

Mr Gérard CAIRET (France)

Je souhaitais intervenir pour indiquer que la France s'associe bien sûr à la déclaration prononcée par la Roumanie au nom de l'Union européenne et de ses États Membres, mais souhaite aussi souligner l'intérêt de la dernière évaluation de la FAO, qui a été réalisée par le Réseau d'évaluation de la performance des organisations multilatérales (MOPAN).

En effet, le rapport du MOPAN identifie les forces et les faiblesses de l'Organisation, et formule des recommandations qui nous paraissent très intéressantes. Nous souhaitons indiquer que ces recommandations devraient pouvoir être prises en compte dans les meilleurs délais, ce qui signifie avant la fin de l'année, par la nouvelle équipe de direction, afin de pouvoir améliorer l'efficacité et l'efficacité de la FAO.

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

Let me first thank you for the kind words you have given to us in the Evaluation Office, which makes us work harder to bring useful evaluations to the Governing Bodies and the Members. Let me start with a couple of points made by the delegate of Romania. Yes, we have conducted an evaluation of the Country Programme Framework. Management is now working on the next CPF guidelines, and we are collaborating with them and providing our inputs to this process.

Hopefully that will take into account the findings that we made. It is up to you, the Governing Body, to request a review process for the new CPF guidelines, if you wish.

On joint evaluations, the UN Reform has given us a mandate to look at the country-centered UN systems support, and for this, we need firstly to be able to conduct more joint evaluations. Secondly, we have to have more capacity in the Decentralized Structures of FAO, to conduct its own assessments and results monitoring, which will be provided to the UN accountability system. This capacity is still very much lacking and we are trying to support that process. A review of the evaluation policy would be needed for this purpose and this has been discussed. We are piloting and testing different systems.

During the next couple of years we might bring up the issue with your Representatives in the Programme Committee and in the Council for further review of the Evaluation System, as well as FAO's results monitoring system in the context of UN Reform process.

A number of questions were raised by Afghanistan, which are all pertinent. Let me just say that this report has a size limit, and we are trying to find our way to squeeze in as much useful information as

possible. The understanding was that this was not an Evaluation Report per se, but a synthetic presentation of its salient findings.

There are a number of recommendations in individual evaluation reports and there is a process set up for following up in a more regular context. Probably this is more practical in following up the management actions but, we are following your advice if you want this Programme Evaluation Report every two years to become more like an evaluation with recommendations and findings and so on.

On the specific questions about the posts and consultant staff balance, gender balance, geographical balance, we are working on it. One constraint is a number of posts we have, which has not changed for a long time. We are glad to provide you with all of this information with concrete figures, if you request it in the next Governing Body Session. I do not have it at hand, but I know we have eight posts.

We have a good gender balance. On the geographical balance, we are making an effort every year to increase the percentage of people from developing countries. On national consultants, we are working very hard and at least more than half are national consultants. Still a large portion of the work goes to consultants overall. This can be looked into, but it is a matter of discussion during the Programme of Work and Budget.

On the gender evaluations, we will have a presentation tomorrow in Commission I. There will be a more in-depth discussion on this particular topic. On Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN), of course we have collaborated with the MOPAN team quite a bit and provided them with inputs on the status of management. I would like to thank the delegate of France for raising that point.

Mr Daniel J. GUSTAFSON (Deputy Director-General, Programmes)

Two issues; first on the private sector and investment. We are very supportive of that idea and I have been moving in that direction for some time, again within the bounds of what would be a public good element of how to promote more and more sustainable, more SDG-aligned private sector investment.

And the area I think where we have had the most experience with that has been with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). That is our second largest international financial institution working in collaboration with the investment center division in essentially lending to the private sector but with FAO's engagement in how to deal with certain segments of the industry. For example, we have had quite a successful interaction with them in re-vitalization and reformulation of the grain markets and grain industry and Ukraine more recently, and the olive oil sector in Morocco and others in ways that do not benefit an individual firm but elevate the quality and income-generating linkages of private sector activities.

Now, more recently, what we have been exploring primarily with European Union but also with others is within the area of blended finance where some public sector funding would be part of a larger package with private sector funding. That would again encourage more investment in food and agriculture, where, with our engagement would on the one hand help prepare the regulatory and policy environment for that, and also as a way of ensuring tax payers that their money is going to support private sector investment, that does in fact meet SDG indicators and promotes in that regard.

This is an area I am sure we will be working more on in the next year and I think it will be quite an exciting thing. That is the direction that not only FAO but I think all of us are moving towards, recognizing that large investments, necessary to meet Agenda 2030, will come from the private sector.

Then with regard to Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs), we are working on those quite a bit, not only in terms of their improvement as it relates to the larger programming framework, the unit that looks after CPF's is part of OSP, the Office of Strategic Planning and Resource Management, but also working very closely with the regional offices. In addition to that, as Mr Igarashi said, the main element there is the change at the country level with the UN Development System Reform and how the common country programming will now even more drive the work of all the Agencies in the country now that we are all on a common platform of the SDG's and how we adjust the CPF's to that

reality is something that we are working. I am sure that also will be an increasingly important element that we will report on periodically over the next year and probably beyond.

CHAIRPERSON

So, we will put the conclusions on the screen now.

The Conference:

- a) Welcomed the Programme Evaluation Report 2019, including the main findings emerging from the thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations completed during the period 2017-18;
- b) Appreciated the findings and lessons learned from the Strategic Objectives evaluations, recognizing the efforts made by the Organization to transform itself around addressing Strategic Objectives agreed by Members and encouraged FAO to step up its role as a convenor, a strategic advisor and knowledge facilitator adding to its recognized trends in the policy and the field level of work;
- c) Welcomed the progress made in the use of partnerships and their improved quality and stressed the need to make further efforts to strengthen synergies with other UN system Organizations, especially Rome-based Agencies as well as strengthening strategic partnerships with the private sector;
- d) Welcomed the synthesis of lessons learned in the application of the Country Programming Framework and looked forward to the further strengthening of the tool to guide FAOs support to the countries in line with the national government priorities and in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the repositioning of the United Nations Development System;
- e) Welcomed the evaluation of the FAO's work on gender and appreciated the relevance and validity of the FAO's policy and gender equality as an overarching framework to guide the gender work of the Organization and encouraged FAO to leverage its proximity to rural communities and track record in agriculture to play a key role in addressing gender issues in rural areas, and to further build the capacity of its technical officers to mainstream gender in their work;
- f) Appreciated the work done by the Office of Evaluation with its thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations and encouraged the office to propose ways to further strengthen results accountability at the country level to meet the demands of the new accountability structure of the United Nations Development System; and
- g) Welcomed the initiative taken by the Office of Evaluation to support national evaluation capacity development and encouraged the Office to continue its effort to this end.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (United States of America)

Thank you for putting the text on the screen. A couple of questions and general observations. Paragraph (b), I do not recall any Member State asking for any of that. I wonder if we could explain where the text in Paragraph (b) came from or indeed what paragraph (b) really means, whether we need it up there, and absent that, we could probably just strike all of paragraph (b).

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I might have an explanation for the findings and lessons learned that might be part of one of our comments, among some other comments, that are not really exactly reflected in your conclusions. We were asking for the Commission to welcome the inclusion in the Report of examples of things that worked well and of things that did not work so well, and we were citing as an example the project of the Voices of the Hungry.

Maybe this is what you are trying to reflect here. What we were aiming at was to emphasize the welcoming of the inclusion of examples about negatives and positives within the Report. If you may allow me just a few more minutes I might have some further comments.

Mr Alamain SID AHMED M ALAMAIN HAMID (Sudan)

Thank you for putting the draft decisions on the screen in order to allow the non-native language speakers to capture and understand what is going on. To follow up on some remarks, there is one from the Secretariat. We commented on the work of FAO to close the gender balance in FAO. I think that we need the language to address the work of FAO in addressing the gender balance as well as the ongoing process of improving geographical balance. I think some language should be put here in the draft decision.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

Please move down so we can fully see Paragraph (f). I think it is difficult because it goes on two pages. It is not very clear what we are trying to say. We were suggesting that we need to strengthen the results frameworks of the Country Programme Frameworks.

CHAIRPERSON

Appreciated the work done by the Office of Evaluation with the thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations and encouraged the Office to propose ways to further strengthen the results accountability at the country level to meet demands of a new accountability structure of the United Nations Development System.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

After CPF I would add also “associated monitoring and evaluation” and we will continue after the evaluation “while noting with concern that maybe country programmes are not linked to FAO’s Strategic Objectives”. With permission, I would like to add at the end of the entire body of conclusions a new paragraph that will read: “Encouraged Member States to adopt the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)”.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

As a matter of process, did we all have a discussion about adopting and encouraging us all to adopt the Food Insecurity Experience Scale? I am not sure if it was such a strong statement or discussion that we have to include that in the record of the meeting. I have no special objection to the scale, but I am just wondering whether that is a fair thing to include. If there is a good reason why we have discussed it and I have just not noticed it, then I am happy to be flexible.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

The Food Insecurity Experience Scale has been adopted as an indicator to measure SDG 2.1.3. We see the relevance of having it cited here.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

I am not sure what we are adopting. Have we actually got this in all the papers and have we had a chance to review it? Do we know we are talking about indicators for SDGs? I am not sure that suddenly throwing this thing in at the last minute is a good process. This Conference is the peak Governing Body which receives advice and deliberates on a whole range of things. I am not sure that throwing something in at the last minute is a very good process, and I for one feel uncomfortable about what we are agreeing to, because I do not know what it is. I am not sure it is a good practice for a Governing Body of this nature to adopt something as a surprise addition like that.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (United States of America)

I just wanted to speak in support of Australia in terms of all the points Australia made about the proposed additional language.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

The lessons learned of the Voices of the Hungry project, from our take, are important to present here but we hope that maybe management can clarify on this.

Mr Daniel J. GUSTAFSON (Deputy Director-General, Programmes)

I can answer part of it in that the FIES indicator is one of the SDG indicators, of which we are the custodian. In that sense it is part of the overall process that has adopted the 24 indicators. It is one of those 24 indicators. In that sense it has been agreed, but not along with the other SDG indicators in the entirety of Agenda 2030. Whether you want to include it in this document is up to you.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

I do not see why we have to include one indicator and not others. It is a Pandora's Box you are opening and in any case the comment of the representative of the United States was that he was very unhappy I think about the language of paragraph (b). Now where do you stand on the language of (b)?

CHAIRPERSON

The new language is: "welcome the inclusion in the Report of examples of lessons learned from the Strategic Objective evaluations." This is a new language. Is it okay?

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON

So, Romania, please respond to USA, Afghanistan and Australia who are objecting to the inclusion of the indicator.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We are not objecting to having a discussion on the language, but the fact is that it is one of the most relevant indicators for our activity here within FAO. That is why we think that it should have a particular place and we could include it here, not to discriminate against other indicators but, especially for the particular importance it has for our work.

CHAIRPERSON

Why only this particular, why not others? It opens Pandora's box, that is the objection, that is the observation. So, I think we need not include it if you agree.

Ms Elizabeth NASSKAU (United Kingdom)

I just wanted to come in to add to Romania's comments on behalf of the EU and its Member States. Just to clarify that I think the point here is that the FIES comes out of the evaluation on the Voices of the Hungry project, and that evaluation which is highlighted in this Report underlines that the development of the FIES has then been adopted as an indicator to measure SDG 2.1.3 and that a number of countries have adopted it for their own national surveys. The point here is that we would like to see that particular point made in this document reflected in the Report as a way of encouraging Member States to adopt FIES themselves. I hope that adds to the reasoning behind wanting to include this particular point because it comes from the Report itself and should not therefore really be opening a Pandora's Box.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I fully agree with what my colleague from the UK put clearly and more eloquently than I could have expressed.

Ms Lieselot GERMONPREZ (Belgium)

Belgium would like to support Romania and the UK in what they just mentioned and would like to add "encourage" because that is what we would do, we would just encourage the Member Nations to adopt the FIES that serves to track global, regional, and national changes in food insecurity.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

Some of what we are talking about here is policy substance and there are questions of mandate around this as well. So as Mr Gustafson alluded to, SDG indicators were agreed in a Commission in New York, and FAO very importantly contributes to those discussions.

Within FAO when we talk about SDGs and the substance of ‘we should adopt indicator x’, I am not sure that a Commission II discussion around an evaluation synthesis report is the right place to have that substantive policy discussion. I am raising a process question. I am not objecting to the indicator or the initiative itself but saying that this is not the right place to have this type of discussion and we have not actually had the substantive policy discussion upon which to reach this conclusion.

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

I do not really want to impose any views on the Member States in the Conference, but I think the point is that this is about a Programme Evaluation Report and this was given as an example of one evaluation which discussed these issues within that Evaluation Report, it was discussed somewhere else. I see the point of this is more about the general evaluation topic and if the delegates did not have enough space to discuss that particular issue substantially, it is difficult to gain the consensus around that topic.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

In order to move forward and to clarify what we are trying to say, maybe the correct word would not be “to adopt”, but instead “to encourage” Members to use FIES. This would be more suitable since indicators have already been adopted. So “encouraging” Members to use what is already adopted.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (United States of America)

Just to comment on Australia’s point about process and the potential language fix here, as I think other countries, the non-European countries, are a little concerned about the prescriptive nature of that, even of a new paragraph (h) and the way it is amended. But we could make it less prescriptive by making the following alteration: “Encourage Member Nations to consider use of the FIES.”

CHAIRPERSON

I think it will solve the problem I will read the conclusions.

The Conference:

- a) Welcomed the Programme Evaluation Report for 2019, including the main findings emerging from the thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations completed during the period 2017-2018;
- b) Welcomed the inclusion in the Report of examples of findings and lessons learned from the Strategic Objective evaluations;
- c) Welcomed the progress made in the use of partnerships and their improved quality and stressed the need to make further efforts to strengthen the synergies with the other UN System Organizations, especially Rome-based Agencies, as well as strengthening strategic partnerships with the private sector;
- d) Welcomed the synthesis of lessons learned in the application of Country Programming Framework and looked forward to the further strengthening of the tool to guide FAO’s support to the countries in line with their national government priorities and in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Repositioning of the United Nations Development System;
- e) Welcomed the evaluation of FAO’s work on gender and appreciated the relevance and validity of FAO’s Policy on Gender Equality as an overarching framework to guide the gender work of the Organization, and encouraged FAO to leverage its proximity to rural communities and track record in agriculture to play a key part in addressing gender issues in rural areas, and to further build the capacity of its technical officers to mainstream gender in their work;
- f) Appreciated the work done by the Office of Evaluation within the thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations and encouraged the Office to propose ways to further strengthen the results framework of CPFs and associated monitoring and evaluation while noting with concern that many country programmes are not linked to FAO’s Strategic Objectives;
- g) Welcomed the initiative taken by the Office of Evaluation to support national evaluation capacity development and encouraged the office to continue its effort to this end; and

- h) Encouraged Member Nations to consider use of the FIES.

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

There was one point in Paragraph (f), I was recalled by the Secretariat that we did not exactly say that many country programmes are not linked to FAO's Strategic Objectives. We said, "it is not linked to the higher development goals in a results chain." But the monitoring system is built in such a way that it is organized and theoretically linked to the Strategic Objectives. So I would suggest that this is linked to higher development objectives as it was provided in the Report, because this is not what we said.

CHAIRPERSON

Paragraph (f) "Appreciated the work done with the Office of Evaluation with the, country and Project Evaluations and encouraged the Office to propose ways to further strengthen the results framework the CPFs and associated monitoring and evaluation while noting with concern that many country programmes are not linked to higher development objectives."

Romania, is it okay? Actually, this is what the Office is saying.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

Could management please elaborate on the difference between the Strategic Objectives and higher development objectives, please?

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director of the Office of Evaluation)

What the Evaluation Report said was that in the Country Programmes, the linkage, the result chain, from the activities to the upper level and the intermediate development goals were not often subscribed and properly indicated. At the same time, they had a designation of different Strategic Objectives so it is tagged to different Strategic Objectives and Outcomes. Therefore, what we are saying is that the lack of the linkage to a proper series of change without impact pathways was missing. And that was the point and the Office of Planning and Budget reminded us that there is a tagging system for the Strategic Objectives, and therefore this is not exactly what we said.

Mr Daniel J. GUSTAFSON (Deputy Director-General, Programmes)

I think that all of the activities proposed in the CPFs are identified with one or more of our Strategic Objectives. But what the evaluation found was that beyond the labelling or beyond identifying which Strategic Objective, the activity or the Reports or project programme contributed to, there was not a sufficiently strong explanation of how those activities would lead to those Objectives. So you could say that this is part of Poverty Reduction or Resilience or any of the Sustainable Food Systems, Inclusive Food Systems. How this proposed work in the Country Programming Framework is going to contribute to that Objective, is what was weak.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

As far as my knowledge goes, this and other CPF activities identified are linked with national objectives. That is straightforward and no question about it. The second question is whether the national objectives are somehow linked to the Five Strategic Objectives. These are the two issues. But it is difficult to link activities directly to FAO.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We welcome the explanation by management and, from what we gathered, it is reflected in the Report. Perhaps it should also be better reflected in the language because the Report is linking Country Programming Framework with Strategic Objectives and it is also measuring the higher development goals. We think that we can indicate both of them, but we could also move forward as it is.

CHAIRPERSON

We will finalize it and then we will read the final version.

Ms Vivi FERIANY (Indonesia)

We would like to seek clarification on Paragraph (h). I think we are still uncomfortable. Suddenly, we come up with “encouraging Member Countries to consider FIES.” Just to reflect what the EU has described, I think we can add something with the contents on what purpose or to address what in the use of FIES. I think our colleague from Romania can add more on that (h) Paragraph.

CHAIRPERSON

Thank you, Indonesia. Romania has agreed with this particular frame. This formulation is okay with them. The last one “Encourage Member Nations to consider the use of FIES” is okay.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We are okay with that. We are able to move with that.

Mme Khadidja HAMMADI (Algérie) (Langue originale arabe)

Je suis d'accord avec l'avis exprimé par l'Indonésie. Je soutiens également les commentaires entendus de la part d'un bon nombre d'orateurs. Ils ont mentionné qu'ici un indicateur nous a été imposé par surprise. Il faut savoir que le niveau d'insécurité alimentaire diffère d'un pays à l'autre, et que même certains pays n'ont plus cette problématique d'insécurité alimentaire.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

To clarify for our colleagues from Indonesia and other colleagues, maybe since this was a consequence of us reflecting on the lessons learned, if we could just include the whole text of the Paragraph and take it from here and include it, where we make reference to the lessons learned, it would make more sense in this context. We keep it and put it in a place where it makes more sense, also to explain what we are trying to convey is as a lesson learned, this has been adapted as an indicator.

CHAIRPERSON

I will read the final conclusions.

The Conference:

- a) Welcomed the Programme Evaluation Report 2019, including the main findings emerging from thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations, completed during the period 2017-2018;
- b) Welcomed the inclusion in the Report of examples of findings and lessons learned from the Strategic Objectives evaluations, taking note of the good example of Voices of the Hungry and FIES in this regard;
- c) Welcomed the progress made in the use of partnerships and their improved quality and stressed the need to make further efforts to strengthen synergies with the U.N. System Organizations, especially the Rome-based Agencies, as well as strengthening strategic partnerships with the private sector;
- d) Welcomed the synthesis of lessons learned in the application of the Country Programming Framework and looked forward to the further strengthening of the tool to guide FAO's support to the countries in line with their national government priorities and in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the repositioning of the United Nations Development System;
- e) Welcomed the evaluation of FAO's work on gender and appreciated the relevance and validity of FAO's Policy on Gender Equality as an overarching framework to guide the gender work of the Organization and encouraged FAO to leverage its proximity to rural communities and track record in agriculture to play a key part in addressing gender issues in rural areas, and to further build the capacity of its technical officers to mainstream gender in their work;
- f) Appreciated the work done by the Office of Evaluation within the thematic, strategic, country and project evaluations and encouraged the Office to propose ways to further strengthen the

results framework of CPFs and associated monitoring and evaluation while noting with concern that many Country Programmes are not linked to higher development Objectives; and

- g) Welcomed the initiative taken by the Office of Evaluation to support national evaluation capacity development and encourage the Office to continue its effort to this end.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We are going back to Paragraph (b) and as it stands written out, the FIES makes no sense in this context. We would like to keep the original text as we stated earlier: “Encourage Member Nations to consider the use of FIES.” And we are not asking them to adopt, we are just encouraging and stating the importance of this indicator. If we want to make it even more clear, we can say: “Encourage Member Nations to consider the use of FIES to help measure SDG 2.1.3”.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

I think that by specifying the SDG 2.1.3 we are getting into a policy discussion again. We have not sat here and discussed the validity of FIES as a tool to measure SDG 2.1.3. It is the mandate of another grouping and if it is to be discussed in FAO it is a matter for Commission I. I think we can live with something like: “Encouraging Members to consider the use the FIES”. But starting to put specifics there to make it look like we all think this is relevant to 2.1.3 when we have not actually had that discussion is a bit too far.

Ms Elizabeth NASSKAU (United Kingdom)

I think that we could go along with ending the sentence at FIES. I think the point was just to respond to some Member States, including Indonesia, who would ask why and so if we did want to add text to respond to that, rather than specifying the SDG, we could just keep that as a more general wording such as: “to help measure SDG indicators on food security.” But that is only if it is needed in response to some questions about what the FIES would be useful for.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We could move along with what has been suggested by the UK in the text and it would suffice.

Sra. Tamara VILLANUEVA (Chile)

Solo queríamos tomar la palabra para apoyar lo expresado por el delegado de Australia. No nos parece adecuado entrar a un tema que realmente no hemos discutido entre los países miembros en profundidad y nos parece que nos deberíamos remitir al tema más general, lo que es propiamente evaluación más que entrar en recomendar el uso de alguna herramienta específica o temas como FIES –algo específico dentro del informe de evaluación que son más bien ejemplos.

Mr Alamain SID AHMED M ALAMAIN HAMID (Sudan)

We go along with the new language in Paragraph (b), but going back to my intervention on the biggest interventions, you might all know that there is a growing concern about the gender balance and the geographical balance. And as far as we know, there is no reflection on that in the evaluation. So my question is about the Evaluation Office. Can we possibly ask the Evaluation Office to enlighten the Members in this regard in the upcoming Reports? If the answer is yes, we can raise the question right now to the Evaluation Office to enlighten us on the progress so far regarding closing the gap in gender equality and geographical balance. If the answer is no, I think we can live with the draft on the screen.

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

Yes. We had also another question from the Afghanistan delegation on the gender and geographical and also national versus international balance of evaluators. On FAO’s gender balance and geographical distribution, I think this is an item that is discussed in the Finance Committee, requesting data from the Office of Human Resources (OHR). Obviously, we can do that but I think it duplicates the process. In my view, this should be left with the current process of tracking these indicators at the Finance Committee on the basis of OHR Reports.

Mr Alamain SID AHMED M ALAMAIN HAMID (Sudan)

We can go along with what came from the Evaluation Office, but my question is how can we acquire the gender balance and the geographical balance from the perspective of evaluation, not from the financial office?

Mr Masahiro IGARASHI (Director, Office of Evaluation)

Concerning the Evaluation Office and its use of consultants, this is a request that we are happy to provide in the next Programme Committee meeting and have some discussion on this. We do not have the data for FAO's overall project on gender balance and geographical balance. It is the Office of Human Resources which has a reporting duty to the Finance Committee.

CHAIRPERSON

I think this concludes the Agenda Item 23.

Item 24. Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 (Draft Resolution on budget level)**Point 24. Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021 et Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget)****Tema 24. Plan a plazo medio para 2018-2021 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2020-2021 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto)**

(C 2019/3; Information Note 1; C 2019/3-WA11; C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.1)

CHAIRPERSON

We now move on to Item 24, *Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (Reviewed) and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21*, this includes the Draft Resolution on the budget level. Please ensure that you have documents C 2019/3 and Web Annex 11 in front of you.

The extract of the Report of the 161st Session of the Council on this document is presented in C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.1, including the recommended Draft Resolution on Budgetary Appropriations 2020-21. Please also have before you the document C 2019/3/Information Note 1 containing the proposal to carry over any unspent balance of the 2018-19 budgetary appropriation for one-time uses in 2020-21.

I would like to recall that the Council endorsed the proposed budget level at its 161st session in April and agreed to recommend that the Conference approve the Draft Conference Resolution on Budgetary Appropriations 2020-21 for the delivery of FAO's Programme of Work and Budget of USD 1 005.6 million.

As Commission II, we wish to express our gratitude to all of the Council Members for their hard work which resulted in this, reflecting the commitment to support achievement of the Strategic Objectives and implement the integrated Programme of Work under the results framework.

I am sure that many of the delegates will have comments to make on the Programme of Work and budget, and I open the floor to your comments after a brief introduction by Ms Beth Crawford, the Director of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

The Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (Reviewed) and the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium is a realistic proposal, which presents a flat nominal budget with no change to assessed contributions. The proposal also counts on strong and continued voluntary contributions from Members and other resource partners, to ensure that we, together, continue to demonstrate results at country, regional, and global level in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The document builds on achievements over the past biennium to make the Organization more focused, effective and efficient. I will briefly highlight the main features of the proposal.

This is the second biennium within this Medium Term Plan. As foreseen in the reformed Programming Budgeting and Results-Based Monitoring System put in place by the Conference in 2009, the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 was reviewed during 2018, taking into account trends and developments in the external environments and the guidance provided by the Regional Conferences, the Technical Committees, the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council. The Governing Bodies and FAO partners expressed support for continuity in the strategic direction of the Organization, in order to realize the full impact of the reviewed Strategic Framework.

The Medium Term Plan sets out what FAO aims to achieve with Members over the four years. It describes the measurable impact and results of our work in terms of objectives, outcomes and outputs.

The Results Framework has maintained the overarching principle of adopting exclusively the SDG targets and related indicators for measuring progress at Strategic Objective level. Overall, FAO's work will contribute to 36 SDG targets measured through 45 unique SDG indicators.

At the level of outcomes contributing to the Strategic Objectives, indicators continue to measure the biennial level of change achieved and the extent to which countries have made progress through FAO's work.

At the level of outputs that FAO delivers, they follow a more standardized formulation around FAO's core functions; that is, norms and standards, data and information, policy dialogue, capacity development, knowledge and technology, partnerships, advocacy and communication. These outputs contribute directly to the outcomes.

Now, the Programme of Work and Budget for 2021 sets out how the Organization will deliver its programmes and achieve the outputs with all the resources put at our disposal. It proposes a biennial Programme of Work funded from the assessed contributions by Members and an estimate of extrabudgetary voluntary contributions.

This proposal has been developed around four main principles.

First, as already mentioned and as you know, it maintains a flat nominal budget with no change in the level of assessed contributions and net budgetary appropriations compared with 2018-19. Second, it identifies areas of programmatic emphasis and de-emphasis based on developments and guidance received.

Third, it ensures that all increase costs are covered without negatively impacting the technical work of the Organization.

Fourth, it uses the programme management arrangements now in place to accelerate the delivery of effective and demonstrable results, particularly at country level.

Resources have been reallocated to cover increased costs and high-priority areas. In particular, USD 19.8 million has been reallocated to cover cost increases; USD 5.1 million is to cover the more than doubling of FAO's cost share to the UN Resident Coordinator's system; USD 1 million has been allocated to separate and strengthen the ethics and ombudsman functions, and to strengthen internal control and compliance; USD 2 million is reallocated for innovative and sustainable agriculture approaches; and USD 2 million to further strengthen activities centred on combating all forms of malnutrition and promoting nutrition-sensitive sustainable food systems.

To enable these resource reallocations, savings of close to USD 30 million have been identified, mainly as a result of improvements to the recovery of direct and indirect support cost under FAO's new cost recovery policy, approved by the FAO Council in 2015 and gradually introduced starting in January 2018.

I will turn briefly to the additional information provided by the Secretariat. First I will refer to document C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.1. Part 1 of this document is, as usual, an exact extract from the Report of the 161st Session of the Council on the MTP-PWB reproducing the Council's guidance and the recommended Draft Conference Resolution on Budgetary Appropriations 2020-21.

Part 2 reflects Council's guidance in the reading of a Paragraph in the PWB related to contributing to sustaining peace.

Second, Information Note 1 makes a proposal for the Conference to authorize the Director-General to utilize any unspent balance of the 2018-19 Appropriations for one-time uses in 2020-21.

Allow me to elaborate briefly on this proposal. The authorization for a carry-over has been a matter decided within the authority of the Conference when considering the PWB for the next biennium. If a carry-over is not authorized, any unspent balance is surrendered to the General Fund through Miscellaneous Income.

Unspent balances arise due to the prudent management of the budgetary appropriation by the Director-General, who under the Financial Regulations cannot overspend the authorized budget level. In order to address budgetary risks relating to fluctuation staff costs, income and commitments, and to ensure best use of resources, there is usually a small unspent balance at the end of each biennium.

The Conference at each of its last five sessions has authorized the carry-over of unspent balances for specific one-time purpose. The unspent balances, known after the closure of the biennial accounts, have been in the range USD 2.5 million to USD 9.4 million per biennium. That is less than one per cent of the appropriation.

While full expenditure of the 2018-19 appropriation continues to be sought, experience has shown that a small-unspent balance could arise. The Conference may, therefore, wish to reflect in its report a one-time authority for the Director-General to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations for one-time uses in 2020-21.

It is suggested that the exact use could be agreed with a Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at their meetings in November and December of 2019.

Mr Chairperson and distinguished delegates, the Medium Term Plan 2020-21 (reviewed) and the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21, including the proposed budget level of USD 1 005.6 million recommended by Council, and the authority to use any unspent 2018-19 appropriation balance, are for consideration and approval by the Conference.

Sr. Benito JIMÉNEZ SAUMA (México)

Gracias a la Secretaría por la explicación introductoria. Respecto al nivel de presupuesto apoyamos la propuesta para el presupuesto del bienio 2020-21 por 1 005.635 millones de dólares. Respecto a esto, a nombre de México, quisiéramos resaltar los esfuerzos de la dirección para mantener un crecimiento nominal cero que va acorde con la política de austeridad de México y de varios países.

Apoyamos y alentamos continuar las eficiencias encontradas por la administración que han resultado en ahorros importantes a lo largo del último bienio, y en general, a lo largo de los últimos años que han permitido mantener la consignación neta con un incremento nominal cero. También apoyamos la armonización del plan de plazo medio 2018-2021 revisado con la Agenda 2030 y también con que la FAO cumpla con sus obligaciones para la reforma del Sistema de Desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas, incluyendo su contribución al sistema de coordinadores residentes.

Al apoyar el Plan a Plazo medio revisado, solicitamos que se destinen recursos suficientes para la integración de la biodiversidad en la FAO y también para dar mayor atención a la labor de la FAO, en relación con la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria y el programa conjunto FAO-OMS de asesoramiento científico. Esto, como suele suceder, se podría hacer al revisar las asignaciones entre capítulos que se presentarán al Comité de Finanzas y al Consejo de la FAO en el segundo semestre de 2019.

También solicitamos a la FAO, con respecto al Programa de Trabajo, que focalice sus esfuerzos en beneficio de los más vulnerables a la seguridad alimentaria, con soluciones prácticas y sencillas que impliquen una verdadera diferencia en el terreno, fomentando las buenas prácticas agrícolas y de nutrición. Apoyamos que se mantenga la consignación del Programa de Cooperación Técnica en 14 por ciento y como se ha reflejado en las discusiones de meses pasados, considera opciones para incrementar este porcentaje en el futuro si acaso es viable. También solicitamos a la Secretaría la información detallada sobre el uso de las contribuciones voluntarias en los últimos tres bienios desglosadas por áreas programáticas y geográficas.

Respecto a la Nota Informativa 1 sobre el arrastre de los saldos no utilizados, agradecemos las explicaciones recién dadas por la Secretaría por la Sra. Crawford. La propuesta no es clara, pero entiendo que, de ser aprobado, lo vamos a discutir en el futuro porque hace dos años, precisamente en la Comisión II de la Conferencia anterior, pedimos que se sistematizara el tratamiento de este tema. El que la propuesta para el uso de saldos no utilizados sea analizada por la Reunión conjunta de los Comités del Programa y Finanzas, y posteriormente por el Consejo, va en buena dirección para sistematizar esta propuesta. Pero, de nuevo, creemos que en la Nota Informativa faltó más detalles sobre qué hacer con los gastos, qué significa exactamente los gastos no recurrentes. Esto hay que detallarlo. Y, quizá, para el futuro, considerar la opción de que los saldos no utilizados se devuelvan a los Estados Miembros a cuenta de sus próximas contribuciones porque es algo que ya se hace en otras organizaciones. Aunque sabemos que la FAO tiene sus particularidades.

Con esos comentarios, reitero el apoyo de mi gobierno al nivel de consignación neto propuesto por 1005.635 millones de dólares para el próximo bienio.

Mr Alamain SID AHMED M ALAMAIN HAMID (Sudan)

I would like to thank the Secretariat for this presentation. At the outset, the Sudan reads this statement on behalf of the Near East Group. We would like to welcome the Medium Term Plan and Programme Work and Budget and with sustained support for the Member States with special attention to the measures to combat climate change and malnutrition. I would also like to point out that the separation between the partnership and the tripartite work has been separated from other courses of action.

As to the zero growth budget, we would like to point out the importance of emphasizing and de-emphasizing, which figures on page 25, with regards to enhancing the strategies for the overall management. I would like a further clarification with regards to Paragraph A, if other resources can be secured by the Secretariat so that this line of action can be continued in the future, and, with regard to enhancing the organizational structures of FAO in its field offices with regards to the Five Strategic Objectives.

With regard to the Medium Term Plan, I would like to point out the importance of Technical Cooperation Programmes (TCPs) and emergency operations in our countries; the increase compared to the past biennium and the increase in other projects which amounted to 21 percent in terms of numbers, and an increase of 10 percent with regard to cost.

We also highly welcome the maintaining of the Technical Cooperation Programme at 14 percent and covering cost increases, representing 19.8 million and I highly commend the efforts of the Organization in this regard.

Despite the many financial restrictions which emanate from Resolution 9/89 and which has still managed to represent 14 percent of the budget for Technical Cooperation Programmes, and due to the increasing needs of our countries facing the many challenges of the current era, we seek the understanding of the Conference for the dire need for such Technical Cooperation Programmes and to increase the budget that is allocated to TCPs to 17 percent, rather than 14 percent.

Considering that the 2030 Agenda requires many efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, we also ask the Secretariat to carry on its efforts in capacity building, especially in the fields of South-South and Triangular Cooperation and through cooperation with the Rome-based Agencies, to enhance efficiency and avoid double lines of action.

Thank you and we commend the efforts of the Organization.

Mr Anton MINAEV (Russian Federation) (Original language Russian)

We support the Draft Resolution, which sets the budget of FAO at the level of the last biennium. We take it that the Conference is now approving namely the Draft Budgetary Resolution but not the Draft Medium Term Plan and Programme of Work since the latter document should still be worked on at the 163rd Session of the FAO Council in December this year.

In this connection, we support the decision of the 161st Session of the FAO Council with regard to the content of the Draft Medium Term Plan and Programme of Work. We support the majority of

provisions of the document. We welcome the fact that when it was being developed, the outcome recommendations of the sectoral Committees and the Regional Conferences of the FAO were taken into account.

We value keeping the zero nominal growth and not increasing the overall level of assessed contributions, in comparison with 2018-19. We know the importance of reflecting in the document such topics as the fight against poverty, social protection with a food component, counteracting the spread of plant and animal diseases, malnutrition, safety and quality of food products, and the sustainable management of natural resources.

We would also like to underscore the significance of the standard setting function of the FAO. We believe that more attention should be paid to these topics, in the framework's implementation of the Programme of Work in the next biennium. We welcome the work of the FAO in the area of ensuring resilience of livelihoods of rural populations in emergency situations with Strategic Objective 5.

In order to facilitate this area of FAO work, the Russian Federation has made a voluntary contribution of USD 3 million for the project to promote the restoration and sustainable development of the agricultural sector in Syria. We are certain that such efforts will enable ensuring food security for the population of this country and the return of Syrian refugees.

On this point, we agree with the wording proposed by FAO, namely that the work of the Organization is to contribute to sustaining peace as is reflected in the new Paragraph 207. I would like to underscore that the work of FAO in the framework of the so-called Global Network against Food Crises established at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016 should be carried out only in the framework of the existing mandate that FAO has. The same goes for the interaction of FAO with the independent international organization, Interpeace.

In conclusion I would like to express my gratitude to the Secretariat of the FAO for the written confirmation that the Russian remarks connected with the restriction of the use of Russian language in a number of planned events at the FAO will be taken into account. At the same time, we note that the Conference is being presented with the very same document, the old document, in accordance with which the Russian language is not included in the provision of simultaneous interpretation in a number of events. We would like to call on the Secretariat to publish the updated document.

In conclusion, I would also like to comment very shortly on the Information Note of the Secretariat in regards of the proposal to carry over the unspent balance of appropriations for 2018-19. On this point, I would like to draw attention to the decision of the 158th Session of the FAO Council.

In Paragraph 10 (c) of the Report, there is a call to the Secretariat to submit for consideration, at one of the next Sessions, a proposal to use the unspent balance of appropriations on a systematic basis, taking into account the results of the consideration of these proposals at the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM), and at the Joint Meetings of the Programme Committee and Finance Committee.

I would like to request that the Secretariat submits such a proposal in reference to recommending to the Conference in order to authorize the Director-General to use any unspent balance in the next biennium.

We stand ready to read out our proposal of wording to be included in the Report.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States. The EU and its Member States welcome the reviewed Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (MTP) and the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 (PWB) and fully endorse the recommendation formulated respectively by the Council, the Programme Committee, the Finance Committee and the Joint Meeting of both Committees.

We welcome the proposal to maintain the flat nominal budget for the assessed contributions and to make no change to the net budgetary appropriations compared to 2018-19. We recognize that the

Organization's overall budget is increasing thanks to donors contributing strong support for FAO's work.

We welcome the presentation of areas of emphasis and de-emphasis and appreciate the transparency in this regard. We are generally in agreement with the management's proposals. However, we would like to reemphasise the Council request that FAO increase the funding in the PWB 2020-2021 for its work on IPPC, the joint FAO/WHO scientific advice programme and mainstreaming biodiversity at FAO.

We particularly support the Council's request to the Secretariat to carefully monitor the anticipated cost increases including inflationary elements related to staff remuneration and we ask the Secretariat to seek further efficiencies with a view to the reform of the UN Development System and related recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit and to update Members through established reporting mechanisms.

Furthermore, we welcome the fact that the Organization will cover the doubled contributions to the UN Resident Coordinator System for the assessed contributions through additional savings. Since those savings will arise mainly from FAO's new cost recovery policy, cost recovery should occur exclusively for those costs that the Organization actually incurs when providing support to the implementation of voluntary funded activities. To that end, we think that an audit of the new cost recovery policy should be carried out during the coming biennium.

Moreover, we would like to ask for a transparent follow up to the implications of the proposals and recommendations of the Governing Bodies and look forward to the adjustment of PWB 2020-21 for consideration by the Council in December 2019.

We support the Council conclusions that the current share of the core budget appropriation allotted to the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) remains at 14 percent at this time. We would like to reiterate our commitment to supporting the important work of FAO. As the biggest provider of core and voluntary contributions to the FAO, the EU and its Member States expect FAO to continuously improve its overall performance, efficiency and effectiveness and to maintain its global leadership as a knowledge-based Organization for food and agriculture including forestry and fisheries and aquaculture.

Finally, please allow me to raise an issue which is closely related to the item we are currently discussing. I refer to C 2019/3 Information Note 1 on the proposal to carry over any unspent balance of the 2018-2019 appropriations for a one time use. In Paragraph 6 of this note, the Conference is requested to authorize the Director-General to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations for one time use in 2020-21 in agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at their Meetings in November and December 2019.

While acknowledging that a decision to authorize the carryover of unspent balance falls under the authority of the Conference, we believe that prior to granting such an authority, the management must comply with a request of the 158th Session of the Council from December 2017, regarding the matter under discussion.

At that Session of the Council, the Council requested the management prepare a proposal on systematic use of unspent balances of biennial appropriations in future biennia, to be reviewed by the Council following review by the Committee of Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) and the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

Unfortunately, such a proposal on systematic use has not yet been presented. The purpose of the aforementioned request was to establish guidelines for the use of unspent balances so as to allow predictable decisions on this matter and to avoid unfruitful, contentious discussions. We request the management to submit such a proposal without any further delay. The proposal should be reviewed by the CCLM, the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at their Meetings in November and December 2019.

At the same time, the Conference should delegate to the Council the authority to authorize the Director-General to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations for one time use in 2020-

21. The Council should then exercise its authority, based on the recommendations of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees at their Spring Session in 2020.

Mr Song Ho SO (Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

The DPRK delegation believes that the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 submitted to this Conference is well drafted to contribute to the food security and agricultural development of the Member States.

This Programme of Work and Budget is formulated in a way that the operations and the Strategic Objectives of the Organization could focus on eradicating poverty, hunger and improving nutrition based on the comprehensive analysis of the global trend of agricultural development.

I hope FAO will continue to pay deep attention to assistance in the fields of agriculture, fishery and forestry of the developing countries in the new Programme. The DPRK will offer full cooperation for the successful implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 and do its best to fulfil its obligation as a Member State.

Ms Maria Esperança PIRES DOS SANTOS (Angola)

Angola, together with Equatorial Guinea, Malawi and Sierra Leone give this statement on behalf of the African Regional Group. We would like to express our appreciation for the work done by the Secretariat which produced an important document.

We welcome the proposed Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (Reviewed) and the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 and express our appreciation for all the effort made before and during the past Sessions of the Council as well as the Programme, Finance and Joint Committees to achieve a better understanding through an inclusive process.

The African Regional Group welcomes the effort of FAO and the Director-General in maintaining a flat nominal regular programme budget and in identifying savings and efficiencies across a range of areas, as well the increasing level of extrabudgetary contributions which reflects the confidence of Members in the leadership and work of the Organization.

We all reaffirm the importance of the Technical Cooperation Programme appropriation in achieving the SDGs and support the need for comprehensive monitoring and evaluation review of TCP's implementation in the next biennium.

On the other hand, the African Regional Group emphasises the appeal to the Secretariat to fully use their allocated amount of the TCP appropriation. The African Regional Group would also like in the near future to see the FAO fulfil the spirit of Conference Resolution 9/89. Among the important areas of activities we would highlight the importance of addressing antimicrobial resistance to contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in all regions.

With these words, the African Regional Groups approves the Programme of Work and Budget proposed by the Director-General for the years 2020-21.

Sra. Angela TEVES LIBARONA (Argentina)

Con relación al Plan a Plazo Medio para 2018-21, la Argentina acoge con agrado que se enfatice la necesidad de considerar las prioridades de todos los países, incluso las prioridades de los países con ingresos medios e ingresos medios altos, ya que aún enfrentan grandes desafíos en aras de lograr el desarrollo de ciertas partes de sus territorios rurales y es en este sentido que la FAO puede realizar un aporte muy significativo como organización internacional, que tiene entre sus objetivos mejorar las condiciones de vida de la población rural. Asimismo, la Argentina estima muy valioso que la FAO considere en su programa de trabajo todos los enfoques que conduzcan a lograr una agricultura sostenible en un contexto mundial en el que la agricultura enfrenta los más variados desafíos, incrementar la productividad agrícola y asegurar la sostenibilidad de la producción de alimentos para alcanzar los objetivos acordados en la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible es un compromiso al que la FAO puede contribuir propiciando y fomentando todas las formas de producción agrícola sostenible sin priorizar unas sobre otras.

Así mismo, y en línea con lo manifestado por otras delegaciones y lo remarcado por el Consejo en su 161.º período de sesiones, acogemos con agrado que el Programa de Trabajo y Presupuesto para 2020-21 haya sido formulado sin una variación nominal de su presupuesto ordinario aunque señalamos que sería importante poder incrementar la financiación sostenible en las esferas técnicas, con mayor atención a las esferas técnicas de la FAO, en especial la labor en relación con la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria, el CODEX y el Programa Conjunto FAO-OMS de asesoramiento científico.

M. François PYTHOUD (Suisse)

La Suisse exprime sa satisfaction quant à l'orientation stratégique cohérente et harmonisée du Plan à moyen terme révisé 2018-2021 et du Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021, avec le cadre d'action global que constituent le Programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030 et ses 17 objectifs de développement durable.

Afin d'atteindre les objectifs du Programme 2030, il est nécessaire d'entreprendre une action transformatrice des systèmes agroalimentaires, en adoptant les principes de durabilité, en s'attaquant aux causes profondes de la pauvreté et de la faim, et en ne laissant personne de côté, en particulier les agricultrices et les agriculteurs.

La FAO, en tant qu'Institution spécialisée des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, a un rôle clé à jouer dans la réalisation de ce changement transformateur, en renforçant ses activités scientifiques, son travail normatif, fondé sur des données probantes et grâce à son pouvoir rassembleur.

Ceci étant dit, la Suisse aimerait souligner les deux points suivants. Premièrement, la nécessité pour l'Organisation d'examiner toutes les approches concernant les systèmes agroalimentaires durables, y compris l'agroécologie, dans son Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021. Dans l'autre salle, en Commission I, on est en train de discuter un projet de résolution à cet effet, et il est important que celui-ci soit aussi reflété dans le cadre du Programme de travail.

Deuxièmement, nous rappelons l'importance d'un financement durable pour la biodiversité, pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, ainsi que pour le programme de soutien scientifique et technique du Codex Alimentarius et pour la convention internationale pour la protection des végétaux.

Sur les bases des recommandations du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier, ainsi que du Conseil, nous invitons le nouveau Directeur général et la direction à considérer ces domaines dans la version ajustée du Programme de travail et budget qui sera soumis au Conseil pour adoption. Avec ces propositions d'ajustement, la Suisse soutient le budget proposé et le projet de résolution sur l'ouverture de crédits budgétaires.

Permettez-moi de conclure avec deux points additionnels. Premièrement, en ce qui concerne le report du solde à la fin de l'exercice biennal, nous soutenons entièrement les propositions qui ont été faites, notamment par le Mexique et l'Union européenne, en ce qui concerne, d'une part, le fait d'impliquer, d'ici la fin de cet exercice biennal, le Comité du Programme, le Comité financier et le Conseil, et la nécessité aussi de développer des directives pour traiter cette question dans le futur.

Deuxièmement, en ce qui concerne le Cadre stratégique sur dix ans, qui avait été adopté par la Conférence en 2009, pour la période 2010-2019, et qui ensuite a été adapté en 2013-2017, nous estimons que le moment est venu, notamment avec l'entrée en fonction du nouveau Directeur général, de vraiment développer une version fortement consolidée, qui tienne compte des nouveaux défis et des développements ayant eu lieu aux niveaux international, régional et national. Ce nouveau Cadre stratégique devra bien évidemment être soumis au processus habituel des Comités du Programme et financier, et du Conseil, pour être présenté à la prochaine Conférence pour adoption.

Mr Viliami KAMI (Tonga)

Tonga calls upon FAO to increase the funding base of the IPPC on an ongoing basis through reallocation of funds from FAO's Regular Programme Budget. The sustainable funding that would be realized through such reallocation is urgently needed and would significantly support advancement of

IPPC work programmes to the benefit of all 183 contracting parties through the IPPC and global plant protection.

This allocation would also support the core mandate of FAO's fundamental work contributing directly to achieving FAO's Strategic Objective 2, making agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable and, also, Strategic Objective 4, to enable inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems.

There is also a reminder to everyone that there is the biggest global event in 2020, which is the International Year of Plant Health and this is being led by the IPPC. Tonga takes note of the amounts quoted for the unspent balance and believe that it is enough or more than enough to meet the IPPC urgent needs per financial year, for the long term. Tonga requests that this urgent request be considered and somehow included in this Programme of Work Budget 2020-21.

Mr Don SYME (New Zealand)

New Zealand would like to thank FAO for delivering a flat nominal budget through cost savings and efficiencies and we highly appreciate that USD 150 million in efficiency savings have been found since 2012 and we would like to commend the outgoing Director-General Graziano da Silva and his team for their efforts.

New Zealand remains confident in the strategy contained in the Medium Term Plan including the linkages between the Strategic Framework and indicators in the SDGs. We welcome the proposed areas of emphasis in the Programme of Work and Budget for 2020-21.

New Zealand is a strong advocate for greater use of innovative and sustainable agricultural approaches including innovations using information technology and we welcome increased resources to promote nutrition-sensitive food systems. These proposals directly address some of the issues raised in the Programme Evaluation Report.

Generally, we consider FAO's core strengths lie in its technical thought leadership and international standard-setting in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors. The prevention of trans-boundary pests and diseases and international science-based food safety standards are also core roles and we strongly support the essential role of capacity building at the national level through the Technical Cooperation Programme.

As discussed earlier this year at the FAO Council, we support those statements made at that meeting that a full evaluation of the TCP Programme be undertaken before any changes to its funding level are considered. We fully acknowledge the difficulty for FAO to fund the priorities of the full Membership under a flat nominal budget and think this proposed budget has done a good job.

However, despite the maintenance of existing funding for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and Codex Alimentarius, like many Members here, we remain concerned about the chronic underfunding of the Food Safety Science Advice Programme and the IPPC. Funding shortages mean that the IPPC cannot help countries to respond to emerging quarantine pests. It means that it cannot help representatives of less-developed countries to attend key meetings and it cannot help countries build their capacity to manage phytosanitary issues.

The backlog of work for scientific advice means it takes longer for food safety standards to be developed that may allow a country to export a product giving opportunities to the farmer and the country. Like others, we hope that further savings can be found to increase the allocation to these areas as the PWB is finalized later this year.

Finally, we would like to note and support the previous Council decision and comments today on the need for a more systematized approach to dealing with unspent balances.

Ms Vivi FERIANY (Indonesia)

Indonesia would like to first give the floor to Philippines to deliver its interventions on behalf of the Asia Regional Group before we give our intervention.

Mr Theodore Andrei BAUZON (Philippines)

The Philippines is pleased to deliver this statement on behalf of the Asia Regional Group. The Asia Group highly appreciates the presentation by the Secretariat on the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (Reviewed) and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21. With regard to these, we would like to highlight the following points.

We commend the Director-General and the Secretariat for maintaining a flat nominal regular programme budget for 2020-21 with no change in the level of assessed contributions and net budgetary appropriation compared with 2018-19. We note that two thirds of FAO's Programme of Work is funded by the voluntary contributions.

While these voluntary contributions depend on the goodwill of donors and FAO has less control over them, we certainly believe that these reflect the confidence of Members in FAO leadership and management. While considering the risks associated with the timing and scale of the voluntary contributions, we would like to request FAO management to seek alternative sources in order to meet the increasing and diverse demand of Member Nations to face the challenges of the 21st Century.

We note the identification of proposed areas of emphasis and de-emphasis and the reallocation of savings to cover increased costs. At the same time, we highlight the importance of sustainable funding for FAO's work on scientific advice and standard setting. We request the management to review and reconsider the long list of proposed deemphasised programmes, like the capacity building of smallholder farmers and family farmer organizations and agricultural value chain activities and to allocate funds from the assessed contributions in order to continue and complete the ongoing activities.

The Asia Regional Group acknowledges the efficiency gains of USD 30 million and supports its usage to put additional resources for FAO's cost share for the UN Resident Coordinator Systems, innovative and sustainable agricultural approaches and separation of ethics officers and ombudsman functions, as identified in the PWB documents.

We would like to draw your attention on the allocation utilization and significant outcomes received from the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP). We, especially the developing country members, have serious concerns about the decrease in the TCP expenditure rate in 2018, the bureaucratic process that hinders its implementation at the field level, and also the lack of detailed report on the impact of TCP projects at the country level.

We endorse the Council's recommendations to reaffirm the importance of TCP appropriation in achieving the SDGs and welcome the TCP appropriation at 14 percent of the net budgetary appropriation while taking note of the Conference Resolution 9/89 and the recommendation of the Conference at its 39th Session. We also call on the Secretariat to review, identify and fix the bureaucratic obstacles from the low TCP expenditure rate and, at the same time, enhance monitoring documentation of results.

We are very much looking forward to seeing a report on the projects under TCP, the reason of under spending and its efficient use as stipulated during the 161st Session of the FAO Council. The Asia and Pacific Region presented five Regional initiatives on Zero Hunger, Blue Growth, One Health, climate change and inter-Regional initiatives on Pacific Small Island Developing States.

We expect these Regional initiatives to contribute to FAO's Strategic Objectives and to support countries in achieving SDGs in the region. The Asia Group emphasises mainstreaming South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC), the assigned projects under SSTC initiatives and expand its partnership with other UN Agencies to make this cooperation more vibrant, dynamic and effective. We also highlight the implementation of the recommendations of the Independent Evaluation including FAO's contribution at country level.

With these comments, the Asia Regional Group endorses the proposed level of budget for 2020-21.

CHAIRPERSON

There is a side event, Real Action on Youth in the Sheikh Zayed Centre from 5:30 to 6:30, so we will close our discussions at 17:30 today, if you all agree. I think we have got four more countries to speak and we will resume at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

Like others, Australia welcomes the zero nominal growth regular programme budget and we thank the Director-General for this as an ongoing achievement during his tenure as he well stated over the weekend. Savings and efficiencies not only keep an Organization focused but create the chance to invest in new priorities.

We would like to highlight the fundamental importance of the sustainable funding of FAO core functions, of standard-setting and normative work, in particular IPPC and Codex and the scientific support for Codex. This is important for all of us. There can be no development and prosperity without standards.

We commend the ring fencing of the funding for the standard-setting work but, through the Governing Bodies and Technical Meetings for some time now, Members have consistently sought a better solution and we are hearing that very clearly again today. Indeed, it has been the most requested area for an increase in funding, referred to at our count by sixteen Governing Body and Technical Meetings totalling over 26 requests. That is a pretty significant request. New Zealand and others have well stated some of the advantages we see with better funding for this work but, ultimately, we are talking about opportunities for farmers, rural communities and safe food.

The good news is that small increases would make all the difference and after being involved in discussions about this in the Finance Committee and Programme Committee, we think that is possible.

We absolutely acknowledge that it is a difficult budget environment and we have heard the Director-General's message that there is only so much you can do within a zero nominal growth budget. But, as the saying goes, where there is a will, there is a way. Today let us reiterate our will to make this core function of FAO sustainable.

We would also like to highlight the importance of FAO continuing and strengthening its work in the Pacific in collaboration with regional partners. It is great to see so many of our Pacific friends in Rome this week. It is a long way from the Pacific islands. In 2017, we were thrilled to see FAO and the Pacific community or the Staff Pension Committee work with the government of Vanuatu to convene the first joint meeting of the Pacific Agriculture Ministers.

These gatherings are a great opportunity to hear about the region's priorities for food, agriculture, nutrition, the blue economy, climate change and other issues. FAO can make a real difference in the Region with a focus on practical actions and collaboration with Regional Bodies. We are looking forward to the September Meeting of the Pacific Agriculture Ministers in Samoa, the seat of FAO's Subregional Office in the Southwest Pacific.

Finally, I would endorse the comments made by many others calling for a more systematic way to authorize the use of the unspent funds from the biennium.

Mr Toru HISAZOME (Japan)

First of all, as stated in the Asia Regional Group statement read out by the Philippines, Japan commends FAO's efforts to achieve zero nominal growth budget.

Secondly, as previous speakers pointed out, we would like to emphasize the importance of sustainable and stable financial support to scientific advice on food safety and standard settings and we encourage FAO to increase its financial allocation to those areas.

Last but not least, as many colleagues pointed out, Japan is also concerned about the Information Note 1, on the proposal to carry over unspent balance. At the Council two years ago, we requested management to prepare a proposal on systematic use of the unspent balances. We have not yet seen

such a proposal from management. So Japan requests management to submit such a proposal as soon as possible and it should be discussed at the Governing Bodies Council in December.

Mr Rodrigo ESTRELA DE CARVALHO (Brazil)

Brazil commends Dr José Graziano da Silva, the outgoing Director-General, for his unequivocal commitment to make this Organization much more efficient and effective. Since 2012, FAO has experienced a major transformational change that contributes to extensive tangible results in Member States. With regard to the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21, Brazil appreciates the significant efforts made by the Secretariat to prepare a flat nominal budget while protecting the delivery of the Programme of Work and its alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Over USD 150 million in efficiency savings over the last years with a further USD 28 million expected in the 2020-21 biennium are certainly an achievement. But we should be aware of the existing limits for further savings and of the challenges that Members and the new Director-General are going to face in this realm.

The amount of voluntary contributions certainly reflects the trust in the effectiveness of this Organization in delivering its objectives. However, the growing proportion with respect to assessed contributions also raises some concerns. Brazil believes that the strength should not lead us to a donor-driven Organization, instead of a Member-driven one. We support Mexico's proposal on a better understanding of the destination of voluntary contributions.

Brazil is aware of the need to keep the TCP on an appropriate level as decided on previous Conference Resolutions. We encourage Member States and the Secretariat to work further in order to increase, progressively, this amount in line with the growing needs of developing countries in our aim to seek more coherence between FAO's Strategic Objectives and the 2030 Agenda.

CHAIRPERSON

We will close this Session today and we will resume tomorrow at 9:30. I will request all of you to please be on time so that we will finish the business well before time.

The meeting rose at 17.30 hours

La séance est levée à 17 h 30

Se levanta la sesión a las 17:30

CONFERENCE CONFERENCE CONFERENCIA

**Forty-first Session
Quarante et unième session
41.º período de sesiones**

**Rome, 22-29 June 2019
Rome, 22-29 juin 2019
Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019**

**THIRD MEETING OF COMMISSION II
TROISIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II
TERCERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II**

25 June 2019

The Third Meeting was opened at 10:02 hours
Mr Bommakanti Rajender,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La troisième séance est ouverte à 10 h 02
sous la présidence de M. Bommakanti Rajender,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la tercera reunión a las 10:02
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Bommakanti Rajender,
Presidente de la Comisión II

- Item 24. Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 (Draft Resolution on budget level) (continued)**
- Point 24. Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021 et Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget) (suite)**
- Tema 24. Plan a plazo medio para 2018-2021 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2020-2021 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto) (continuación)**
(C 2019/3; Information Note 1; C 2019/3-WA11; C 2019/LIM/4 Rev.1)

CHAIRPERSON

I am pleased to open the Third Meeting of Commission II.

We will now continue our discussions on Item 24, *Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2020-21*. This includes the Draft Resolution on the budget level. Please ensure that you have document C 2019/3 and C2019/3-WA-11 (Web Annex 11) in front of you. The extract of the Report of the 161st Session of the Council on this document is presented in C2019/LIM/4 Rev.1 including the recommended Draft Conference Resolution and the Budgetary Appropriation 2020-21.

Please also have before you document C 2019/3 Information Note 1 on the proposal to carry over any unspent balance of the 2018-19 budgetary appropriation for one time use in 2020-21.

Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)

We would like to echo many of the points that were made yesterday.

First, Canada welcomes FAO's efficiency gains and savings and we express our support for the flat nominal budget presented in the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2020-21 and we are confident that these will not impact negatively on the delivery on the Programme of Work and is actually presenting opportunities to explore how to better deliver it.

Second, we do appreciate FAO's continuity in the strategic direction to align its Strategic Framework with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We welcome the areas of emphasis and we would support the point made by Argentina yesterday regarding how FAO advocates on sustainable approaches, reminding, as many of the Governing Bodies have agreed, that they are context-specific, that we have to look at all the tools in the box and recalling some of the findings of the evaluations of Strategic Objective 2 and Strategic Objective 4, that it would be useful for FAO to look at trade-offs and go deeper into that discussion.

Third, like others, we would like to recall the fact that several Governing Bodies have made the decision and the last Council has requested that funding be increased in the PWB 2020-21 for the work of the IPPC and the joint Scientific Advice Programme for Codex Alimentarius and that we expect that this will be fully taken into account in the adjustments to the Programme of Work and Budget at the December Session of Council in 2019.

Fourth, we support the recommendation in the MTP 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21, to strengthen and develop indicators and targets for the Strategic Objective Outputs and in alignment with the recommendation included in the recent evaluations of FAO's work on gender. We would like FAO to strengthen the indicators that would go beyond gender discrimination data but that would include indicators that track changes in women empowerment levels that occur as a direct or indirect result of development interventions in order to better report on gender-related achievements across all Strategic Objectives (SOs).

In this regard, we recall the importance of the Action Plan to operationalize the updated Gender Equality Policy. We also encourage FAO to draw from IFAD and WFP experience, including in the respective commitment to adopt gender transformative approaches and the importance of receiving a report on an annual basis containing the progress made in achieving the implementation of the Gender Equality Policy and the Action Plan.

Fifth, on the issue of the Technical Cooperation Programmes (TCPs), we would like to support the recommendation of the Council to maintain it at 14 percent of the PWB, recalling the Conference

decision in this regard and to note, as was made by the statement of the Asia Group, that we would like to have a more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation on the effectiveness and efficiency of the TCPs on the ground, as well as encourage full use of the allocated amount and to explore whether it is the most effective approach or whether there are sources of funding that could be diversified.

Last, but not least, on the unspent balance. We would also like to support interventions made yesterday about the fact that there was a request of Council in December 2017 for proposals from the Secretariat to look at how to systematically address this issue and we would like the Conference to delegate to Council the authority of the one-time use for the next biennium, 2020-21, as well as how to address this in the future. This should be presented to the Governing Bodies in the fall.

Mr Winston RUDDER (Trinidad and Tobago)

The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago intervenes to commend the Secretariat on the coherence between the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Strategic Objectives of the Medium Term Plan 2018-21, and the activities outlined in the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21.

We welcome the enhanced alignment across these documents and we argue it is a planning methodology which can be adopted with appropriate modifications by countries within the Organization with limited agricultural planning capacity.

We note the constraints imposed by budgetary limitations on developing a more comprehensive Programme of Work and Budget and the concomitant increased dependence, inherently, on certain extrabudgetary resources to fulfil the Organization's mandate and meet the expectations of Member States.

We are grateful that the credibility of FAO and the generosity of willing donors have conspired to cover some funding gaps. But, we caution about the danger and uncertainty attendant upon such unsustainable approaches to financing critical development.

We appreciate the accommodation of the regional dimension in preparing the Programme of Work and Budget and in particular the focus on Latin America and the Caribbean on transforming food systems, addressing malnutrition in its many manifestations (overweight, obesity and micro-nutrient deficiencies), rural poverty, biodiversity and green financing.

We welcome consideration given to the improved delivery of activities and services, reminding that this is of immense importance to mitigating vulnerability in Small Island Developing States (SIDS), and, therefore, must be accorded more meaningful recognition within FAO.

Small may be beautiful but it is not without tremendous disadvantages. It should not be necessary to remind this Conference that 25 years ago, the United Nations Programme of Action on Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), popularly referred to as *the Barbados Programme of Action*, was developed as a global policy document to guide actions aimed at addressing the economic, environmental and social developmental vulnerabilities facing island states.

A lot has happened and much has been promised since 1994. Today we ask, can concerned Member Countries within FAO point to clearly identifiable, functional institutional arrangements for dealing with the SIDS Agenda? Do we have a coherent, differentiated and adequately funded programme to address the needs of the SIDS in FAO?

Two years ago there was a gala to launch the Global Action Programme on Food Security in SIDS: *Supporting the implementation of the Samoa Pathway*. I merely repeat that since 1994, much has been promised. We in the Caribbean Sub-Region of Latin America and the Caribbean, appreciate the continuing discussions on rationalizing institutional arrangements to more effectively serve the Small Island Member Countries.

However, we make the point that service delivery to these countries is severely compromised by extended use of out-posted technical officers as FAO Representatives (FAORs). This practice not only dilutes the impact of FAO's technical support but equally constrains its overall representational presence.

We remain convinced that programme delivery in the Caribbean Subregion will be considerably enhanced by a more informed assessment of the optimum mix of the critical decentralized technical expertise needed to match the requirements of Subregional agricultural, forestry and fisheries development.

We are also quite confident that it would be to the advantage of FAO and benefit of countries, if the Organization became more activist in the deepening dialogue on forging strategic partnerships with key Subregional institutions. This would not only enhance and streamline provision of vital technical support service but potentially expand access to resources inclusive of finance.

With these comments, Trinidad and Tobago endorses the MTP 2018-21 and expresses satisfaction that the activities detailed in the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21 align with the Strategic Objectives of the MTP. We also support the financial envelope developed to undertake the agreed PWB of FAO for the coming biennium.

Ms Vivi FERIANY (Indonesia)

Indonesia aligns itself with the Asia Group statement delivered yesterday by the Philippines and welcomes the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 (Reviewed) and Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21.

Indonesia appreciates the Director-General and the Secretariat's work to maintain a flat nominal budget with no change in the level of assessed contributions, while managing to address and realign focus of the Organization's strategic programmes with the current challenges and global developments in the food and agriculture sector.

We encourage the FAO Secretariat to continue its efforts to find savings and efficiencies. We welcome the effective presence of FAO at the country level that has closely worked with Member Countries through the Country Programming Framework (CPF).

For Indonesia, such a partnership provides beneficial technical support and programmes that become models for Indonesia in developing our national policies and scaling up innovative practices based on national priorities.

Therefore, we welcome the allocations of 14 percent of the budget for Technical Cooperation Programmes that directly benefits Member Countries. With a high number of young people, the Government of Indonesia currently focuses on engaging the youth in the agricultural sector through, amongst others, improving skills, knowledge, technology and innovation.

We also continue improving small-scale farmer's welfare that would contribute to reducing rural poverty and attracting a younger generation.

In this regard, we would like to seek the attention of the Secretariat to carefully assess the emphasis and the realignment of the Strategic Programmes by taking into account the Least Developed Countries' and Developing Countries' needs in their efforts to achieving food security and nutrition and other global commitments, such as the SDGs and of the UN Decade of Family Farming.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (United States of America)

Firstly, we would like to begin by commending the outgoing FAO Director-General, Dr José Graziano da Silva, for proposing a zero nominal growth budget and for his overall ability to manage FAO in difficult budgetary circumstances. We fully support the Draft Resolution.

We join other colleagues in calling for increased budgetary funding moving forward for the IPPC and also the joint Scientific Advice Programme for Codex Alimentarius. Similarly, as discussed at Council, we support maintaining the Technical Cooperation Programmes at 14 percent of the budget, but also fully support the need for a comprehensive assessment of its use moving forward.

On the unspent balance questions, we appreciate the work of the Secretariat in the Information Note provided and for getting ahead of this situation for this Conference, in contrast with previous Conferences.

But, we also join other delegations in calling for the Secretariat to move beyond that Information Note and to prepare a proposal on the systematic use of unspent balances of biennial appropriations in

future biennia, to be reviewed by the December Council following review by the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) as well as the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

Mr Haitham ABDELHADY (Egypt)

I would like to first thank the FAO management for presenting this document on the Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21. Egypt would also like to align itself with the statement delivered by Sudan, on behalf of Near East Group, and we would like to stress some additional points.

Egypt appreciates the significant efforts made by the Director-General to maintain a flat nominal budget by absorbing cost increases through efficiency savings that reached around USD 150 million in the last years.

We would like to reaffirm the importance of Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) appropriation in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in developing countries and, in this regard, we believe that TCPs, at 14 percent of the net budget, could be a good basis from which to increase to cope with Conference Resolution 9/89, which calls for increasing the share of TCPs to 17 percent of the budget.

In light of the increasing challenges we are facing today to achieve the Zero Hunger objectives by 2030, we believe that the time has come to seek innovative ways to increase TCP share of the budget in the upcoming biennium to support developing countries in their tireless efforts to achieve the SDGs by 2030.

The delegation of Egypt believes that increasing the TCP share in the biennium 2020-21 is timely, following the election of a new Director-General and also given the increasing number of hungry people in the last three years.

Regarding the increasing of the TCPs share in the budget, we are very open to any options to increase the financial resources to support developing countries, through budgetary resources or extrabudgetary resources, and through voluntary contributions, to address the priorities of the Organization and also to support developing countries.

Mr Salah Yousef Ahmed AL TARAWNEH (Jordan) (Original Language Arabic)

On behalf of the Near East Group, we support the interventions from Egypt and the United States of America, and would like to stress the assessment of the Technical Cooperation Programmes.

Yesterday, Jordan's Minister for Agriculture had a meeting with Dr Qu Dongyu and we also held a meeting with the Arab Group comprising 21 Ministers of Agriculture. We must move away from paper information practices and move into the field. The Near East and North Africa (NENA) is suffering major problems. When we want to implement plans and programmes that are on paper, we find that we are lacking the resources to do so.

Therefore, we hope that this Conference can re-guide the TCPs so that we can have concrete achievements, particularly *vis-à-vis* family farming.

Mme Jeanne DAMBENDZET (Congo)

La délégation congolaise se joint aux premiers intervenants pour rendre hommage au Directeur général sortant, pour son action efficace à la tête de la FAO durant son mandat, et lui souhaite plein succès dans la vie qu'il va mener maintenant, assurés qu'il saura mettre à profit le repos qu'il mérite et l'exploitation de l'expertise acquise dans son rôle de Directeur général de cette grande Organisation qu'est la FAO.

À Son Excellence Monsieur le Directeur général élu, je formule des vœux de bonheur, de succès et de grande réussite à la tête de notre Organisation. La préparation du Plan à moyen terme 2018-2021 révisé et le Programme de travail et budget 2020-2021 constitue sans nul doute un exercice qui exige de lui esprit d'imagination, d'ingéniosité et d'innovation pour prendre en compte les nouveaux défis et

enjeux qui ne cessent de se diversifier et deviennent de plus en plus complexes dans certaines régions du monde.

Je voudrais revenir sur ce que j'ai souligné avant-hier, à savoir que la FAO devra déployer plus d'ingéniosité et d'imagination pour renforcer son action à l'endroit des femmes, qui sont dans certains pays des actrices déterminantes dans le domaine de l'agriculture et dans l'évolution de la vie dans le monde rural. Le Congo insiste pour que la FAO, qui est une Organisation unique et travaille pour le relèvement de la situation des paysans du monde entier, développe une activité innovante.

Nous acceptons le budget proposé, qui serait cependant plus pertinent si l'on regardait davantage la situation des productrices afin de les aider à se former, à s'approprier des nouvelles technologies, même les plus simples, en mettant à leur disposition des crédits de proximité, en améliorant l'accès aux bassins de production qui souvent sont enclavés, et en les aidant à améliorer leur santé.

Les équipes mobiles de santé d'il y a à peu près 50 ans rendaient des services immenses aux populations. Malgré les progrès réalisés, la situation dans de nombreuses zones rurales reste encore pénible et mérite d'être soutenue.

L'analyse des contraintes par zones et la définition des actions menées me paraît une stratégie plus efficace et appropriée que les définitions d'ordre général qui ne prennent pas toujours en compte la réalité du terrain. Avec ces commentaires, le Congo au nom du Groupe Afrique, adopte le document.

Mr Manash MITRA (Bangladesh)

Bangladesh would like to support the intervention delivered by the Philippines on behalf of the Asia Regional Group.

At the outset, I would like to congratulate Dr Qu Dongyu on his election as the ninth Director-General of this specialised institution of the United Nations. We would also like to thank the outgoing Director-General for the commendable work he has done during his two tenures, especially to accommodate the demands of FAO Members within the flat nominal budget.

Bangladesh would like to also express our appreciation of the proposal made by the FAO management on the Medium Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget for 2020-21. At the same time, we would like to echo the statement made by Egypt that the new Director-General should have a comprehensive review of the Technical Cooperation Programme at the field level, the achievements, monitoring and evaluation of the Technical Cooperation Programme and how to better support the FAO Members with this Technical Cooperation Programme.

We would also like to make a comment on the unspent balance and the Information Note provided by FAO management. We would like to have a systematic review of the unspent balance that we would like to use for the next biennium.

Mr Jun LI (China) (Original language Chinese)

China appreciates the USD 29.9 million of savings, as well as the other re-allocations that have been made, especially for innovative practices for sustainable food and agriculture and nutrition-sensitive farming. China welcomes taking into consideration gender equality across the board, as well as budgetary resources.

China encourages FAO to step up to continue its 14 percent share of the Technical Cooperation Programme. China is among developing countries and hopes to have more actions for food security and hopes that FAO will step up its work to ensure the timely payments of the Technical Cooperation Programme.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

We thank you for endorsing the budget level as presented, which as you know is a flat nominal budget with no change in the level of the assessed contributions or the net budgetary appropriation. I also appreciate that many of you have acknowledged the large number of efficiency savings that we have been able to identify over the previous biennia to be able to present this type of budget to you.

I would also like to reassure you that our seeking efficiency savings is an ongoing activity. We are continuing to monitor, for example, our cost increase assumptions for 2020-21, as well as other assumptions built into the budget, to see if there are any further savings that can be identified. We have taken note in this regard of the request for additional funding in various areas, which I am sure will be highlighted in the Report as well.

As you know, the next steps would be that the Conference approves the budgetary appropriations Resolution along with the Report that would contain this further guidance and that then we would move to preparing the document adjustments to the Programme of Work and Budget 2020-21, which will go to the Programme and Finance Committees and the joint Session in November of this year and to Council in December of this year.

Thank you also for your comments on the carry-over of the unspent balance, if there is an unspent balance from the 2018-19 budgetary appropriations. We have taken note that you have reminded us and recalled the importance of presenting a proposal on the systematic use of the unspent balance. So, we hope to be able to do that by the next Session as requested by several of the distinguished delegates.

CHAIRPERSON

1. The Conference considered the Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2018-21 (Reviewed) and the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2020-21, the observations and recommendations of the Council as relates to the information provided to the Secretariat in Information Note 1.
2. The Conference commended the Organization for its maintenance of a flat nominal regular programme budget and its increase of voluntary contributions to facilitate achievements of the Strategic Objectives and implementation of the integrated Programme of Work.
3. Regarding the substance of the proposals in the MTP and PWB, the Conference:
 - a) appreciated the close alignment of FAO's Strategic Objectives with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
 - b) supported the priority areas of de-emphasis and resource allocations including the additional resources for innovation and sustainable agriculture approaches and for combating all forms of malnutrition and promoting nutrition-sensitive sustainable food systems;
 - c) requested that FAO increase the funding of the PWB 2020-21 through efficiencies and cost savings without negatively impacting the delivery of the agreed Programme of Work or, if necessary, from the areas of technical de-emphasis to the extent feasible for:
 - FAO's work on the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and on Joint FAO/WHO Scientific Advice Programme;
 - Mainstreaming biodiversity at FAO;
 - d) noted that adjustments in resource allocations and results framework arising from decisions and guidance of the Governing Bodies and from the work planning process would be reported in the adjustments to the PWB 2020-21 for consideration by the Council in December 2019;
 - e) encouraged continued monitoring of cost increase assumptions and further review of opportunities for savings and efficiency measures in order to facilitate consideration of the proposals with the Council in December 2019;
 - f) reaffirmed the importance of Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) appropriation in achieving the SDGs and welcomed the share of the TCP at 14 percent of the net budgetary appropriation, while taking note of the Conference Resolution 9/89 and the recommendation of the Conference at its 39th Session;
 - g) highlighted the importance of addressing antimicrobial resistance (AMR) to contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;

- h) stressed the importance of multilingualism at FAO and underlined the importance of maintaining the integrity of language service capacity within the PWB 2020-21.
4. In addition, the Conference:
- a) welcomed the proposed flat nominal budget level with no change in the level of assessed contributions and net budgetary appropriation compared with 2018-19;
 - b) appreciated the identification of efficiency gains and savings with a view to reallocating USD 29.9 million to cover cost increases and priority areas without negatively impacting the delivery of the Programme of Work;
 - c) encouraged Members to continue to provide voluntary contributions for the sustainable funding of the integrated Programme of Work and Budget.
5. Concerning the longer-term financial health of the Organization, the Conference deferred the future biennial replenishment of the working capital fund as well as incremental funding of the after-service medical coverage past service liability.
6. The Conference authorized the Director-General, notwithstanding Financial Regulation 4.2, to use any unspent balance of 2018-19 appropriations for one-time uses in 2020-21 in agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at their Meetings in November/December 2019; and recalled the Council's request for a proposal to be presented under systematic use of unspent balances of biennial appropriations.
7. The following review by the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM) and Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee's footnote CL 158/REP, Paragraph 10 (c) and requested that such a proposal be presented to their next Sessions.
8. The Conference adopted the following Resolution as recommended by the Council, Resolution 20/2019, Budgetary Appropriations 2020-21.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I might come back with some other comments, but right now, I am referring to the section of your conclusion regarding the use of the unspent balance. So, if you could kindly scroll down, I believe it is Paragraph 6.

The language seems to get the gist of what we were trying to say, but it should be presented the other way round because what we requested was first for the proposal of the systematic use of the unspent balance that was requested back in 2017 to be put in place. A decision should be taken regarding this systematic use, this procedural use of unspent balance and this decision should be taken first before the Council takes the decision on how to actually use the unspent balance.

While the gist seems right in your language, the timing should be the other way around. The Programme and Finance Committee, plus the Council in November and December 2019, should first put in place and agree on the systematic use of the unspent balance and following a decision by the Council in December 2019, the joint meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee in the Spring of 2020 and the Council in 2020 should take a decision based on those systematic use guidelines from the Council in December.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Paragraph 6 says that the Director-General is authorized, notwithstanding Financial Regulation 4.2, to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations. That would need to remain in the Report, because the Conference is the only body that has the authority to grant that authorization.

I believe what the distinguished representative from Romania is suggesting was something that I had not quite understood earlier. We were suggesting that it would be the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee and the Council at their meetings in November and December 2019 that would agree on the use of the carry-over. But, I believe now it is being suggested that it would actually be the Joint Meeting and the Council in April and May of 2020 to agree on the carry-over.

Legal Counsel is not here with us right now. But my understanding would be that that would be acceptable. We do not know the full amount of the carry-over until around March of 2020 in any case, when the financial accounts close for the 2018-19 biennium.

As long as the Conference does provide that authority, I do not believe that there would be a major issue with delaying the decision on the use of those funds until the first Meetings of the Joint Meeting and the Council in 2020.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

It seems that we are on the right track now. Just one more point that should also be reflected in your text. The Conference should delegate to the Council the authority to do this, to authorize the Director-General. Not the Conference authorizing, but the Conference should delegate the authority to the Council.

If it is helpful, I have a proposal for a text. I can read it for your consideration and even submit it to you in writing to see if it is even clearer. It reads as follows:

- Request the management to submit a proposal on the systematic use of unspent balance of biennial appropriations in future biennia to be reviewed by the CCLM and the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at their Meetings in November-December 2019.
- Request that the Conference delegate to the Council the authority to authorize the Director-General to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations for one-time use in 2020-21.
- The Council should exercise this authority based on the recommendations of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees at their Spring Session in 2020.

That is our proposition, Chair. I hope it is very clear in this matter.

CHAIRPERSON

Is it the appropriate language?

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Much of what is being suggested here by the delegate of Romania is also the gist of what the original Paragraph said, related to authorizing the Director-General. One way to approach it would be to change the dates that are in this Paragraph to say an agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council at the Meetings in April and May of 2020. That would allow us to stick with the normal wording for this type of authority.

The way the EU proposal is worded right now, it is that the Conference delegates to the Council. That would need to be reviewed by our Legal Counsel. I am not positive if that would be the appropriate way to express it.

I wonder if an easier way might be to change the dates in the original paragraph which reflects the type of wording that is normally used for this type of authority.

Mr Haitham ABDELHADY (Egypt)

I am very confused about this additional language proposed by the esteemed delegate of Romania and we need to get the advice of the Legal Counsel. We are very comfortable with the original language. I cannot really understand this new language and I think we need to consult our Legal Counsel.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Our Legal Counsel has suggested that changing the dates in the original wording would be the preferable approach but that the new wording presented, from a legal point of view, would also be acceptable. His question was how the delegation would be related to the agreement on the use of the funds, because those elements are no longer present in the same paragraph.

There is the delegation and the agreement. This is why we believe the original Paragraph wording with the change in dates would be the preferable one. But, he has confirmed that the language is acceptable from a legal point of view in the proposed one as well.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We wanted to reiterate the language of ours, also, to try to be as clear as possible in our intentions here and also to emphasise that it is a matter of sequence on how we should proceed because there are still open, pending issues dating from the Council in 2017 that clearly should be taken care of first. That would be the decision on the systematic use of the unspent balance. I think that we got this message through and only after that, based on this issue being solved and on the conclusions on this issue, the Council should state the decision.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Perhaps I could suggest that we do two things. One is that we invert the sequence of these two Paragraphs, so that we first have the proposal to be presented, and then we have the Paragraph which authorizes the Director-General, and we could even add at the end of that Paragraph, “following review of the proposal presented”, so that it is clear that the next step on the use of the funds comes after the review of the systematic proposal.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I think we are clear now and we are willing to go along with the newly amended text proposed by the Secretariat and by Management.

Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)

I think this is a very useful discussion and I thank you for the clarification. We very much support this logical order. I was just wondering if, for the second Paragraph, do we need to have a proposal for the use for 2020-21 that is distinct from a proposal on the systematic use or for the approval for the authorization in Spring 2020. My question is; will we receive two proposals that are distinct? I think that we should clarify that.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Yes, certainly, that was what was meant by the second Paragraph in the part where it says, “in agreement with the Joint Meeting”. But we could make that clearer to say “the agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council would be based on a proposal that would be put forward at that time for the use of the funds”. Perhaps it could be, “authorized the Director-General notwithstanding financial regulation 4.2 to use any unspent balance of the 2018-19 appropriations for one-time use in 2021 to be presented in a proposal and in agreement with the...”, something like this.

Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)

That is clearer. Another way would have been to start that sub-paragraph by saying “requested the management to submit a proposal on the one-time use” and then say that you “authorized the Director-General to use it in agreement with...” But, I am flexible, as long as it is clear that we will have a specific proposal in advance to look at.

CHAIRPERSON

We can clarify this Paragraph.

“Recall Council’s request for a proposal to be presented and the systematic use of unspent balances of biennial appropriations following review by the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters and the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee’s -footnote CL 158/REP, Paragraph 10 (c) - and requested that such a proposal be presented to the next Sessions;

Authorised the Director-General, notwithstanding the financial regulation 4.2, to use any unspent balances in 2018/19 appropriations for one-time use in 2020-21 to be presented in a proposal and in

agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and Council at their meeting in April-May 2020 following review of the proposal presented”.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

I realize the language is a bit awkward now because we have the proposal presented twice, but I believe that we can work on the language to make it clear.

CHAIRPERSON

We welcome this and we will go to the other paragraphs, please, we will discuss this again.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

Just a matter of maybe being clear on Paragraph (a) regarding the time of the next Sessions because they vary. CCLM is usually in October, the Programme and Finance Committees in November, and of course Council in December. So the next Sessions should be in the next Session in October, November, December 2019.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

Regarding Paragraph (b), I would suggest perhaps after “for one-time use in 2021”, we say “requested that the proposed use be elaborated and presented for agreement of”, and then the rest of the sentence, “the joint meeting”.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

It is okay for us.

Mr Theodore Andrei BAUZON (Philippines)

I just wanted to confirm that the authority given by the Conference to the Director-General to use the unspent balance is a conditional authority once there is an agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee and the Council. Just so it is clear that until there is an agreement in the Programme Committee and Finance Committee and the Council, there is no authority, it cannot be immediately used for the unspent balance.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

I believe that this is similar wording that was used for the last biennium where it was a similar situation. So I believe that that would be inherent in this paragraph. But if any of the delegates have suggested wording, we are open to that as well.

Ms Mi NGUYEN (Canada)

I do not know if that could help on the third line to say instead of ‘Requested’, ‘Choosing the unspent balance based on a proposal to be submitted to the Joint Meeting for their agreement’.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

The sentence now is ‘Based on a proposal to be submitted to the Joint Meeting’. You may wish to continue to include in there ‘and agreed’. It would read ‘Based on a proposal to be submitted and agreed’.

Mr Abdul Razak AYZI (Afghanistan)

It is not very clear. I do not understand it. It quite clearly says “Authorized by Director-General 2020-21 in agreement with the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees”.

CHAIRPERSON

Agreed. Submitted and agreed by the Programme and Finance Committees, or “in agreement with the”. The content is the same. There is no change in the content and the spirit, but the language needs

to be, 'Submitted and in agreement'. Please finalize the draft so that we can read it once again. Paragraph 6 is almost final. Are there any positions in other Paragraphs please?

Mr Ryan WILSON (Australia)

I was here in April for the discussion about the Programme of Work and Budget and I found that a very stimulating discussion. The one particular difference I noticed with the discussion we had this morning there were quite a few references to the particular needs of Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

That was sort of an additional theme that I did not really hear in the Council discussion, so I wondered whether somewhere appropriate in the sequence, we add a small line that says, 'and noted the particular requirements of SIDS, maybe as a standalone.

I would have to see the whole thing, but there might be somewhere where we get into substance. Maybe after Paragraph (c), add a generic reference given that that was a recurring theme. I counted at least four countries that made a comment about that, so it would be good to have a small reference if other delegations would be okay with that.

CHAIRPERSON

Any comments and suggestions on the proposal given by Australia regarding inclusion of SIDS?

Mr Winston RUDDER (Trinidad and Tobago)

I would agree with the proposal by Australia.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

Just one other thing that came to my mind would be that, the point of FAO's commitment to the UN Reform has been brought up in some of the interventions and we think that it would be good to be reflected somewhere in your conclusions. We don't really have an opinion where or how, but, just a general reference to the continuation of FAO's commitment to the UN Reform I think would be welcomed. But we will leave it to your decision and judgement.

CHAIRPERSON

I think it was already mentioned in the previous Items 22 and 23 so there is no problem.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

I would say: "Noted the special technical and developmental needs of Small Island Developing States".

Sra. Angela TEVES LIBARONA (Argentina)

Gracias por la presentación de este resumen que contiene las conclusiones que reflejan, en grandes líneas, los principales puntos que hemos abordado en este debate. En el apartado 3, aunque se listan todas las cuestiones relacionadas con la sustancia de las propuestas del PPM y el PTP, no se ven reflejados también dos de los comentarios que ha presentado la delegación argentina.

El primero tiene que ver con la importancia de tener en cuenta las prioridades de todos los países incluidos los que presentan ingresos medios e ingresos medios altos: eso es sumamente importante en el contexto de los diferentes países que, si bien, han experimentado altos niveles de crecimiento económico aún conviven con la desigualdad y con niveles de pobreza e inseguridad alimentaria, en especial modo en las zonas rurales. Entonces, quisiera proponer la inclusión bajo el apartado 3 de una frase que refleje este comentario.

Aunque no sepa en cual específica parte del apartado el comentario pueda ser insertado, lo importante es que sea parte de eso y que enfatice la importancia de tener en cuenta las prioridades de todos los países, incluidos los de ingresos medios e ingresos medios altos.

Mr Manash MITRA (Bangladesh)

We would like to come to the point of the Paragraph now it has been changed about the TCP. I am just wondering because in the Asia Group statement, even some of the Member Countries have mentioned having a comprehensive review and to get a report on the TCP projects and the monitoring and evaluation review of the TCP implementation for the next biennium. I think we should include this in somewhere after (g) maybe?

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

I would suggest that we use similar language as was in the last Council Report which would be: “Requested a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation review of TCP implementation in the next biennium”.

Mr Manash MITRA (Bangladesh)

What would be the timeline of getting this report? Should we mention anything about this?

CHAIRPERSON

I think it is a general broad thing, in principal, that we ought to agree. Ms Crawford, regarding the timeframe, can we include it in this particular sentence?

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

The wording ‘in the next biennium’ is referring to when this comprehensive review would be submitted but we were not specific. Perhaps, we could leave it like this so that we could work out our schedule of reporting for next biennium.

Sra. Angela TEVES LIBARONA (Argentina)

Quisiera volver a discutir sobre el segundo comentario que estaba pendiente. El citado comentario hace siempre referencia al apartado 3, y tiene que ver con la mención que hizo mi delegación a la necesidad de que se tomen en consideración todos los enfoques relacionados con la agricultura sostenible y que no se priorice un específico tema sobre otro en la preparación del programa de trabajo de la FAO. Tal vez, este comentario podría incorporarse después del párrafo b) y podríamos remitirnos a la redacción del texto utilizada por el Consejo en su última sesión: en esa se subraya que se “recalcó la necesidad de tomar en consideración todos los enfoques relacionados con los sistemas alimentarios y la agricultura sostenibles en la preparación del programa de trabajo de FAO”.

CHAIRPERSON

We are writing a separate paragraph for that. Any more suggestions?

Mr Abdul Razak AYZI (Afghanistan)

I would say “requested an evaluation of the TCP Programme in the next biennium”. We are not only evaluating the implementation we want to evaluate the formulation, follow up, implementation, essentially everything. Our suggestion would be “requesting the evaluation of the TCP Programme in the next biennium”.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

In relation to the comment just made by our distinguished colleague from Afghanistan, we would prefer to stick to the language that has already been agreed within the Council in order not to reopen another debate on this issue, which is the language that we just presented and was read by management straight from the Report of the Council.

Mr Abdul Razak AYZI (Afghanistan)

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON

If there are no more suggestions we will read out the draft conclusions. Afterwards, if anyone still has some suggestions please, feel free to make them. It is not the final one, I think a second draft will be read again.

1. The Conference considered the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) 2018-21 (Reviewed) and the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2020-21, the observations and the recommendations of the Council as relates to the additional information provided by the Secretariat in Information Note 1.
2. The Conference commended the Organization for its maintenance of a flat nominal regular programme budget and its increase of voluntary contributions to facilitate achievement of Strategic Objectives and implementation of integrated Programme of Work.
3. Regarding the substance of proposals of the MTP, PWB, the Conference:
 - (a) appreciated the close alignment of FAO's Strategic Objectives with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
 - (b) supported the priorities, areas of de-emphasis and resource allocations including the additional resources for innovative and sustainable agriculture approaches and for combatting all forms of malnutrition and promoting nutrition sensitive sustainable food systems;
 - (c) requested that FAO increase the funding in the PWB 2020-21 through efficiencies and cost savings without negatively impacting the delivery of the agreed Programme of Work or, if necessary, from the areas of technical de-emphasis to the extent feasible for (i) FAO's work on the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and a joint FAO/WHO Scientific Advice Programme and (ii) Mainstreaming Biodiversity at FAO;
 - (d) noted the special technical and development needs of Small Island Developing States (SIDs);
 - (e) noted that adjustments in resource allocations and resource frameworks arising from the assistance and guidance of the Governing Bodies and from the work planning process would be reported in the adjustment to the PWB 2020/21 for consideration by the Council in December 2019;
 - (f) encouraged continued monitoring of cost in these assumptions and further review of opportunities for savings and efficiency measures in order to facilitate consideration of the proposals by the Council in December 2019;
 - (g) reaffirmed the importance of Technical Cooperation Programme appropriation in achieving the SDGs and welcomed the share of TCP at 14 percent of the net budgetary appropriation while taking note of the Conference's Resolution 9/89 Recommendation of the Conference at its 39th Session;
 - (h) requested a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Review of TCP implementation in the next biennium;
 - (i) highlighted the importance of addressing Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) to contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
 - (j) Stressed the importance of multilingualism at FAO and underlined the importance of maintaining the integrity of language service capacity within the PWB 2020-21;
 - (j) emphasized the need to take into account priorities for all countries, including middle-income and upper middle-income countries;
 - (k) stressed the need for considering all approaches regarding sustainable agriculture and food systems in the preparation for the Programme of Work for the Organization.

4. In addition, the Conference:
 - (a) welcomed the proposal to flatten the nominal budget level with no change in the level of assist contribution and net budgetary appropriation compared with 2018/19;
 - (b) appreciated the identification of efficiency gains and savings with a view to reallocating USD 29.9 million to cover cost increases in priority areas without negatively impacting the delivery of the Programme of Work; and
 - (c) encouraged Members to continue to provide voluntary contributions for the sustainable funding of the integrated Programme of Work and Budget.
5. Concerning the longer-term financial health of the Organization, the Conference deferred to future biennia the replenishment of the working capital fund as well as incremental funding of the After-Service Medical Coverage past service liability.
6. The Conference:
 - (a) recalled the Council's request for a proposal to be presented on the systematic use of unspent balances of biennial appropriations, following review of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters and the joint meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees, (footnote CL 158/REP paragraph 10 (c)), and requested that such a proposal be presented to their next Sessions in October-December 2019;
 - (b) authorized the Director-General notwithstanding financial regulation 4.2 to use any unspent balance of the 2018/19 appropriations for one time-use in 2020-21 based on a proposal to be submitted and agreed by the joint meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees and Council at their meetings in April-May 2020 following a review of the proposal presented.
7. The Conference adopted the following Resolution as recommended by the Council, Resolution 20/2019 Budgetary Appropriations 2020/21.

Mr Haitham ABDELHADY (Egypt)

I think a lot of countries including Egypt have raised this issue, to consider a potential increase in TCP and we did not find anything here relating to this issue.

Also, during our deliberation in the Council, you forgot to indicate here the footnote of the two Resolutions 9/89 and also the Resolution of the recommendations of 2015. So I would like to see these two footnotes here in the Conference.

We indicate this to educate and also provide all the Membership the language of these two Resolutions. So I would like to indicate these two footnotes and put it in the Report.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (United States of America)

In response to my distinguished Egyptian colleague's point, colleagues will recall how contentious the debate was on this matter in Council, I would therefore ask that the language in this Conference Resolution map as closely as possible the language which we ultimately agreed upon in Council. That said, I believe the two footnotes that my Egyptian colleague noted were part of that Council Report, so we would not have any objection to seeing those included here.

CHAIRPERSON

We must go with the language and it was a very big debate in the Council for a very long time and we agreed on the language. I think you were all part of that.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

We fully support the intervention made by the United States. We would also like to recall that we requested that maybe something regarding the Reform of the UN System be included, but it was not so. We have a suggestion if we go to the end of Paragraph (3) to add another subparagraph. Very short and very concise.

CHAIRPERSON

We have included that as a footnote which I have indicated. We will try to first include the UN Reform then you may speak.

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

I think we did not make ourselves very clear. We were not asking for the inclusion of the footnotes. We were asking for inclusion of a subparagraph under (3) regarding the UN Reform, which we were willing to read. So we were asking for you to go back.

CHAIRPERSON

It is not your suggestion we have included. It is the suggestion of Egypt we have included. Sorry. And your suggestion regarding UN Reform will also be included. Just wait for a moment. So if we can formulate the language we will just include “regarding the UN Reform.”

Mr Vlad MUSTACIOSU (Romania)

Subparagraph, “and highlighted the importance of the full implementation of the UN Development System Reform”. That is it, the full implementation.

Mr Haitham ABDEL-HADY (Egypt)

Can we go please down to see the footnote, because I think we also forgot here to indicate the link of these two Resolutions, as indicated in the Council Report.

CHAIRPERSON

We will do that.

Ms Angela TEVES LIBARONA (Argentina)

I would like to go back to Paragraph 5. I do not think we have mentioned these matters on the floor today. I would like to know where this is coming from.

Ms Beth CRAWFORD (Director of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

It is correct that it was not mentioned on the floor of the Conference. This is however a topic that is included in the Programme of Work and Budget and is for decision by the Conference. It was first the Finance Committee that recommended the deferral of this replenishment and then Council concurred with that, which is why I believe there was not much discussion on this today because it was already decided. Generally, it would be appropriate to nonetheless include it in your Report to make it clear that this is the final decision of Conference, as well on this topic.

CHAIRPERSON

This concludes Agenda Item 24. Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation in the deliberations.

With this, we have concluded our work in Commission II. The timing of the Drafting Committee will be confirmed through the Journal. We will reconvene as Commission II for the Adoption of the Report once the Drafting Committee completes its work. The timing of this will also be confirmed through the Journal. If this is acceptable then I look forward to seeing you for the adoption of the Report. This meeting of Commission II is adjourned.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

The meeting rose at 11:43 hours

La séance est levée à 11 h 43

Se levanta la sesión a las 11:43

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE CONFERENCIA

Forty-first Session Quarante et unième session 41.º período de sesiones
Rome, 22-29 June 2019 Rome, 22-29 juin 2019 Roma, 22-29 de junio de 2019
FOURTH MEETING OF COMMISSION II QUATRIÈME SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II CUARTA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II
25 June 2019

The Fourth Meeting was opened at 14:54 hours
Mr Bommakanti Rajender,,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La quatrième séance est ouverte à 14 h 54
sous la présidence de M. Bommakanti Rajender,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la cuarta reunión a las 14:54
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Bommakanti Rajender,
Presidente de la Comisión II

**Adoption of Report / Adoption du Rapport / Aprobación del Informe
(C 2019/II/REP)****CHAIRPERSON**

It gives me great pleasure and honour to speak to you on behalf of Commission II for the adoption of its Report. I will now give the floor to Mr Thomas Duffy of the United States of America, the Chairperson of the Drafting Committee, to report on its proceedings and the preparation of the Report of Commission II that is before us today.

Mr Thomas DUFFY (Chairperson, Drafting Committee Commission II)

Let me begin by paying our respects and our gratitude to the Chair of Commission II who every ably led us through some potentially controversial discussions and maintained a process full of consensus and careful discussion.

Indeed, the work of the Drafting Committee for Commission II was made very simple because of the inclusive way that the Chair of Commission II worked out the draft language of the Report with all Members of Commission II. So, we only covered three items as compared to Commission I which had a much longer Agenda of items. But for our three items, for two of the three items, in fact, we borrowed a practice from FAO Council and put those documents on the screen.

That initiative helped colleagues to have a thorough discussion in Commission II, which, I will admit, drew on much fuller discussions in FAO Council and in the appropriate Committees. But the sum was that we were very rapidly in the Drafting Committee in Commission II to get through the draft report you in front of you.

We think that the draft Report, which had only minor changes present in the Drafting Committee, is an accurate reflection of the discussions in Commission II, but we also drew heavily on extensive discussions that we all had had at FAO Council and in the Programme and Finance Committees.

We think that the draft Report you see before you is an accurate summation of the points raised at all three levels of FAO Governance and we recommend its adoption *en bloc*.

CHAIRPERSON

After reflecting on the work of the Drafting Committee, I recommend to Commission II to adopt the Report of Commission II, *en bloc*.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Thank you very much for your participation and your valuable interventions. I would like to place on record my deep appreciation for the Drafting Committee, the Chairperson and all the Members, and the Secretariat and all the Member Countries for your active participation and cooperation.

With this I close the meeting of Commission II and thank you for your participation.

The meeting rose at 14:56 hours

La séance est levée à 14 h 56

Se levanta la sesión a las 14:56

