


May 2011

	منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة	联合国 粮食及 农业组织	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture	Продовольствен ная и сельскохозяйств енная организация Объединенных Наций	Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación
---	--	--------------------	---	---	---	--

## COUNCIL

### Hundred and Forty-third Session

Rome, 28 November – 2 December 2011

Report of the 107<sup>th</sup> (Special) Session of the Programme Committee  
(Rome, 16-17 May 2011)

### Table of Contents

	Page
Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable .....	2
<b>I. Evaluation</b> .....	2
Evaluation of FAO's interventions funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and Management Response.....	2
FAO's effectiveness at country level: A synthesis of evaluations in large, rapidly- developing countries (India and Brazil) and Management Response .....	3
Appointment of the Director of Evaluation.....	3
<b>II. Standing Items</b> .....	4
Report of progress on the Multi-year Programme of Work (MYPOW) of the Committee ..	4
Date and place of the Hundred and Eighth session .....	4
Any Other Business .....	4
Annex 1 .....	5

## REPORT OF THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH (SPECIAL) SESSION OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Rome, 16 - 17 May 2011

### INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee submitted to the Council the following report of its Hundred and Seventh session.
2. In addition to the Chairperson, Ms Riikka Laatu (Finland), the following representatives of Members were present:

Mr A.R. Ayazi (Afghanistan)	Mr M. Valicenti (Canada)
Mr C.A. Amaral (Angola)	Mr M. Hosni (Egypt)
Ms M. del Carmen Squeff (Argentina)	H.E. C. Obama Ondo (Equatorial Guinea)
Mr T.S. Power (Australia)	Mr T.G. Haußmann (Germany)
Ms S. Afroz (Bangladesh)	Mr K. Shioya (Japan)
Ms M. van Dooren (Belgium)	

3. The Chairperson informed the Committee that Mr Thomas G. Haußmann had been designated to replace Ms Swantje Nilsson as the representative of Germany for this session. A summary of the qualifications of the above representative is given in the addendum to this report<sup>1</sup>.

#### **Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable<sup>2</sup>**

4. The Agenda and Timetable for the meeting were approved.

### **I. Evaluation**

#### **Evaluation of FAO's interventions funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and Management Response<sup>3</sup>**

5. The Committee noted that the Evaluation was comprehensive and appreciated the good work done by FAO in emergencies. The Committee:
  - a) recommended that the Secretariat further strengthen its partnerships and emphasized the principle of giving visibility to implementing partners in project completion reports;
  - b) recommended that efforts be continued to ensure that emergency activities and development work at country-level are complementary; and
  - c) requested that the Secretariat address concerns raised in the Evaluation related to improving the capacity of country offices.
6. The Committee noted the Evaluation was timed to serve as an input in the food security sector for the ongoing five-year global evaluation of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and suggested that the recommendations from the present Evaluation addressed to the CERF Secretariat be included as input to the global evaluation of the CERF.

---

<sup>1</sup> CL 143/5 Add. 1

<sup>2</sup> PC 107/1; PC 107/INF/1

<sup>3</sup> PC 106/4; PC 106/4 Sup.1

7. The Committee requested that:
- a) The Office of Evaluation (OED) undertake a comprehensive review of recommendations made in other relevant Evaluations to be used in the Secretariat's follow-up report on the Evaluation of FAO's Operational Capacity in Emergencies<sup>4</sup>;
  - b) OED prepare an analysis of relevant Evaluation recommendations relating to the capacity of country offices to fulfill their mandate, for the Committee's consideration; and
  - c) the Secretariat be more specific about the nature of the requirements for additional funding to implement recommendations when this is indicated in the Management Response.

**FAO's effectiveness at country level: A synthesis of evaluations in large, rapidly-developing countries (India and Brazil) and Management Response<sup>5</sup>**

8. The Committee appreciated the synthesis report of Evaluations in two large, rapidly developing countries (India and Brazil) and welcomed Management's positive response to the recommendations made.
9. The Committee was concerned about the feasibility of implementing the recommendation to develop with each International Financial Institution protocols for project administration, finance, audit and reporting that would apply to any initiative funded by that Institution and executed or implemented by FAO.
10. The Committee recommended that:
- a) the recommendations in country Evaluation synthesis reports be considered for use by other countries, where applicable;
  - b) the experience gained from country Evaluations be used in enriching the scope, quality and modality of South-South Cooperation;
  - c) knowledge sharing within and between countries be improved;
  - d) recommendations of country Evaluation synthesis reports and Management Responses be more precise;
  - e) special attention be paid to the access and use of FAO's information products in all FAO languages and from different cultural environments;
  - f) the nature of this kind of synthesis report of country Evaluations be considered in the review of the next Rolling Work Plan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation.

**Appointment of the Director of Evaluation<sup>6</sup>**

11. The Committee recalled that at its 106<sup>th</sup> Session it had been informed that the Director of Evaluation would be retiring on 30 September 2011, under Staff Regulation 301.9.5 whereby "*staff members may not be retained in active service beyond the age of 62 years, unless the Director-General, in the interests of the Organization, extends this age limit in exceptional circumstances*". The Committee requested the Chairperson to write to the Director-General, on behalf of the Committee, asking him to consider extending the appointment of the Director of Evaluation under that Staff Regulation, so that the Director could serve for a four-year term as foreseen in the Charter. The Committee noted that the Director-General had accepted to extend the appointment of the Director of Evaluation until the end of the period foreseen in the Charter.

12. The Committee examined document PC 107/2 entitled "*Proposed amendment to the Charter of the Office of Evaluation*" prepared at the request of the Programme Committee, at its 106<sup>th</sup> Session, and containing options for the amendment of the Charter.

---

<sup>4</sup> PC 103/7 - FC 132/10

<sup>5</sup> PC 106/6; PC 106/6 Sup.1

<sup>6</sup> PC 106/9; PC 107/2

13. The Committee recommended to the Council that paragraph 43 of the Charter should be amended to read as follows:

43. *The Director of Evaluation serves for a fixed term of four years with a possibility of reappointment only once for a further term of four years. If the Director of Evaluation reaches the age of 62 years during a fixed term of four years, he/she will continue to serve for the remainder of that term, notwithstanding Staff Regulation 301.9.5. In such cases, the appointment may not be renewed beyond that fixed term of four years. The renewal of the appointment of the Director of Evaluation is subject to consultation with the Programme Committee. Likewise the Director-General shall consult with the Programme Committee before the termination of the appointment of the Director of Evaluation. The Director of Evaluation may not be reappointed within FAO to another post or recruited as a consultant during a period of one year following the expiry or termination of the appointment<sup>7</sup>.*

14. In response to the question of whether it would be necessary to amend Staff Regulation 301.9.5 to reflect the particular situation of the Director of Evaluation, the Legal Counsel clarified that the revised paragraph 43 was clear in providing for an exception to the Staff Regulation, thus obviating the need for an amendment to the Regulation. At the same time, revised paragraph 43, seen in the overall context of the Charter, was specific to the Director of Evaluation and could not set a precedent for any other officials of the Organization.

## II. Standing Items

### Report of progress on the Multi-year Programme of Work (MYPOW) of the Committee<sup>8</sup>

15. The Committee reviewed and approved its Report of progress on the Multi-year Programme of Work from December 2009 to May 2011, as included in *Annex 1*.

### Date and place of the Hundred and Eighth session

16. The Committee was informed that the Hundred and Eighth session of the Programme Committee was scheduled to take place in Rome from 10 to 14 October 2011.

### Any Other Business

17. There was no discussion under this item.

---

<sup>7</sup> Words underscored to be added.

<sup>8</sup> PC 106/9

## Report of progress on the Multi-year Programme of Work (MYPOW) of the Committee

1. This is the Report of the Programme Committee on its progress on the Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW) from December 2009 to May 2011.

### A. PROGRAMME PLANNING AND PRIORITY SETTING

2. During the biennium 2010-11, the Programme Committee discussed the following issues pertaining to programme and priority setting:

- Priorities for the technical work of the Organization in the 2012-13 biennium
- Medium Term Plan 2010-13 (Reviewed) and Programme of Work and Budget 2012-13
- Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development
- Sustainable animal health and contained animal-related human health risks – in support of the emerging One-Health agenda

3. All recommendations so far proposed by the Committee were approved by the Council, and therefore the indicators of the MYPOW in this respect were exceeded. The Committee's recommendations have been consensual and precise.

4. The Committee reviewed the priorities of the Organization for the biennium 2012-13 in an informal meeting, as well as in its formal sessions. These exchanges of views with the strategy teams and Assistant Directors-General (ADGs) were very useful as they facilitated more focus on the main areas of changes in the PWB, but the formal sessions were greatly hampered by the late arrival of the background documents. In the future, it should be considered how Regional ADGs could be also heard, possibly via video links. The time needed to discuss the underlying reasons for the areas of emphasis and de-emphasis and their resource implications need to be considered in the future.

#### *Assessment of the proposed PWB 2012-13*

5. The Committee reviewed the proposed PWB in terms of its responsiveness to emerging priorities as expressed by the Regional Conferences and Technical Committees. It also assessed how lessons were drawn in the proposal from past performance, as evidenced in various evaluations which had been discussed in the Committee. Further, the Committee discussed the effects of the integrated budget, including the distribution of resources among funding sources.

6. In the next programming cycle, the Committee's work related to planning and priority setting needs to be further streamlined. This would involve:

- a) concrete proposals from the Regional Conferences on their preferred priorities;
- b) specific time-bound priorities from the Technical Committees within the context of their respective Organizational Results;
- c) priorities emerging from other sources compatible with those of (a) and (b); and
- d) standardized reporting from the Regional Conferences and the Technical Committees to facilitate the deliberation of the Programme Committee on priority setting.

7. In this endeavour, the deliberations of the Programme Committee would be facilitated by having prior consultation with the Chairs of the Regional Conferences and the Technical Committees. One way to do this could be for the Independent Chairperson of the Council to arrange a coordinating meeting prior to the sessions of the Regional Conferences and the Technical Committees, as was done in 2010.

8. The October 2011 Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees should evaluate the format and the content of the PWB 2012-13 document in order to draw lessons for the next programming cycle, and consider how to look at the PWB 2014-15 (jointly and separately).

#### **B. RESULTS-BASED MONITORING OF PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

9. The following issues pertaining to results-based monitoring of programme implementation were discussed by the Programme Committee and the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees, respectively:

- Programme Implementation Report (PIR) 2008-09 (Joint Meeting)
- Mid-term Review Synthesis report – 2010, including review of PWB 2010-11 implementation and proposal for adjustments
- Progress on implementation of the TCP (three times, Joint Meeting)

10. All Council advice and decisions on adjustments to the programme of work have reflected the Programme Committee's and Joint Meeting's recommendations. The recommendations of the Committee and the Joint Meeting to the Council have been precise and consensual.

11. The Committee considered the Mid-term Review Synthesis Report 2010; the first such report prepared under the new results-based reporting system, including the allocation and use of different resources and alignment with the Organizational Results. It also considered the proper reporting of regional results, cross-cutting issues and interdisciplinary areas. The Committee stressed that the PIR 2010-11 should make improvements in the benchmarks and performance indicators.

#### **C. EVALUATION**

12. The Committee has discussed the following Evaluation items:

- Charter for the FAO Office of Evaluation
- Indicative Rolling Workplan of Strategic and Programme Evaluation 2010-12
- Strategic evaluation of FAO country programming and Management Response
- Evaluation of FAO's activities on capacity development in Africa and Management Response
- Second Real-Time Evaluation of FAO's work on HPAI and Management Response
- The Evaluation of FAO's operational capacity in emergencies and Management Response
- Joint Thematic Evaluation of FAO and WFP support to information systems for food security and Management Response
- Evaluation of FAO's role and work related to water and Management Response
- Evaluation of FAO's interventions funded by the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and Management Response
- Evaluation of FAO's Regional and Subregional Offices for the Near East and Management Response
- FAO's effectiveness at country level: A synthesis of evaluations in post-conflict and transition countries (Democratic Republic of Congo, Tajikistan, Sudan) and Management Response
- FAO's effectiveness at country level: A synthesis of evaluations in large, rapidly-developing countries (India and Brazil) and Management Response
- Follow-up to the independent Evaluation of FAO's role and work in statistics

13. The Committee has been careful in selecting topics for Evaluation, thereby giving guidance in order to focus FAO's evaluation work on strategic issues. All Evaluations agreed for the future are strategic in nature.

14. The Committee has been fairly thorough in discussing the Evaluation reports and Management Responses. The Committee has also followed-up on earlier Programme Committee recommendations based on Evaluation reports and Management Responses, with the aim of ensuring the integration of their recommendations in FAO's work. While there is evidence that the Strategy Teams have considered Evaluation recommendations, it is not fully clear how these are systematically reflected, e.g. in the work leading to the Programme of Work and Budget.

15. When considering future topics of evaluation, it might be useful to consider topics related to the structure, content and performance of the FAO field programme, including systems in place for project planning and monitoring. More assessments of aspects of the decentralization process could also be considered, as well as evaluations of key topics or individual Strategic Objectives addressing pressing global challenges. The proposed increase in the budget for the Office of Evaluation should be used mainly for increasing the scope and follow-up to the implementation of the Evaluation recommendations.

16. The Committee requested the Office of Evaluation to propose a new methodology to improve follow-up and impact of Evaluations.

#### **D. IPA IMPLEMENTATION AND INTEGRATION INTO PWB**

17. It was decided by the Finance and Programme Committees' Chairs to discuss the remaining IPA-related issues, where decisions had not yet been reached, in the Joint Meetings of the Programme and Finance Committees.

- Access to TCP on a grant basis: eligibility criterion (twice in the Programme Committee)
- Preliminary review of statutory bodies with particular reference to Article XIV bodies and their relationship with FAO (Programme Committee)
- Results-based Work Planning, Monitoring and Reporting System (Joint Meeting, twice)
- Resource mobilization and management strategy (Joint Meeting, twice)
- Progress on decentralization (Joint Meeting)
- Vision for the structure and functioning of the Decentralized Offices (Joint Meeting)
- FAO strategy on partnerships with the private sector (Joint Meeting)

18. The responsibilities between the mandates of the Programme Committee, the CoC-IEE<sup>9</sup> and OEWG<sup>10</sup> have not been entirely clear. However, the Programme Committee has completed the IPA actions related directly to the Programme Committee work (actions 2.35, 2.36, 2.38, 2.39, 2.44, 2.45, 2.46, and 2.47). In the future, careful planning between the Agendas of the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee, and of the Joint Meetings needs to be continued in order to avoid duplication in the Agendas.

#### **E. IMPROVED METHODS OF WORK AND EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE**

19. The Programme Committee has discussed two issues related to its methods of work:

- Multi-year Programme of Work of the Programme Committee
- Review of progress on the Multi-year Programme of Work of the Committee.

20. The formulation of the MYPOW was facilitated by informal seminars. The Programme Committee was the first of the governing bodies to complete a MYPOW, which was then endorsed by Council.

---

<sup>9</sup> Conference Committee for the Follow-up to the Independent External Evaluation of FAO

<sup>10</sup> Open-ended Working Group on measures designed to increase the efficiency of Governing Bodies

21. Generally speaking, the Programme Committee Agendas have been focused, allowing for efficient work of the Committee. However, the Agendas have been somewhat overburdened. Better time management will require more flexible meetings in the future, particularly taking into account the increasing volume of Evaluations.
22. The Committee's recommendations to the Council and FAO management have been precise and sharp, and the format was appreciated by the Council.<sup>11</sup> The feedback to the constituencies has thus been satisfactory. The working atmosphere has been friendly and cooperative, and Programme Committee Members have been open to compromises.
23. The working relations with the Finance Committee and FAO Secretariat have been very supportive. Relations with other governing bodies have been less regular, but have also been friendly and facilitated streamlined work of the governing bodies. In the future, there will be a need to regularize these relations and to further develop the relationships of the Committee with other governing bodies.
24. The request of the Programme Committee to standardize the presentation in the background documentation, including the cover page, has been met by the Secretariat. However, the delay in receiving the documentation from the Secretariat in all languages on time has been a major problem. The rules in this respect should be observed for the member countries to be able to play the governance role expected of them.
25. Informal meetings have been well attended and have provided opportunities for more in-depth discussions on the most crucial issues (particularly prioritization of FAO's work) on the Programme Committee Agenda. They have been appreciated by Committee Members, and should be considered as a way to also prepare for formal sessions in the future.
26. The Committee considered that the participation in the sessions of the Programme Committee of Deputy Directors-General and other senior managers was extremely useful. The Committee also recommended to invite the ADG/Regional Representative through videoconferencing to attend the Programme Committee, when appropriate. In the future, there should be flexibility in organising formal and informal meetings, as required. It might be useful to have a shorter Agenda in the formal meetings, and increase the number of these meetings by one or two. The Agenda setting of the Committee could be improved, for example by having a rolling work plan available in each meeting.
27. The Regional Groups, in selecting their Members for the Programme Committee, should give consideration to the advantages of institutional memory and continuity.
28. The Committee encouraged the participation of silent observers, particularly Council Members.

---

<sup>11</sup> CL 139/REP paragraph 20