

Rome, Roma 1999



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

Organisation  
des  
Nations  
Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et  
l'agriculture

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

Hundred and Seventeenth Session • Cent dix-septième session • 117º período de sesiones

**Rome, 9 - 11 November 1999**  
**VERBATIM RECORDS OF PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL**

**Rome, 9 - 11 novembre 1999**  
**PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES PLÉNIÈRES DU CONSEIL**

**Roma, 9 - 11 de noviembre de 1999**  
**ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES PLENARIAS DEL CONSEJO**



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – TABLE DES MATIÈRES - INDICE

---

### FIRST PLENARY MEETING PREMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA

(9 November 1999)

*Page/Página*

<b>I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION</b>	
<b>I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE</b>	
<b>I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO</b>	3
<b>1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)	
<b>1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)	
<b>1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)	3
<b>2. Election of three Vice-Chairpersons, and Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>2. Élection de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	4
<b>IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS</b>	
<b>IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES</b>	
<b>IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS</b>	5
<b>14. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters</b>	
<b>14. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</b>	
<b>14. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos</b>	5
<b>14.1 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to Attend FAO Sessions</b> (CL 117/LIM/2)	
<b>14.1 Invitation d'États non membres à participer aux sessions de la FAO</b> (CL 117/LIM/2)	
<b>14.1 Invitaciones a Estados no Miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO</b> (CL 117/LIM/2)	5
<b>14.2 Applications for Membership in the Organization</b> (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)	
<b>14.2 Demandes d'admission à la qualité de membre de l'Organisation</b> (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)	
<b>14.2 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organización</b> (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)	5

<b>I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION</b> (continued)	
<b>I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE</b> (suite)	
<b>I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO</b> (continuación)	6
<b>1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (continued)	
<b>1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (suite)	
<b>1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario</b> (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (continuación)	6
<b>II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO</b>	
<b>II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO</b>	
<b>II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO</b>	7
<b>3. Preparations for the Thirtieth Session of the FAO Conference, including:</b> (C 99/16)	
<b>3. Préparatifs de la trentième session de la Conférence de la FAO, notamment:</b> (C 99/16)	
<b>3. Preparativos para el 30º período de sesiones de la Conferencia, en particular</b> (C 99/16):	7
<b>3.1 Nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference)</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>3.1 Désignation du Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (Recommandations à la Conférence)</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>3.1 Propuestas de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y las comisiones de la Conferencia (recomendaciones a la Conferencia)</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	7
<b>3.2 Election of the Nominations Committee</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>3.2 Élection de la Commission des candidatures</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	
<b>3.2 Elección del Comité de Candidaturas</b> (CL 117/INF/9)	8
<b>3.3 Margarita Lizarraga Medal</b> (C 99/INF/10)	
<b>3.3 Médaille Margarita Lizárraga</b> (C 99/INF/10)	
<b>3.3 Medalla Margarita Lizárraga</b> (C 99/INF/10)	9
<b>III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</b>	
<b>III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION</b>	
<b>III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</b>	10
<b>7. Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001</b> [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (English and Chinese only) CL 117/2 (paras. 20 to 29); CL 117/3 (paras 8 to 42); CL 117/4 (paras 5 to 10); CL 117/LIM/3)]	
<b>7. Programme de travail et budget 2000-2001</b> [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (anglais et chinois seulement) CL 117/2 (par. 20 à 29); CL 117/3 (par. 8 à 42); CL 117/4 (par. 5 à 10); CL 117/LIM/3)]	
<b>7. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2000-2001</b> [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (sólo inglés y chino); CL 117/2 (párrs. 20-29); CL 117/3 (párrs. 8-42); CL 117/4 (párrs. 5-10); CL 117/LIM/3)]	10

**SECOND PLENARY MEETING  
DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

(9 November 1999)

*Page/Página*

**III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE  
MATTERS (continued)**

**III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX  
FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)**

**III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS,  
FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)** 32

**7. Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1;  
C 99/3-Corr.2 (English and Chinese only) CL 117/2; CL 117/3; CL 117/4) (continued)

**7. Programme de travail et budget 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1;  
C 99/3-Corr.2 (anglais et chinois seulement) CL 117/2; CL 117/3; CL 117/4) (suite)

**7. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3 Corr.1;  
C 99/3-Corr.2 (continuación) 32

**II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO**

**II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO**

**II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO** 44

**5. Outcome of the Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture  
and Land (Maastricht, September 1999)** (C 99/INF/20)

**5. Conclusions de la Conférence sur le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture  
et des terroirs (Maastricht, septembre 1999)** (C 99/INF/20)

**5. Resultados de la Conferencia sobre el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura  
y la tierra (Maastricht, septiembre de 1999)** (C 99/INF/20) 44

**THIRD PLENARY MEETING  
TROISIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

(10 November 1999)

*Page/Página*

<b>II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO</b>	
<b>II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO</b>	
<b>II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO</b>	60
<b>5. Outcome of the Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land (Maastricht, September 1999) (C 99/INF/20)</b>	
<b>5. Conclusions de la Conférence sur le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture et des terroirs (Maastricht, septembre 1999) (C 99/INF/20)</b>	
<b>5. Resultados de la Conferencia sobre el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura y la tierra (Maastricht, septiembre de 1999) (C 99/INF/20)</b>	60
<b>III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)</b>	
<b>III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)</b>	
<b>III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)</b>	62
<b>8. FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 (Version 4.0) (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (Spanish only); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)</b>	
<b>8. Cadre stratégique de la FAO 2000-2015 (Version 4.0) (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (espagnol seulement); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)</b>	
<b>8. Marco Estratégico para la FAO 2000-2015 (Versión 4.0) (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (sólo español); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)</b>	62

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

(10 November 1999)

*Page/Página*

**III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE  
MATTERS (continued)**

**III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX  
FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)**

**III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS,  
FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)**

90

**8. FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1;  
CL 117/2 paras 9 to 19) (continued)

**8. Cadre stratégique de la FAO 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1;  
CL 117/2 par. 9 à 19) (suite)

**8. Marco Estratégico para la FAO 2000-2015 (Versión 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1;  
CL 117/2 párrs. 9 a 19) (continuación)

90

**9. Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance  
Committee (Rome, September 1999)** (CL 117/2)

**9. Rapport de la réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier  
(Rome, septembre 1999)** (CL 117/2)

**9. Informe de la Reunión Conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas  
(Roma, septiembre de 1999)** (CL 117/2)

112

**10. Report of the 82<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Programme Committee  
(Rome, September 1999)** (CL 117/3)

**10. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-deuxième session du Comité du Programme  
(Rome, septembre 1999)** (CL 117/3)

**10. Informe del 82º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa  
(Roma, septiembre de 1999)** (CL 117/3)

113

**11. Report of the 93<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Finance Committee (Rome, September 1999)**  
(CL 117/4)

**11. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-treizième session du Comité financier  
(Rome, septembre 1999)** (CL 117/4)

**11. Informe del 93º período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas  
(Roma, septiembre de 1999)** (cl 117/4)

115

**11.1 Financial Position of the Organization** (CL 117/LIM/1)

**11.1 Situation financière de l'organisation** (CL 117/LIM/1)

**11.1 Situación financiera de la Organización** (CL 117/LIM/1)

115

**11.2 Scale of Contributions 2000-2001**

**11.2 Barème des contributions 2000-2001**

**11.2 Escala de cuotas para 2000-2001**

115

**11.3 Other Matters Arising Out of the Report**

**11.3 Autres questions découlant du rapport**

**11.3 Otros asuntos planteados en el Informe**

115

<b>II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO</b> (continued)	
<b>II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO</b> (suite)	
<b>II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO</b> (continuación)	122
<b>4. Outcome of the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent (Rome, July 1999) (C 99/14)</b>	
<b>4. Conclusions de la Conférence de plénipotentiaires sur la Convention de Rotterdam sur la procédure de consentement préalable en connaissance de cause (Rome, juillet 1999) (C 99/14)</b>	
<b>4. Resultado de la Conferencia de Plenipotenciarios sobre el Convenio de Rotterdam sobre el consentimiento informado previo (Roma, julio de 1999) (C 99/14)</b>	122
<b>6. Regional Representation at the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) (CL 117/INF/10)</b>	
<b>6. Représentation régionale au GCRAI (Groupe consultatif pour la recherche agricole internationale) (CL 117/INF/10)</b>	
<b>6. La representación regional en el Grupo Consultivo sobre Investigación Agrícola Internacional (GCI AI) (CL 117/INF/10)</b>	126
<b>IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS</b> (continued)	
<b>IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES</b> (suite)	
<b>IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS</b> (continuación)	126
<b>12. Report of the 70<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, September 1999) (CL 117/5)</b>	
<b>12. Rapport de la soixante-dixième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, septembre 1999) (CL 117/5)</b>	
<b>12. Informe del 70º período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos (Roma, septiembre de 1999) (CL 117/5)</b>	126
<b>13. Amendment to the Staff Regulations (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)</b>	
<b>13. Amendement au Statut du personnel (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)</b>	
<b>13. Enmienda del Estatuto del Personal (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)</b>	129
<b>V. OTHER MATTERS</b>	
<b>V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES</b>	
<b>V. OTROS ASUNTOS</b>	132
<b>15. Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and other main Sessions (1998-99) (CL 117/INF/8)</b>	
<b>15. Calendrier révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des réunions principales de 1998-99 (CL 117/INF/8)</b>	
<b>15. Calendario de los períodos de sesiones de los Órganos Rectores y de otras reuniones principales de la FAO (1998-99) (CL 117/INF/8)</b>	132
<b>16. Any Other Matters (CL 117/INF/15)</b>	
<b>16. Autres questions (CL 117/INF/15)</b>	
<b>16. Otros asuntos (CL 117/INF/15)</b>	132



**FIFTH PLENARY MEETING  
CINQUIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

**(11 November 1999)**

*Page/Página*

**ADOPTION OF REPORT  
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT  
APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME**

134

**DRAFT REPORT – PARTS I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2; CL 117/REP/3;  
CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7; CL 117/REP/8;  
CL 117/REP/9)

**LES PROJETS DE RAPPORT – PARTIES I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2;  
CL 117/REP/3; CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7;  
CL 117/REP/8; CL 117/REP/9)

**LOS PROYECTOS DE INFORME, PARTES I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2;  
CL 117/REP/3; CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7;  
CL 117/REP/8; CL 117/REP/9)

134



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Seventeenth Session Cent dix-septième session 117o período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 9-11 November 1999 Rome, 9-11 novembre 1999 Roma, 9-11 de noviembre de 1999</b>
<b>FIRST PLENARY MEETING PREMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>9 November 1999</b>

**The First Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.20 hours  
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding**

**La première séance plénière est ouverte à 10h20  
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Président indépendant du Conseil**

**Se abre la primera sesión plenaria a las 10.20 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo**

**CHAIRMAN**

Ladies and Gentlemen, I call the first meeting of the Hundred and Seventeenth FAO Council Session to order. Before proceeding, I would like to make a short announcement. The European Community is participating in this Meeting in accordance with Paragraphs 8 and 9 of Article II of the FAO Constitution. I have been asked to inform you that the Declaration made by the European Community and its Member States is contained in document CL 117/INF/6, which has already been distributed to all members of the Meeting. I would draw the attention of the Meeting to this Declaration.

Before we move to the Agenda, allow me to extend a warm welcome to the Director-General and all the delegates and observers, and I am particularly pleased to see a number of ministers in the room. I would now like to give the floor to the Director-General.

**LE DIRECTEUR GÉNÉRAL**

Je voudrais vous remercier de me donner la parole, et surtout saisir cette occasion pour souhaiter la bienvenue aux représentants des États Membres à ce Conseil. Ce Conseil revêt une importance toute particulière puisqu'il se tient juste avant la Conférence qui devra décider de l'avenir de cette Institution, à la fois en ce qui concerne son programme et les ressources nécessaires pour mettre en oeuvre ce programme sur une période de deux ans, mais surtout en ce qui concerne le Cadre stratégique, c'est à dire l'action de notre Organisation à l'horizon 2015 et son insertion dans un cadre beaucoup plus évolutif, compte tenu des changements importants qui se passent dans le monde d'aujourd'hui. C'est aussi une réunion tout-à-fait symbolique, dans la mesure où elle se situe à la fin d'un millénaire, et à la naissance d'une nouvelle époque, porteuse d'espoirs, mais qui comporte aussi beaucoup de facteurs d'inquiétude.

Nous sommes dans un monde où 800 millions de personnes n'ont pas encore un accès adéquat à la nourriture.

Le Sommet mondial de l'alimentation a adopté pour objectif de réduire de moitié, d'ici 2015, cette quantité trop importante de personnes qui se couchent sans pouvoir se nourrir de manière adéquate.

Comme le récent document sur l'état de l'insécurité alimentaire dans le monde l'a montré, nous avons déjà fait des progrès puisque, de la période 1990-92 à la période 1995-97, le nombre des personnes qui ont faim a diminué de 40 millions. Mais ceci est le résultat d'une évolution contrastée. D'une part, nous avons des pays qui ont fait un progrès énorme en diminuant de 100 millions le nombre de personnes qui ont faim dans le monde. En même temps, d'autres pays ont vu le nombre des mal-nourris augmenter de 60 millions. Et c'est ce différentiel qui s'élève à 40 millions.

Si nous voyons la progression annuelle de la baisse du nombre des personnes qui ont faim dans le monde, nous nous rendons compte que ce chiffre est de 8 millions par an. Or, il faudrait arriver à 20 millions par an pour pouvoir atteindre l'objectif du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation.

Nous avons donc des efforts plus importants à réaliser. Nous aurons besoin de ressources plus importantes pour pouvoir atteindre les objectifs que la communauté internationale et notamment les Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement nous ont assignés.

J'ose espérer qu'avec vos conseils, vos avis et vos orientations, il nous sera possible d'apporter notre contribution avec l'expertise de l'Organisation. Avec la bonne volonté et la foi que nous avons dans les idéaux de cette Organisation, il nous sera aussi possible d'atteindre les objectifs du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Encore une fois, soyez les bienvenus à Rome et merci d'être venus à cette réunion du Conseil.

**I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION****I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE****I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO**

**1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)

**1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)

**1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6)

**CHAIRMAN**

Our first item is the adoption of the Agenda and Timetable as set out in documents CL 117/1-Rev. 1, CL 117/INF/1-Rev. 1 and CL 117/INF/6. CL 117/1-Rev.1 contains the Provisional Annotated Agenda.

Are there any comments on the Provisional Agenda? If there are none, the Agenda is adopted.

*The Agenda was adopted.*

*L'Ordre du jour est adopté.*

*El Programa queda aprobado.*

**CHAIRMAN**

With respect to the Provisional Timetable you have in document CL 117/INF/1-Rev. 1, this is a provisional draft. Does this Timetable meet with the approval of the Council?

The Timetable was adopted.

Le calendrier est adopté.

El Calendario queda aprobado.

**CHAIRMAN**

May I also take this opportunity to call upon your cooperation in keeping to the Timetable and enabling us to start our meeting on time? We have a demanding Timetable and only two days effectively to get through it.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

We have approved the Provisional Timetable. However, I note in document CL 117/OD/1, Order of the Day, that there has been a change in the order of events, and it is proposed that we take up Item 5 before A Strategic Framework for FAO. Perhaps this should be drawn to the attention of the Members.

Second, I note that both the Provisional Timetable and the Order of the Day indicate that Item 5 is for information only, but I expect that there will be some debate, and, in fact, in the previous Council we ordered ourselves to debate this, so perhaps that should also be drawn to the attention of the Members.

**CHAIRMAN**

In both the Order of the Day and in the Provisional Timetable that have been adopted, the item on the outcome of the Maastricht Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land is tabled this afternoon after the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001. We will see if it is for information only or if delegates would like to discuss it. I was asked yesterday if we could make time to discuss this item, but I would like to remind everybody that the Council is indeed very short, and this is a preparation for the Conference right after the Council.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

Just to clarify, the Provisional Timetable that I have indicates that Item 5 will be discussed on the afternoon of 10 November. We are now proposing to discuss it on the afternoon of 9 November, and delegations may wish to draw this to the attention of people whom they wanted to have pay attention to this particular issue, whom perhaps they had planned to have here tomorrow afternoon, that they should be here this afternoon.

**CHAIRMAN**

Again, we have adopted the Provisional Timetable, and I do have the revised Timetable here. I don't know if you have the revised one. According to the revised one, I may also draw your attention to the fact that the afternoon session is from 14:30 to 17:30 or later if required. So, I think that what you have asked has been accommodated here.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

Yes, the time is short but with respect to Item 5, I think the June Council very clearly indicated that we would have a full discussion, and I don't think that we should be driven by time constraints to try to shorten that discussion because I think that if you look at the Timetable you will see that this may help us in the next item. This was just a reminder of that.

**CHAIRMAN**

Can we proceed to Item 2? Item 2 is the Election of the three Vice-Chairpersons and the Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

I need some clarification, before Item 2, on the Provisional Timetable. I have the document CL 117/INF/1-Rev. 1. Now, is this approved as the Timetable of the Council?

**2. Election of three Vice-Chairpersons, and Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee (CL 117/INF/9)****2. Élection de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction (CL 117/INF/9)****2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción (CL 117/INF/9)****CHAIRMAN**

We go now to Item 2, Election of the Three Vice-Chairpersons.

Following consultation among the regional groups, we have the following proposals for the three posts of Vice-Chairperson: Mr Lincke of Germany, Mr Khalifa of Egypt and Mr Misika of Namibia. If there are no objections, I wish to congratulate the three Vice-Chairpersons on their election.

Now we proceed. For the Drafting Committee, the regional groups propose Ms Wögerbauer of Austria as Chairperson and the following delegations as Members: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, Republic of Korea, Morocco, Pakistan, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Syria. Are there any objections?

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

**IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS**  
**IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES**  
**IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS**

**14. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters**  
**14. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques**  
**14. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos**

**14.1 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to Attend FAO Sessions (CL 117/LIM/2)**  
**14.1 Invitation d'États non membres à participer aux sessions de la FAO (CL 117/LIM/2)**  
**14.1 Invitaciones a Estados no Miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO (CL 117/LIM/2)**

**CHAIRMAN**

We are now taking other constitutional and legal matters. Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions, and the document is CL 117/LIM/2.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

A request was received from the Russian Federation to attend this Council Session in an observer capacity, and an invitation was issued on 13 October subject to approval by the Council. Formal Council approval is now sought to admit the Russian Federation as an observer to the Hundred and Seventeenth Session of the Council.

**CHAIRMAN**

Can I take it that the Council agrees that the Russian Federation attend the present session as an observer?

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

**CHAIRMAN**

Paragraph 5 of the document lists those non-member nations that have participated in FAO meetings since the last session of the Council. Unless someone wishes to speak on this subject, we will proceed to the next item on our agenda.

**14.2 Applications for Membership in the Organization (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)**

**14.2 Demandes d'admission à la qualité de membre de l'Organisation (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)**

**14.2 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organización (C 99/10; C 99/10-Sup.1; C 99/10-Sup.2)**

**CHAIRMAN**

Item 14.2 Applications for Membership in the Organization, document C 99/10-Sup. 1 and C 99/10-Sup 2. Members will recall that in June the Council authorized Niue to attend sessions as an observer pending its admission. As you will see from the regulation and from the relevant documents, CL 99/10, C 99/10-Sup. 1 and C 99/10-Sup. 2, there are five further applicants for membership in the Organization, namely, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Palau, San Marino and Micronesia. The Council is requested to authorize the Director-General to invite these applicant countries to participate in an observer capacity in appropriate Council meetings, as well as in the regional and technical meetings of the Organization that may be of interest to them.

Does the Council agree to this? I see no objection.

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

**I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION (continued)****I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE (suite)****I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO (continuación)**

**1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (continued)

**1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (suite)

**1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario** (CL 117/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 117/INF/6) (continuación)

**G. Anthony BEATTIE (United Kingdom)**

I apologize for going back to an earlier agenda item but I am afraid there is a degree of unclarity on the part of this Member of the Council, and I believe others, as to what might have been decided about the order of the Agenda, and it is essential that we should all be clear what Timetable we are discussing.

Can I ask you to give the floor to Finland as the President of the European Community and its Member States to raise a point on this.

**CHAIRMAN**

I think I have made it clear that the Provisional Timetable, as stated in document CL 117/INF/1-Rev.1, is the one that has been adopted, and our distinguished delegate from the Republic of Korea has asked me to again confirm that, and it has been confirmed. So, I do not see any reason to open up a discussion again on this because we are really pressed for time, and we should proceed.

**Louis DOMINICI (France)**

Nous ne voulons pas réouvrir le débat mais nous avons le sentiment qu'il y a eu un malentendu. Un malentendu sur le déroulement du débat, justement. Si nous regardons les choses de bonne foi, ce qui est le cas pour nous, nous souhaiterions que vous donniez la parole - comme vient de le demander le Royaume-Uni - à la Finlande, pour qu'elle puisse donner, au nom de l'Union européenne, une indication sur ce qu'il serait opportun. C'est une question de bonne volonté de notre part, et de la part des autres Membres bien sûr.

**CHAIRMAN**

I really hesitate to open up an item that has been adopted by the Council, and there had been some questions from Canada as to whether we were looking at the same document and I explained that it was the revised document, and again I confirm that it was the revised document that we are adopting, answering the request from the intervention from the Republic of Korea, so I really do not see any reason why we should go back and open up a discussion on this.

I think this is the adopted Agenda and Timetable, and so we should proceed.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)**

Il n'est pas question de réouvrir le débat, il est seulement question de préciser. Je crois que l'intervention de la délégation de la Finlande, au nom de l'Union européenne, pourrait nous aider dans ce sens. J'appuie donc ce que viennent de dire les délégations du Royaume-Uni et de la France.

**Sra. Ileana DI GIOVAN BATTISTA (Argentina)**

Yo comprendo su reticencia a reabrir un tema que ya ha sido cerrado, pero creo que como cortesía de los demás Miembros del Consejo, no deberíamos tener inconveniente en permitir que la Delegación de Finlandia se expresara.



**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Nosotros apoyamos la moción presentada por Argentina. Creemos que es bueno para nuestros debates que precisamente Finlandia pueda dirigirse a nosotros y entregarnos la información que quiere hacer.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Nos parece un poco extraña la situación que se está presentando. Tradicionalmente cuando un presidente de un grupo regional o de un grupo de concertación no es Miembro del Consejo, el mecanismo que prevé el reglamento es de que un Miembro solicite la palabra y se le dé. En esta ocasión tres países de la Unión Europea la han solicitado y creo que es un derecho que no se les debe negar, está perfectamente previsto en el reglamento.

**Ignacio TRUEBA JAINAGA (España)**

Me uno a la solicitud que anteriormente han hecho los colegas del Reino Unido, de Francia, de Italia y también de la delegación argentina.

**CHAIRMAN**

I will now give the floor to Finland but I would like to remind everybody that we are not going to open up a debate on something that has been decided by the Council, not by the Chairman only, but by the Council.

**Ms Aulikki KAUPILA (Observer for Finland)**

The European Community and its Members States would like to ensure that the discussion on Item 5 about the outcome of the Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land be continued on 10 November. Our proposal would be that it be presented today as indicated in the document in the adopted Timetable but that we ensure that those experts who are coming only tonight for a discussion tomorrow be able to participate in the discussion.

**CHAIRMAN**

I think Chile made the point that we should give the floor to Finland so that Finland could inform us on what they had to say on this. Again, the fact is that the Provisional Timetable has been adopted. We do have a Timetable now. I think we should proceed.

**II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO****II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO****II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO****3. Preparations for the Thirtieth Session of the FAO Conference, including: (C 99/16)****3. Préparatifs de la trentième session de la Conférence de la FAO, notamment: (C 99/16)****3. Preparativos para el 30º período de sesiones de la Conferencia, en particular (C 99/16):****3.1 Nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference) (CL 117/INF/9)****3.1 Désignation du Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (Recommandations à la Conférence) (CL 117/INF/9)****3.1 Propuestas de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y las comisiones de la Conferencia (recomendaciones a la Conferencia) (CL 117/INF/9)****CHAIRMAN**

We now move to Item 3.1, Nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference, Recommendations to the Conference, Rule XXIV-5(b) of the General Rules of the Organization provides that the Council shall propose candidates for the office of the Chairperson of the Conference and Chairpersons of the

Commissions of the Conference and also elect the Nominations Committee of the Conference, consisting of eleven Members Nations. As you may recall, the Nominations Committee proposes nominations for the Office of the three Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference, the nine Members of the Credentials Committee and seven elected Members of the General Committee.

Following consultations during and following our last session in June, it was proposed that His Excellency Belahouadjeb Benalia, the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries of Algeria, be Chairperson of the FAO Conference, that Mr Luigi M. Fontana-Giusti of Italy chair Commission I and that Mr Bhaskar Barua of India chair Commission II.

Can I take it that the Council endorses the proposals?

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

### **3.2 Election of the Nominations Committee (CL 117/INF/9)**

### **3.2 Élection de la Commission des candidatures (CL 117/INF/9)**

### **3.2 Elección del Comité de Candidaturas (CL 117/INF/9)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

We now move to Item 3.2, Election of the Nominations Committee.

Following the consultations among the Regional Groups, the following membership was proposed: Belgium, Czech Republic, Italy, Islamic Republic of Iran, Libya, Tanzania, Republic of Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Republic Korea and El Salvador.

Can I take it that the Council endorses the designated membership?

#### **Ms Mariann KÓVACS (Hungary)**

On behalf of the OECD countries, we nominated also the United States of America.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you, madam, for the reminder because it is in here, the United States of America.

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

#### **Sra. Ileana DI GIOVAN BATTISTA (Argentina)**

Ahora también comprendo su prisa en llevar adelante esta Agenda que está muy cargada, pero permítame decir, quizás en nombre de los demás Miembros del Consejo, que es preciso agradecer al señor Ministro de Argelia Belhouadjeb, al Embajador Fontana-Giusti de Italia y al señor Bhaskar Barua de la India para aceptar presidir nuestra Conferencia y también las Comisiones I y II. Nosotros nos complacemos particularmente por el hecho que Italia se involucre en los debates de la Conferencia y presida la tan importante Comisión I pero sobretudo, como país en desarrollo, nos regocijamos que un representante de la India, que ha protagonizado la revolución más importante en materia agrícola del siglo XX, presida la Comisión II y que un representante de Argelia, país que ha estado siempre en el centro y en toda encrucijada en los temas de desarrollo, de cooperación multilateral y que ha llevado adelante las banderas de los países más desprovistos y con más problemas del planeta, presida la Conferencia. Creo que es un hecho auspicioso por el cual todos debemos expresar nuestra satisfacción y nuestro agradecimiento.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I would like to take this opportunity to announce that the Nominations Committee will meet on Wednesday 10 November at 14.00 in the Mexico Room.

**3.3 Margarita Lizarraga Medal (C 99/INF/10)****3.3 Médaille Margarita Lizárraga (C 99/INF/10)****3.3 Medalla Margarita Lizárraga (C 99/INF/10)****CHAIRMAN**

I move on to Item 3.3, the Margarita Lizarraga Medal. This award was instituted by the Conference at its Twenty-ninth Session. It is awarded biennially to a person or organization whose work favours the application of the *Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*. The Medal pays tribute to the late Margarita Saucedo Lizarraga, a Senior FAO Fishery Liaison Officer who played a decisive role in promoting the Code of Conduct.

The Council is invited to endorse the nomination of the National Fisheries Solidarity Organization (NAFSO) of Sri Lanka, as set out in document C 99/INF/10.

I take it that the Council endorses this proposal?

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Tengo el honor de hablar en nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. Hace dos años la propuesta de nuestra región, la 29a Conferencia de la Organización, adoptó por aclamación el establecimiento de la Medalla Margarita Lizárraga. Con esta decisión se rinde un merecido y justo homenaje a una distinguida latinoamericana que dedicó la mayor parte de su vida al sector pesquero. Al igual que muchos colegas, tuvimos el privilegio de conocerla y de valorar no sólo su capacidad profesional sino también la gran nobleza humana que la caracterizaba. Podremos decir que el *Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable* es sin duda el mayor de sus frutos profesionales. Margarita fue quien concibió este Acuerdo Internacional Voluntario que constituye hoy, junto con la Convención del Mar, el instrumento de referencia obligado en las actividades de pesca.

El destino quiso que desde diferentes puestos ella siguiera la concretización de esta trascendente iniciativa, primero como Representante de su país ante la FAO; posteriormente como funcionaria de la Organización le correspondió seguir las negociaciones y la adopción del Código. Como colega siempre fue una persona entregada a su trabajo, apasionada de la pesca, solidaria como compañera en todas sus acciones en las que siempre tuvo presente no sólo a su país sino a Latinoamérica y a todos los países en desarrollo. En su extensa trayectoria profesional, participó en la planeación e implementación de diversos proyectos de desarrollo que beneficiaron a numerosas comunidades de Africa, Asia, Medio Oriente y América Latina. Destacado no sólo fue su trabajo técnico sino también su labor social reflejada en el respaldo que brindó a grupos de pescadores de varios países. Su dinamismo le permitió a lo largo de su fructífera existencia cumplir diversas funciones, incluida la docencia e investigación. En este sentido estableció programas de maestría y doctorado sobre pesca en diferentes instituciones de enseñanza superior de México además de haber sido en su país la Directora del Instituto Nacional de Pesca.

Con el reconocimiento de la labor de la Doctora Lizárraga, la FAO rinde también un reconocimiento a la labor de la mujer, cuyo papel resulta clave en todas las actividades que realiza la Organización. La medalla es igualmente en gran sentido un tributo a la labor que llevan a cabo todos los funcionarios que en sus diferentes áreas de especialización entregan cotidianamente sus esfuerzos en la FAO.

**III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**  
**III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION**  
**III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS**

**7. Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001** [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (English and Chinese only) CL 117/2 (paras. 20 to 29); CL 117/3 (paras 8 to 42); CL 117/4 (paras 5 to 10); CL 117/LIM/3)]

**7. Programme de travail et budget 2000-2001** [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (anglais et chinois seulement) CL 117/2 (par. 20 à 29); CL 117/3 (par. 8 à 42); CL 117/4 (par. 5 à 10); CL 117/LIM/3)]

**7. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2000-2001** [(C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (sólo inglés y chino); CL 117/2 (párrs. 20-29); CL 117/3 (párrs. 8-42); CL 117/4 (párrs. 5-10); CL 117/LIM/3)]

**CHAIRMAN**

We now come to Item 7 of our Agenda, namely the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001. I would like to ask Dr Bommer, Chairman of the Programme Committee to take the floor.

**D. BOMMER (Chairman, Programme Committee)**

I think the Programme Committee, the Finance Committee separately, and the Joint Meeting of both Committees considered the important document of the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001.

I shall start with the main findings of the Joint Meeting which reflects, to a large extent, those of the Programme Committee; I shall then refer to some additional points made by the latter.

The Joint Meeting recognized the conditional character of the document and endorsed its more concise nature which was made possible by posting more detailed information on the Organization's Internet site, something the Committees encouraged further. The Committees observed that the application of the new programming model not only enhanced clarity and focused on the presentation of the programmes but encouraged an increase in timebound objectives and made a clearer distinction between technical projects and continuing programme activities. The Committees were satisfied with the development of the three budgetary scenarios contained in the document, and observed that the cost increase estimate of US\$14.9 million had been developed using an exchange rate of Lire 1800 to the US dollar, as recommended by the Committees and the Council.

We also noted that organizational restructuring in administrative and operational areas form part of the proposals, an approach not without risks but justified, in order to protect to the extent possible the substantive programmes of the Organization.

There was general endorsement of the priorities reflected in the proposals and in particular, of the protection offered to the Fisheries and Forestry programmes. It was, however, emphasized that priorities identified by the relevant Ministerial Meetings related to Forestry and Fisheries should be even stronger reflected.

There was a general discussion on the budget level. Many Members stressed that FAO should be provided with the sufficient resources to allow it to apply its mandate role and fulfil the demands placed upon it in the wake of the World Food Summit and therefore, reported the Real Growth budget. Others expressed preference for a Zero Real Growth budget and several Members supported the Zero Nominal Growth budget - both to take account of the domestic budgetary stringencies and the general policy pursued by their governments throughout the UN System. The Committees hoped that continued dialogue would bridge the gap between the different positions prior to the Conference.

In addition to the views reflected here from the Joint Meeting, the Programme Committee in its deliberations considered, more in depth, the programme structure and content. It recognized that the full benefits from the new programme approach would only be realized in the new biennium, when the Medium-Term Plan based on the strategic framework 2000-2015 would be presented, making it possible to establish clear relationships with the corporate objectives of the Framework to be eventually approved by the Conference.

Further specific comments made by the Committee in its detailed review of the major programmes of Chapter 1 to 4 are contained in its reports. This would be the summary introduction.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation)**

I will not introduce the report; I simply will provide Members with the latest developments concerning certain aspects of the budget proposals.

First of all, I wish to address the impact of the exchange rate. Today the rate of exchange stands at about Lire 1 860 or Euro 0.964 to the dollar, whereas the document you have before you is based on Lire 1 800 to the US dollar. The impact of this exchange rate difference will depend on whether the Conference chooses to approve a Real Growth, a Zero Real Growth or a Zero Nominal Growth budget.

Under the first two options, that is Zero Real Growth and real growth, where the Conference is approving a programme of work as opposed to a nominal limit, the impact is to reduce the cost of that programme. The Conference would, therefore, receive an Appropriation's Resolution which has been revised according to the accepted methodology, reducing the requirements by approximately US\$8 million - that is, US\$8 million less as a result of the exchange rate 1 860 versus 1 800 that has been assumed in the document. Therefore, under Real Growth the appropriation would fall to approximately US\$679 million, and under Zero Real Growth US\$657 million, US\$7 million over the magical US\$650 million, if I can put it that way.

Under the third option, that is the generally-accepted definition of Zero Nominal Growth being simply US\$650 million, there would be no change to the appropriation, instead an additional US\$8 million would be released as a reduction in the cost of non-dollar based expenditures and could be ploughed back into programmes.

In line with the priorities previously expressed by Member Nations, the Director-General advises that, in principle, he would first of all accelerate the recruitment of those technical posts which were underfunded in the Zero Nominal Growth scenario - you will recall that in this scenario one way we have made savings is to underfund those technical posts that were vacant and were in the non-protected areas. We would release additional resources to fill those technical posts as quickly as possible. We would then reinstate in part, or in whole, the cuts made to consultants and travel resources, particularly under the technical programmes. Thirdly, we would apply amounts as necessary to allow the more measured implementation of the structural changes now envisaged in Headquarters and the Regional Offices. This may result in some adjustments between budgetary chapters. We are not quite clear of the extent to which it would, but if so the Director-General would make specific proposals by chapter to the Finance Committee next year for its approval, under Financial Regulation 4.5.

If I may now turn to the question of the payment of arrears. As many Members will have seen perhaps from the press, there is an increasing likelihood, although no certainty, that a significant payment of arrears may be made in the period 2000-2001. This of course is good news but, as such, it does present us with a technical problem in that the spending authority generally has to be authorized to meet the provisions of Financial Regulation 4.1. Financial Regulation 4.1 is the one that states that the Director-General has the authority to spend up to the appropriation, as you would be approving an appropriation of US\$650 million, US\$657 million or US\$681 million, that would be the limit to the approval that you give the Director-General and thus these payments of arrears would create a surplus which would be returned to Member Nations under the provisions of Financial Regulation 6.1.

As a consequence of this possibility, the Secretariat has prepared a Draft Conference Resolution which is contained in a supplementary document CL 117/LIM/3, which includes an explanation of the background and a draft resolution authorizing the use of such funds in the event that they are received in 2000-2001.

Members will note that the potential expenditure items listed are of a one-time nature. This is essential as the payment of specific arrears being itself a one-time event cannot logically be used to fund continuing expenditure, unless there is an explicit assurance of funding in future periods.

Finally, on this point, the attention of Members is also drawn to the final clause of the Resolution concerning redeployment and separation costs arising from the implementation of the PWB 2000-2001. Under each of the scenarios, there is a requirement that we reduce staffing levels in various areas and therefore, that we will incur some redeployment and separation costs beyond those allowed for in the budget. This clause, that is the final clause of the Resolution, has the effect of authorizing such expenditures, over and above the Resolution for the Appropriation, in advance of the receipt of arrears.

Just to explain, the entire Resolution on Arrears assumes receipt of the arrears before we can spend the money, but in this particular case, we are seeking authorization to spend money on separation and redeployment costs in advance of receipt of the arrears, so as to avoid delaying the implementation of efficiency measures envisaged in the Programme of Work and Budget as proposed. Given that US\$93 million remains outstanding from the Major Contributor alone, such utilization of resources against this receivable amount is certainly not unreasonable. Members are requested to give favourable consideration to the proposed Resolution.

On the question of restructuring, which is referred to in the document, I would just like to bring you up to date on the on-going work being undertaken to improve the administrative efficiency of the Organization. Throughout the Programme of Work and Budget, there are references to adjustments to the organizational arrangements in administrative and operational areas of the Organization.

In particular, I would draw Members attention to the intention to establish a central Management Support Service which would result in transferring staff from the Departmental MSUs to this Central Unit. This is mentioned in paragraph 45 of the document.

I would also draw attention to the reference to the reorganization of the Financial Services Division in the light of the implementation of Oracle and in the light of the creation of this Central Management Support Service. This is mentioned in paragraph 753.

Now considerable progress has been made in this area with post descriptions having been developed for much of the new structure. In developing these structures, it has become apparent that there is a clear need to strengthen the Financial Services Division. We wish to report that this will be achieved, in part, through the conversion of abolished General Service posts to junior level Professional posts and, also, through the appropriate rebalancing of staffing between the Business Units of the Financial Services Division and the proposed Central Management Support structure. In any case, the net budgetary effect will be zero in that the additional costs will be offset by savings.

Again there may be some implications for budgetary chapters but we hope these will be minimal, as all programmes will continue to pay for the services directly related to the delivery of their programmes as in the past. Of course, the Director-General will keep the Finance Committee informed of whatever actions are taken in that area.

The final area I would like to report on, and I regret taking the time, but this is to bring you up to date for your discussions. In the rationalization of operations we would like to report that the rationalization measures referred to under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario - this is different because the previous measures occur under Zero Real Growth. These are referred to in paragraph 76 of the Programme of Work and Budget, where we discuss the need to capitalize on the synergies between the decentralized groups in the Regional Offices, in particular we discussed the

synergy between the technical groups, the operational branches and the Regional Office Management Support Units. As indicated in the text, it is still too early specifically identify the optimum structure which may vary across the decentralized structures and between countries depending upon various factors, such as the size of programmes, etc. It is also likely that we will need to take a gradual approach, starting with a trial arrangement and, having learnt from that experience, replicating the solution elsewhere as appropriate. Again, it is expected that this exercise will have implications for Headquarters where we will need to arrive at an optimum solution for coordinating operational activities. We will keep the Finance Committee informed of what happens there.

In conclusion, the Secretariat is available to respond to questions and again I apologize for taking so much time.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Queremos pedirle que otorgue la palabra a la distinguida delegación de Haití quien preside actualmente al Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Sra. Suze PERCY (Observador de Haití)**

El Programa de Labores y Presupuesto constituye la herramienta fundamental de la Organización porque centraliza las cifras y los programas que le permitirán a la FAO cumplir con su misión en el próximo bienio y además porque constituye un insumo fundamental para el debate político entre los Estados Miembros sobre los asuntos que son competencia de la Organización.

La forma de presentación del documento es substantivamente distinta a los documentos presentados en ocasiones anteriores y se enmarca en el nuevo enfoque de programación fijado por los órganos rectores. En este sentido apreciamos el esfuerzo de la Secretaría por ofrecernos no solamente un PLP más conciso, sino también un documento que refleja en gran medida la aplicación sistemática de criterios de determinación de las prioridades a través de proyectos técnicos, actividades programáticas continuas y acuerdos de servicio técnico. Al respecto deseamos enfatizar nuestro interés en que se introduzcan progresivamente mejoras en la formulación de los elementos de los programas a través de calendarios previamente establecidos de acuerdo a los objetivos de cada uno de ellos, teniendo en cuenta que se deben elaborar, cuando sea conveniente, actividades programáticas continuas que le otorguen sostenibilidad a los proyectos técnicos en vista que estos últimos tienen una duración máxima de seis años.

Asimismo, el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe quiere manifestar que el éxito en la aplicación de los programas del PLP dependerá de un adecuado uso de los recursos en función de las prioridades asignadas y, por tanto, constituye principalmente un asunto de eficacia y eficiencia en el gasto.

Además, es particularmente importante que el PLP recoja las orientaciones de los comités y de las reuniones ministeriales cuando se fije la asignación de los recursos. En esta ocasión, quisiéramos relevar que el PLP tiene una importancia adicional en vista que estamos también analizando el proyecto de Marco Estratégico de la FAO; sin profundizar en esta materia, que será objeto de una declaración adicional, pero considerando que el mismo influirá necesariamente en la aplicación del PLP y de los Programas a Plazo Medio, consideramos que deberá mejorarse en su oportunidad la aplicación del nuevo enfoque de programación en función de las prioridades que asigna el Marco Estratégico.

La Región de América Latina y el Caribe desea reiterar la importancia que le otorga a una aplicación equilibrada del mandato de la FAO. En este sentido, abogamos por un enfoque que permita que los aspectos informativos, normativos y operacionales estén contemplados de la misma manera en todos los documentos de la Organización así como en los programas de la misma. En este sentido, el GRULAC considera de la mayor importancia el reforzamiento del programa de cooperación técnica, y acoge con satisfacción el hecho que el PLP en cualquier escenario contemplará al mismo como un área protegida.

Lo anterior se enmarca en nuestro absoluto convencimiento de que la realidad de nuestra Región requiere una colaboración activa de la FAO. En nuestros países existen situaciones de extrema pobreza. Nos preocupa que las cifras macro-económicas no reflejen adecuadamente esta realidad. Por tal motivo el GRULAC defenderá siempre la necesidad de dar una atención adecuada y equilibrada a todas las regiones en desarrollo.

Nuestra Región confía en que el presupuesto que finalmente se apruebe refleje la prioridad que le otorgan los Estados Miembros a las labores de la FAO. En este sentido, como países en desarrollo, estimamos que el presupuesto para el próximo bienio no puede ser de Crecimiento Negativo. El nivel mínimo aceptable constituye el Crecimiento Real Cero. Sólo de esta manera podemos reflejar políticamente nuestro compromiso con los acuerdos de la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación y de esa manera dotar a la FAO de una estructura adecuada al iniciarse el próximo milenio.

Alentamos a la FAO a continuar buscando la manera de conseguir una mayor eficacia como instrumento que favorezca la cuantía del presupuesto y como medio para reprogramar los recursos para las actividades prioritarias. Confiamos en que la FAO siga promoviendo el ahorro administrativo suficiente que permita reforzar los programas sustantivos. Al mismo tiempo, subrayamos la necesidad de evitar la duplicación de funciones, esfuerzos y gastos. A nivel interno, ello debe reflejarse a través de una adecuada comunicación entre las dependencias de la Organización estableciendo mecanismos periódicos de supervisión y evaluación. A nivel externo, debe fortalecerse la coordinación entre las organizaciones del sistema a fin de potenciar actividades interdependientes cuando el caso así lo requiera. En este mismo contexto quisiéramos reiterar el llamado para que todos los Estados Miembros, en especial los mayores contribuyentes, cumplan con sus compromisos financieros y de esa manera se contribuya a resolver el problema de los pagos atrasados, los cuales influyen directamente en la ejecución continua y eficiente de los programas y proyectos de la FAO.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

Allow me to thank the Secretariat for its clear presentation of this important Agenda item. My delegation would like to associate itself with the views expressed by the GRULAC. As Chairmen, when we took floor on this subject during the Hundred and Sixteenth FAO Council, we emphasized the perspective within which the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001 had to be viewed. This perspective needs reiteration. The FAO millennium PWB should meaningfully and as far as possible measurably contribute to combatting increasing hunger, malnutrition and poverty in the wake of financial crises, natural disasters and civil strife. And, in terms of declarations of various Summits and Conferences, particularly the Rome Declaration of the World Food Summit, it should contribute to meeting the demands placed by the membership through various technical committees and regional conferences, sending correct signals in the fight against hunger and arresting the declining trend in the share of agriculture in ODA.

We call for FAO to do more. The perspective we enunciated alone justified a call for Real Growth budget, but we asked for the Zero Nominal Growth scenario as well, with the hope that additional efficiency savings might be identified to free resources for identified priority programmes. Unfortunately, we do not necessarily see additional efficiency savings identified.

Under Chapter 2, posts are being retained rather than abolished signifying that there is still the use for these posts. These are being underfunded just to protect programmes. These certainly cannot be labelled as efficiency savings.

Funding for improved language coverage has been reduced by US\$500 000 dollars. This cannot be termed as efficiency savings. Regional offices that were strengthened between 1996 and 1998 are now going to be de-strengthened through – those specific posts have not been identified. This can hardly be justified as a well-considered efficiency savings proposal.

We note that the Finance Committee considered and endorsed the cost increase calculations as well as its assumptions leading to a figure of approximately US\$14.9 million which may be reduced given the explanation of the exchange rate. Having accepted this level of cost increases



and being not entirely convinced of corresponding efficiency savings generated, we cannot justify approving the budget, which has a real value of only about US\$635 million.

At the Hundred and Sixteenth FAO Council we called for FAO to do more. We indicated our priority areas. These were reflected in paragraph 85 of that Council Report. In the Zero Real Growth scenario, of course, these have merely been protected at the ZRG level. As there were no additional efficiency savings, this was probably the best that could have been done. But this is not good enough. No wonder then, that the majority of Members in the Finance Committee sought a Real Growth scenario and most Members attending the Joint Session of the Programme and the Finance Committees also supported either a Real Growth or a Zero Real Growth scenario. We can only but endorse the viewpoint of this majority. This is not to say that we believe that there is no further scope of efficiency in the Organization. Surely we must always remain in pursuit of efficiencies. In this sense, we are willing to participate in any exercise leading to introducing planned efficiencies. Any initiative in this regard will be welcome and gains thereof hopefully transmitted to the identified priority areas.

Finally, we endorse the appeal of the Finance Committee to all Member Nations with contributions outstanding to pay assessed contributions and arrears in full as soon as possible. As we had proposed at the Hundred and Sixteenth Council Session, we reiterate that any arrears received during the biennium 2000-2001 should be channelled towards funding the identified priority programmes of FAO in addition to the approved Programme of Work and Budget.

**Dietrich LINCKE (Germany)**

May I ask for the floor for the Finnish delegation on behalf of the European Union.

**Ms Aulikki KAUPILA (Observer for Finland)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. Given the major contribution of the Member States of the European Union to the FAO Regular Budget, we attach great importance to achieving a well-balanced and transparent Programme of Work and Budget that ensures adequate resources to those activities that have been defined to be priorities within the mandate of the Organization.

As the budget is the most central tool for FAO's work in the next biennium, right focus is important even though the present documentation has been prepared during a transitional period towards the new planning framework.

We welcome the changes made to improve the transparency and user-friendliness of the document. The preparation of the three scenarios of the budget level is detailed enough to allow the Organization work next year, whatever level will be decided by the Conference.

The three categories of programme activities, Regular Programme Technical Projects, Continuing Programme Activities and Technical Service Agreements make it easier to understand the nature of activities. The text under each programme entity, in its present form, explains the tools and partnerships that we have emphasized in the discussions on the Strategic Framework.

In the view of a European Community and its Member States, certain areas are a high priority in the field of agriculture and rural development, fisheries and forestry, as they all are areas of vital relevance to FAO's central goals, areas where FAO has an important comparative advantage and thus can put its resources to the best possible use. These areas are the following, not in any order of importance: Information work and promotion of research on food and agriculture, forestry and fisheries; International forum for discussion and agreements; Standard-setting activities, in particular under *Codex Alimentarius* and the International Plant Protection Convention; Activities concerning the role of women in agriculture, which should be translated into a more extensive and mainstream integration of gender issues in FAO's activities; Socio-economic and gender issues in rural development including in the field of genetic resources; Assessment and conservation and sustainable management of natural resources for food, agriculture, forestry and fisheries; A system for developing countries and countries in transition for drafting in sector our policies including supporting, in the framework of the appropriate international organizations, the

preparations for the forthcoming agricultural trade negotiations; Work on emergencies including forest fires, encompassing preparedness, early warning and rehabilitation within the Organization's mandate; and *Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*, regional activities such as combatting animal and plant diseases where activities are needed in several countries.

At the Council Meeting in June, we expressed our concerns on the allocation of regular programme resources among agriculture, fisheries and forestry and asked our Secretariat to take into account the conclusions of the Ministerial Meetings and Technical Committees when working further on the Programme of Work and Budget.

In this connection, we also expressed concern that the Regular Programme resources for administrative and management support activities are relatively too high. We still have the same concerns. We strongly urge that FAO take into account the conclusions of the Ministerial Meetings and Technical Committees, namely that marked long-term relative changes in the political and economical importance of FAO's three main areas of competence be reflected in a reallocation of regular resources of our Organization, in particular, in favour of Fisheries and Forestry activities.

To explain further our concerns, we were disappointed to notice that the main implications of the Ministerial Meeting on Fisheries for the Programme of Work and Budget seemed to have been degraded to the level of possible Trust Fund activities. There is not even a reference to the highly political matter of a Plan of Action to deal with illegal, unregulated and unreported fisheries or the implementation of the three Plans of Action agreed at the Committee on Fisheries in early 1999.

We are also concerned about the status of Forestry in the Organization. The vital role of forests in the economic and social sectors of countries, and the multiple use approach of forest management are more and more recognized all over the world. The ongoing IFF process and the growing importance of the sustainable utilization and conservation of forests in view of carbon sequestration, sustainable rural development, as well as soil, water, and biodiversity conservation, make forestry in our view, particularly relevant for FAO. Our concern is based on the fact that highly-prioritized activities such as forest resources and forest policy and planning are heavily dependent on Trust Fund financing. We repeat our call made at FAO's Hundred and Sixteenth Council in June, that the Special Programme Food Security be evaluated using the framework of a new programming model.

In general terms, there seems to be a move towards an increased importance given to normative activities in the Regular Programme. We particularly appreciate the increase focus of overall operations and field activities on the complementarity of policy and normative work, and on field assistance and operational activities.

The complementarity on normative and operational activities is of utmost importance. Also the activities of the Technical Cooperation Programme should be clearly defined and the transparency of these programmes should also be improved.

These observations make us think that our Programme of Work and Budget lacks a necessary establishment of priorities, and, in addition, some needs expressed by Technical Committees are placed out of the regular budget and thus depend on possible extrabudgetary resources. The priority activities that have been clearly identified by FAO's Governing and Technical Bodies, including efforts towards the improvement of language balance, should be integrated into the central part of the Programme of Work and Budget, and thus not depend on additional resources.

In order to find room for funding the above-mentioned priority activities from the regular budget, more prioritization is needed. We hope that the new model of a Medium-Term Plan will help us in this task. We welcome the savings identified in the Programme of Work and Budget, as well as the links and partnerships mentioned under each programme entity. However, we find a very still but significant scope for efficiency savings and we note that several of the proposals that we made in the June Council have not been reflected in the present Programme of Work and Budget. We would like to see further consideration given to the number of Country Offices, taking into

account the number of Regional and Sub-regional offices, or vice versa. Costs of meetings could be further lowered by reducing meeting days, where possible, and seeking a reduction in the number of FAO Intergovernmental Groups on the Committee on Commodity Programmes.

Efforts to make savings in this field should be continued. Efficiency and effectiveness need to be the key watchwords for FAO. They are the barometers we will use to check how the Programme of Work and Budget is implemented and how consistent its activities are with what is contained in the Strategic Framework and in the Medium-Term Plan to come.

**Wilberforce KISAMBA MUGERWA (Uganda)**

This is a far-reaching subject, and as you predicted it will generate much debate. May I beg your indulgence that Tanzania is given the floor on behalf of the G-77 Group.

**Albano L.T. ASMANI (Observer for Tanzania, United Republic of)**

Let me say from the outset how glad I am on behalf of the G-77 and China, a group that I speak for.

I wish to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, as well as the two Vice-Chairmen whom we have just elected and of course not forgetting the Drafting Committee, which has an important task before it. Likewise, let me thank the Secretariat for its excellent introduction of this particular and very important document but, more importantly for the new information that is not in the document, which, I may say, makes the challenge of the document to be very important. We have been informed of the exchange implication that affects all the well-known three scenarios.

The document before us is a result of hard work by the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee. They brought us where we are now. But we also have to acknowledge that in the course of preparing the document, there have been several interesting arguments trying to come up with a balanced document that might be carried by this house.

The three scenarios, of which I do not intend to go into detail, are well known, and I wish to assure the House that the G-77 has extensively analysed them very critically, and understands the implication of each scenario. But in the belief of this group that we have to go not just because a scenario sounds nice; it is not a question of terminologies, but a question of what it means, and whether the outcome of a scenario will meet the expectation of this House and, more important, the expectation which we expect the Organization to deliver. And the G-77 supports very well and very much all those delegations who talk of efficiency for the Organization.

Adequacy of resources is the key to the success, not only of FAO but of any organization that uses financial resources to implement its programmes.

We in FAO, I believe, have one indisputable objective, and this is what was agreed way back in 1996 at the Food Summit and Plan of Action. We undertook to reduce the number of the hungry and the malnourished. The figure was said to be 800 million, but recent documentation does indicate that that figure might be increasing for so many unfortunate reasons. Now, if that is the case, and we still hold to our commitment, it is important therefore that we make available to the Organization the required resources to achieve that objective.

In life there are always competing demands. For that reason we have to make priorities. I do not believe that there is any better priority than addressing the hungry. Unfortunately, most of these 800 million happen to come from the area I represent, that is the G-77. Hunger is poverty, so we have to fight hunger because we have to fight poverty, and the best way to fight hunger is to fight poverty itself.

There is a question of arrears, and I would like to confirm with this House, that the G-77 takes arrears as a very serious issue. We do understand why we have arrears, and there are several reasons for why we have arrears. But let me say this: arrears by Members of the G-77 are not arrears, because we attach any conditions. We have arrears because we have a genuine reason for not being able to meet our own commitments, but I wish to promise that the G-77 will do as much as it can not to have unreasonable and undefendable arrears. It has been encouraging that we seem

to be expecting something positive on the question of arrears, at least that is what I heard from the previous speakers from the high table over there. It is therefore encouraging and refreshing that we may reach that important day when the arrears, I think that is a figure, I do not know who said about US\$93 million for one sort of arrears, and we pray that those arrears will find their own way to the Organization.

I was reading the Agenda of the Conference, and I observe that there are three sessions where Commission II will be addressing this particular subject. Now, rather than spending most of our time here, I wish to promise that we shall meet in Commission II where there is going to be more time to deliberate, as previous speakers before me have said, and to see how we could amicably arrive at a reasonable level for the budget. I mean that I use the word eight hundred without saying eight hundred million, so the hundred is eight hundred million. I wish we had 800 and not 800 million.

**Nehad Ibrahim ABDEL-LATIF (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

At the outset, may I thank the Secretariat of FAO for the excellent documents it has produced for this meeting of ours.

May I speak on a specific point, namely, the different scenarios prepared by the Organization for the Programme of Work and Budget for the year 2000-2001. My delegation is fully confident that of the three scenarios, namely Real Growth, Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth, the Organization, if it wishes to achieve its goals and objectives, and fight poverty, hunger and malnutrition, should use the Zero Real Growth scenario, because the challenges facing the Organization are tremendous indeed. Therefore, this Organization does need more resources. Although we believe that efficiency is the key word, we also believe that this does not mean diminishing resources for the Organization. It means the use of adequate resources in the best possible way. We believe that the budget should not be below the Zero Real Growth, which would create the necessary resources for the implementation of the Organization's activities.

Second, I have another observation concerning the use of languages in the Organization. We support the idea of establishing the proper balance and fairness in the use of languages within the Organization and outside it. Therefore, we believe that the Organization should adopt the necessary Resolution in order to strike the proper balance among all languages. We believe that equality among languages was discussed in the last session of the Council in June of this year, and during that session the Council was unanimous in supporting the equal treatment of languages on the basis of Article 47 of the Basic Texts of the Organization. We believe that such a decision was really made. Hopefully, it will be further supported by the Conference.

There is another request, that submitted by the Near East Group to the Director-General of the Organization, namely, to appoint a Secretary to the Desert Locust Control Commission, within the framework of the budget for 2000-2001. The Near East Group does consider this issue of paramount importance. We have been notified about the abolition of this post, and we also know that this post is not referred to in the draft budget. How was this post abolished without our knowledge? The Desert Locust Control Commission, which encompasses five countries in the northwestern part of Africa, agreed to establish such a position. We do submit this plea, namely, that the Organization appoint a Secretary for the Desert Locust Control Commission for the Near East Group. Such a request should be submitted to the Conference, bearing in mind the importance of this issue.

**Ahmed Suleiman AL-AQUIL (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (Original language Arabic)**

First of all, we would like to congratulate the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman on their election and also the delegation of Algeria on the election as Chairperson of the Minister representing Algeria and also congratulate Mr Fontana-Giusti on his election to Commission I and also the Chairman of Commission II. We also congratulate all the countries that have been elected to the Nominations Committee.

We thank Mr Bommer on his interesting presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget and we thank Mr Wade for the clarification provided and the very relevant information provided, especially that concerning the exchange rate.

The Member Nations of the Near East Group, on behalf of the G-77, have discussed the three scenarios and the budget, which is submitted in detail. We believe that the minimum that our Group can accept is Real Zero Growth. That is the bare minimum we can accept for the budget of the Organization.

We have also listened to the information provided this morning on the new exchange rate, the lira to US dollar rate, and we believe that the differences in the level of the budget proposed - considering the new exchange rate of Lira 1800 lira to the US\$1, and the difference between Nominal and Zero Growth, required by many contributing countries, and Zero Real Growth, as required by developing countries as a minimum for the budget of this Organization - do not require a complex and lengthy discussion. We believe that the Council can accept an acceptable level for the budget which takes into account the needs of developing countries and, likewise, takes into account the request submitted by contributing countries, which asks that the additional costs be absorbed in budget savings. We believe that the Zero Real Growth scenario needs to take into account the equality in the use of languages in this Organization. This principle of equality among languages must be retained, whatever scenario is selected, and this especially in the main bodies and Governing Bodies of FAO.

I think we should also take account of the decisions adopted by Regional Conferences, both for the scenario and the budget.

We wish to stress the importance of the Desert Locust Control Programmes for North Africa and Africa in general, and we hope that a new Secretary will be appointed as soon as possible for the Commission on Desert Locust Control. We submitted this matter at previous meetings. Nonetheless, this was unfortunately not taken into account.

We wish to commend the Secretariat for the improvements made to document CL 117/4. The document is more concise, more streamlined, and this is not what we had in the past, so we really commend this.

**Julian A. THOMAS (South Africa)**

On behalf of the Africa Group and South Africa, we wish to extend our welcome to you. It is very good to see you in the Chair again, guiding our deliberations over here today.

Our congratulations also go to the new members of the Bureau, that is, the two new Vice-Chairs assisting you and the other new members of the Bureau.

We would like to thank the Secretariat and the contribution made by Mr Bommer as well in the introduction of the documents this morning and, of course, for the documents themselves, that is, the Programme of Work and Budget itself and the accompanying documents of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee.

We would like to express our satisfaction with the format of the Programme of Work and Budget and the way the three scenarios are handled, attempting to anticipate the implications of the different budgetary levels. We are looking forward to when there will be closer and clearer links between the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget, and the complementary exercises, the Programme Evaluation Report and the Programme Implementation Report. This will be in the not too distant future and, as has been mentioned before by the Finnish Representative of the European Union, will allow greater clarity and transparency in the Programme of Work and Budget.

While endorsing the priorities in the Programme of Work and Budget, and the protection offered to the Fisheries and Forestry Programmes, Africa believes that the way forward for FAO as a viable agency, promoting agricultural production, is along the path of the Real Growth Budget or, at the very least, at the level of Zero Real Growth. Africa considers that another negative growth

budget would have an extremely negative effect on FAO. It would further harm the substantive activities of the Organization, both normative and field operations, especially in Chapters 2 and 3 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001. It would send a negative signal to FAO's partners, beneficiaries and employees. It would thus be contrary to the purpose and philosophy behind FAO as a key organization contributing to the achievement of the objective agreed to by all our Governments during the World Food Summit, namely, to take up the challenge of reducing the number of hungry and poor in the world by half by the year 2015.

Africa believes in a strong and dynamic multilateral system to help create a better world for all. Accelerated agricultural and rural development is strongly needed in most developing countries, including many African countries, as a basis for growth, development and achieving food security. Additional efforts need to be made to facilitate the transfer of know-how and technology to developing countries in order to enable them to accelerate their development. We all know that existing efforts in this regard are not making a sufficient impression on reducing the numbers of hungry and poor in the world. We also know that official development aid, and the part of ODA directed at agriculture, is decreasing. Africa thus considers that it is time to increase, not decrease, FAO's capacity to assist developing countries.

As indicated again by the Finnish Representative, on behalf of the EU, we need a strong, balanced FAO to adequately fulfil its normative and field activities. In our opinion, this capacity rests on FAO's having a strong Regular Programme. FAO needs a strong, balanced Regular Programme to preserve excellence in its core activities and to attract and manage extra-budgetary activities.

A Zero Real Growth Budget enables FAO to merely maintain the momentum of its activities. We consider that FAO should do more to at least respond to some of the additional activities asked of it by Members at various Technical Committees of Council and at the two Ministerial Meetings held over the past two years. In response to Africa's needs, we consider that additional resources should be allocated at least to the following areas: livestock production; monitoring of land and freshwater resources; the use of biotechnology in Africa (an extremely important aspect with many dimensions to it); enhancing the implementation of FIVIMS at national and international levels; full support to Codex Alimentarius; training and capacity-building; illegal, unauthorized and unreported fishing; and the study of the impact of sanitary and phytosanitary measures on international trade.

While in favour of providing FAO with the financial support and security it needs, we would support efforts to render the Organization more effective and efficient through more rational use of its resources. We thus support the current examination of support costs referred to in the Report of the Finance Committee and would be open to examining, together with other Member Nations, other ways that the Organization could use its resources more rationally.

At this juncture, we would like to align ourselves with the comments made by the Chairman of G-77, concerning the question of arrears. While recognizing major difficulties faced by many developing countries, Africa also aligns itself with those who point to the need for all Governments to respect their financial obligations to the Organization to the maximum extent possible.

Later today we will be discussing the FAO Strategic Framework for 2000 and 2015. We would like to point out that the value of the Strategic Framework, in guiding the future of FAO, would be seriously diminished should the current downward trend in FAO's budget continue. Although the document itself may be considered by some to be resource-neutral, it would be inconceivable, in our opinion, to move forward with hope if those who approve such a Strategic Framework do not, at the same time, at least maintain the present level of FAO's financial resources.

In conclusion, Africa supports a Zero Real Growth Budget as the absolute minimum level acceptable, with the request that any additional resources forthcoming, from savings or other resources, be directed to enhance priority technical and economic programmes.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

En relación a los documentos que ha presentado la Secretaría sobre este punto del temario de actividades, la delegación argentina quiere destacar algunos aspectos que considera de relevancia para la sostenibilidad económica y financiera y los programas de la Organización en el próximo bienio.

El Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, a nuestro juicio, es la herramienta esencial de la Organización por cuanto permite efectuar un sustantivo diálogo político entre sus Miembros respecto a su planificación, priorización e implementación. En este sentido el documento C 99/3 presenta características diferentes de sus predecesores. En efecto además de una nueva estructura en las líneas generales del Programa, el Director General lo considera como un documento de transición que deberá tener en cuenta las orientaciones generales y los objetivos del Marco Estratégico luego de su aprobación eventual por la Conferencia.

En lo referente a las líneas generales del Programa, es preciso destacar que el nuevo enfoque aprobado por los Órganos Rectores de la FAO, implica la sustitución de terminología de elementos de sus programas; éstos eran base de los anteriores PLP. Si bien reconocemos que registra un avance positivo en la metodología aplicada, la lectura comparativa con ejercicios anteriores se ve un tanto complicada. Con relación a los niveles de sostenibilidad del Presupuesto presentado, la delegación argentina desea subrayar dos aspectos que, a nuestro juicio, deberían ser tomados en consideración por los Miembros del Consejo. Por una parte, expresamos nuestra profunda preocupación por el nivel de atrasos en el pago de las contribuciones de los Estados Miembros, hecho que ha sido reflejado por otras delegaciones que nos han precedido. Somos conscientes de las dificultades financieras que padecen muchos de los países en desarrollo aquí presentes, debido a una multiplicidad de factores. De hecho, nosotros también padecemos algunas de esas dificultades. Sin embargo, constatamos que otros Miembros que estarían en condiciones de pagar puntualmente sus cuotas y que constituyen un alto porcentaje de los ingresos previstos por la Organización, lamentablemente no lo hacen. En consecuencia, parece oportuno preguntarse si ello es debido también a dificultades financieras propias o bien a una demotivación por las metodologías aplicadas hasta el momento en la implementación de los programas presentados. En tal sentido, y como todos sabemos, las cuotas constituyen una obligación para todos los Miembros; la conclusión a la que se llega es que la administración y ejecución de los recursos puestos a disposición no ha sido suficientemente atractiva como para convencer a dichos contribuyentes. El documento FC 93/8 presentado al Comité de Finanzas en su párrafo 12 referido a "Cuotas Corrientes Recaudadas" nos muestra que al 30 de junio de este año nos encontrábamos en el menor nivel de recaudación en año de conferencias; en términos porcentuales fue al 30 de junio de 1999 prácticamente un 52,5 por ciento. En el período anterior, 1997 fue un 61,81 por ciento y en 1995 fue un 54,70 por ciento, reitero al 30 de junio de cada uno de estos años.

Otro elemento que genera preocupación en la delegación argentina está constituido por la tendencia registrada en los últimos años con relación a las contribuciones voluntarias, que suman otros ingresos como los Fondos Fiduciarios y que continúan siendo la principal fuente de financiación del Programa de Campo. La tendencia verificada en los recursos extra-presupuestarios presentada en la página 35 del documento C 99/3 y la evaluación de los Programas de Labores y Presupuesto desde el bienio 1992-93 hasta la fecha también constituye una señal de alarma, sobretudo si analizamos el desglose de sus cifras. En tal sentido, hemos evaluado que una de las principales fuentes de los recursos extra-presupuestarios está constituida por los ingresos provenientes de fuentes extra-presupuestarias, en particular el Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo y los Fondos Fiduciarios.

De acuerdo al Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el período 1992-93 hasta 1998-99 los recursos extra-presupuestarios disminuyeron de 888 millones de dólares a 669 millones de dólares en 1994-95, continuando la tendencia de crecimiento hasta 443,7 millones de dólares durante 1998-99. Esto representa una caída total de más del 50 por ciento; en términos regionales la

declinación fue más aguda en el caso de África: 67 por ciento, 48 por ciento para Cercano Oriente y 45 por ciento en el caso de América Latina y el Caribe.

Otro documento que hemos analizado es el CL 116/3 que en su párrafo 43, presentado en el último Consejo, se ve que el patrón de reducción en el Programa de Campo sigue una tendencia similar. El Programa FAO/PNUD registró una pronunciada merma de 108 millones en 1993 a 28 millones en 1998, lo que representa un descenso real del 74 por ciento. Los Fondos Fiduciarios para actividades no urgentes, otro ítem de esa composición, disminuyeron de 155 millones en 1993 a 128 millones en 1998, lo que también registra una caída del 17 por ciento. Los Fondos Combinados entre PNUD y los aplicados a No Emergencias, suponen en el período analizado un descenso más agudo: 41 por ciento. El Fondo Fiduciario para Emergencias incrementó sustancialmente en un 68 por ciento, lo cual de alguna manera ha creado la falsa impresión de que el total de los ingresos por Fondos Fiduciarios en el 1998 registraron un aumento. Pero en realidad, tomado en cifras globales, la declinación aún está continuando.

Teniendo en cuenta la información proporcionada en los documentos presentados no hallamos ni suficientes ni objetivas las razones que puedan explicar la magnitud del marcado descenso en este tipo de ingresos. En virtud de las cifras analizadas nos planteamos el interrogante para saber si la razón de la merma de dichos recursos no está relacionada, lamentablemente, con una visualización externa de la FAO de una eventual pérdida de competitividad de la Organización. En este sentido la delegación argentina desea llamar la atención de los Miembros del Consejo a fin de que se evalúen en profundidad las reales causas que han motivado la persistencia en los atrasos en las contribuciones, como así también la tendencia observada en cuanto a recursos extra-presupuestarios. Ello nos parece de la mayor relevancia a fin de comprobar la efectiva sostenibilidad del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto.

Quisiera referirme brevemente a algunas de las cuestiones que tienen que ver con la restructuración de la Organización y que, de alguna manera, impactan también en su presupuesto. Sólo entendemos que uno de los aspectos claves de esta restructuración en la FAO es el proceso de descentralización hacia los países y las regiones propuesta por el Director General al comienzo de su mandato y aprobada por el Consejo en su sesión de junio del 1994 y que aún se encuentra en ejecución. Entendemos que, pese a las dificultades financieras que se han observado, éste es un proceso que ha llevado demasiado tiempo y recursos en su implementación. Por otra parte, estimamos que es urgente proceder a la evaluación de lo actuado hasta el momento y lamentamos que, tal como lo expresara la Secretaría en junio último, esta tarea no haya sido incorporada a la Agenda de Actividades. Esperamos que en el futuro se incorpore este proceso de evaluación a la Agenda de Actividades de la Secretaría. A modo de ejemplo agregamos que los presupuestos presentados demuestran que la carga presupuestaria de las oficinas regionales y las oficinas en los países significa un monto que casi duplican los fondos asignados al Programa de Cooperación Técnica para el bienio para la totalidad de los Miembros de la FAO. A nuestro juicio esta correlación sería indicativa de la falta de evaluación previa del impacto de dicho proceso, o sea hay algo que no ha sido efectivamente previsto. En tal sentido y tal como fuera destacado por el último Consejo, propiciamos una evaluación del costo-beneficio de los programas y actividades de la FAO a fin de efectuar una planificación eficiente de los recursos con que contarán en el futuro sin que esto implique una reducción de puestos que arriesgue el fin que se desea alcanzar. Por otra parte un aspecto de relevancia que deberíamos considerar es el relacionado con una efectiva delegación de autoridad hacia las Oficinas Regionales en los países a fin de mejorar la relación de costo-beneficio de la descentralización. En tal sentido, y de acuerdo al análisis efectuado por nuestra delegación, el sistema de promoción y contratación de personal parecería que aún continúa demasiado centrado en la Sede. El mismo criterio se estaría aplicando con la introducción del sistema ORACLE y nos preguntamos si su actual desarrollo hace prever que la autorización de los recursos financieros disponibles resulte una mayor centralización que en el pasado. En consecuencia, estamos convencidos que el análisis respecto de la descentralización deberá llevarse a cabo como condición necesaria y suficiente a través de un enfoque amplio y participativo, en el cual intervengan los Estados Miembros, los funcionarios de la FAO en el terreno y los oficiales en la Sede. Con ello se podrá evitar por un lado, un eventual desinterés de



los países donantes y beneficiarios en el proceso de reformas y por el otro se crearán las condiciones para que los funcionarios de la Organización tengan una motivación permanente en alcanzar los objetivos, las metas y cumplir con la misión de la FAO.

Por último, mi delegación entiende que como prerequisite para obtener recursos adicionales o bien para ser más eficiente al actual nivel de gastos debe aplicarse un enfoque global que incluya como elemento central un efectivo proceso participativo en el que se profundicen la interacción de los Estados Miembros, otras agencias del sistema, instituciones académicas de los Países Miembros y los integrantes de la sociedad civil de dichos países consustanciados con los objetivos del mandato de la Organización.

A nuestro juicio ello resultará decisivo para incrementar substancialmente la transparencia en la ejecución de los programas y actividades de la FAO, a través de una libre circulación de la información tanto hacia el interior como hacia el exterior de la Organización. Asimismo permitirá una constante evaluación del impacto de la utilización de los recursos disponibles y su monitoreo por los actores antes mencionados, aumentando con ello su nivel de interés por las metas y programas de la FAO.

Disculpe lo extenso de nuestra declaración, pero consideramos relevante destacar estos aspectos que ha evaluado la delegación argentina.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

I appreciate the excellent explanation from Mr Wade and also the Chairperson of the Programme Committee.

First of all, I would like to mention the efficiency savings. We recognize that FAO has done its best efforts to increase efficiency savings and effective budgetary operations and management, goals which many other UN Agencies have been pursuing. However, we still request that FAO keep up this effort.

Secondly, I would like to mention the budgetary levels, which will be decided during the Conference, since many Member Nations are very interested in this matter.

Taking into account the fact that Member Nations in arrears have increased in recent years as stated in the document, it would be undesirable that the budgetary scale of the Organization for the next biennium is set over the levels that Members could actually contribute to the Organization, under the given fiscal situation, as our delegation requested during the Hundred and Sixteenth Session of the Council.

In addition, it seems noteworthy that several regions of the world have yet to recover from economic recessions attributed to the spiral effects of financial turmoils.

Finally, I would like to mention the criteria for the resource allocation within the regions. As we know, the goal of the World Food Summit is reduction of the number of the hungry. We would like to recommend the Secretariat to keep the balance between the regions when allocating resourcing, especially considering the number of hungry in the Asia regions.

**Kazuo TANAKA (Japan)**

As Japan being the substantially large financial contributor to FAO and, as an honest supporter of FAO, I would like on behalf of the Japanese Government to make the following comments on the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001.

We welcome the detailed document which explores three different scenarios, reflecting on the proposal for Real Growth, Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth as requested by the Council during the last June session. We wish to thank the Secretariat for the excellent work produced.

We feel however, that the document seems still rather restrictive and lengthy. It appears that several programmes are still overlapping in different Departments, in particular between the

Agriculture Department and Sustainable Development. More efforts need to be made to make the document more concise, clearly focusing on essential information.

In this regard, we would like to suggest that this work be carried out with much closer consultation with the Technical Departments.

Chapter 2, Technical Economic Programme is the core substantive work of FAO. Therefore, we fully concur with the observation made in paragraph 13 of the Report of the Finance Committee document CL 117/4 that financial transfers from the substantive work to non-substantive work which took place in the 1998-99 biennium should be avoided as much as possible for the coming biennium.

In this connection, we would like to stress that, in order to protect the technical and economic programme, we should encourage FAO to accelerate implementation of adjustments to the organizational structure in the administrative and operational areas.

Let me turn to the question on the level of budget. The question of the size of the budget should be considered not simply in the light of the comparative size *per se* as presented by the Secretariat but reviewed, in a much broader perspective, so that we may be able to see and understand the situation clearly.

Firstly, the Japanese delegation would like to stress that many Member Nations, including Japan, have been facing a very tight financial situation because of the downturn of the economy. The central, as well as the local governments in Japan are now all under mounting political pressure to restrain public expenditure and to reduce its debt. It is no exception in this regard for the Government's payment of the assessed contributions to the international organizations to have been seriously reviewed from various points of view, including responsibilities that Japan bears commensurate with the amount of financial obligations in a given organization. These are part of the reasons why we had to take a belt-tightening policy measure of Zero Nominal Growth *vis-à-vis* the UN and the large UN Specialized Agencies such as ILO, WHO and FAO.

Secondly, these measures have served to bring about excellent results in rationalizing the organizational structure and in improving efficiency and effectiveness. This has been particularly noticeable in the case of FAO under the courageous leadership of the present Director-General. We need to encourage and continue to support his efforts towards this direction for the budget 2000-2001 as well.

Thirdly, despite the above measures, the Government of Japan has taken into account financial needs for the FAO's programme implementation and, in fact, increased its Trust Fund for this year from US\$ 3.3 million to US\$ 5.1 million. We shall continue to make our support in this direction for the next year as well.

This fact will demonstrate our positive attitude toward FAO, and you may be rest assured that we will do our utmost in this regard.

We wish to draw your attention to the following two points which would certainly contribute the healthy financial management of FAO. First on arrears: as already pointed out by previous speakers, according to the report of the Finance Committee, paragraph 27 regarding the financial position of the Organization as of 13 September 1999, 94 Members have not yet made any payment toward the 1999 assessment. This means that 44 Members might lose their Voting Rights at the Conference later in the year, and it appears to be too optimistic to expect a Real Growth budget level, in fact, insufficiently funded to carry out the programme as foreseen.

Japan has paid in full its contributions for 1999, in line with a strong support policy toward FAO activities. We urge other countries that have not fulfilled their obligation to do the same so that FAO may be able to continue to effectively and efficiently carry out its mandate and responsibilities.

Secondly, with regard to cooperation and partnership with international organizations and bilateral donors, it cannot be overemphasized that FAO pursues more vigorously its cooperation

with UN funding agencies for technical assistance programmes, namely, UNDP and international financing institutions and bilateral donors, especially with a view to securing funding sources for technical and economic programmes.

With the above note, the Japanese delegation wishes to thank FAO, under the leadership of the Director-General, for the intelligent and thoughtful implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

The United States supports the budget for the coming biennium of not more than US\$650 million. We realize that a budget level of US\$650 million means that FAO will not be able to carry out all of the programmes that the Secretariat outlined in the PWB document under the Real Growth scenario, but it is our firm view that FAO will be able to make a real contribution at this level in areas that are within its comparative advantage.

Let me please explain why we think this is so. Priorities between programmes and major chapters and among chapters have to be set. Every public sector entity in today's world must exercise this self-discipline, because funding sources are limited - whether those are taxpayers or sovereign countries, funding sources are limited.

Secondly, the Strategic Framework will help FAO set priorities in a way that has not been possible to date.

Third, further cost savings and efficiencies can be achieved in FAO's overseas offices, its overseas country offices particularly, in recovery of support costs from extra-budgetary projects -- which South Africa mentioned earlier -- in the use of consultants, in travel, in eliminating programmes that are not to FAO's comparative advantage or mandate or that private voluntary organizations or other organizations can do better and more efficiently.

Fourth, while the exchange rate between the dollar and the lira is unpredictable -- and Tony Wade pointed out where we are right now -- there is nothing fixed about that exchange rate. I think that if I were a betting woman, I would bet that it will change between now and when the date that the budget is adopted. On the FAO's lira costs which are a significant decrease in dollar terms with the appreciation of the dollar, for every movement of 25 lira in the exchange rate, I believe the figure that Mr Wade told the Finance Committee is that there is an additional US\$ 3.7 million in cost savings, that is, if the lira depreciates against the dollar. So we could have further narrowing of the difference between Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth between now and when the budget is voted at Conference, which is the date on which the rate of exchange is adopted.

We would also note that despite data being circulated around this building showing that FAO has been cut more than other agencies, this is actually a relatively new trend in the recent past. From the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s, FAO's budget grew rapidly by some 60 percent between 1984-85 biennium and the 1994-95 biennium, while other agency budgets were much more modest. I would also note that, as the Japanese delegate pointed out, both World Health Organization and the International Labour Organization in fact, have agreed on Zero Nominal Growth budgets for the coming biennium.

With respect to the question of arrears, perhaps some of you have followed the debate that is going on between the two branches of our Government in the United States, the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch. I know I have certainly been following it closely and we may well be close to an agreement between the two branches of government on paying our arrears and many of you also know or let me remind you that this is a very important priority for the Clinton Administration. The President himself and the Secretary of State have staked a lot of their prestige on making our contributions up to date and on time in all of the UN Agencies, it is a solemn obligation, the President accepts that, but all Members must meet their financial obligations and I think this is a key factor in an organization that is not defined by weighted voting. This is a universal and democratic organization where one country has one vote at the end of the day, and so for that reason it is important for all countries to meet their obligations. We

would also note that those obligations are set on a sliding scale depending on the country's ability to pay. That is an old and well-respected UN practice.

I would also endorse the comments made by the Republic of Korea and Japan with respect to the sustainability of the budget level. This is something that has to be borne in mind when one assesses the numbers of countries who are in fact having difficulties in meeting their obligations.

I have two more points to make and then I will close. It is time, I think overdue in fact, for FAO to apply the concepts of modern resource allocation methods to the Programme of Work and Budget. I know that Tony Wade and his shop are working really hard on that. I am particularly referring to the need to set performance measures in indicators for all programmes at their inception and to do the same with respect to establishing timebound objectives. We believe these concepts can and should be applied to continuing programmes, technical programmes and technical service agreements. Obviously, there are some challenges in applying these kinds of concepts to continuing programmes, but other countries and other institutions have done so and there is much expertise available to the Secretariat in this field.

Finally, one programme note that could affect resource allocation. It is important for FAO to become more pro-active on biotechnology, particularly on the sensitive area of genetically modified organisms. The convening of an Expert Panel of Advisors on the Ethical Aspects of Biotechnology is helpful, but is also essential that science-based aspects be considered. We note that the OECD has already got a Website link to their work on biotechnology. While I have every respect for the OECD, my country is a Member and I worked on the OECD myself, the science expertise resides in FAO and we need to take advantage of that.

**Nahi SHIBANI (Syria) (Original language Arabic)**

I shall be brief in exposing the viewpoint of my country regarding the Programme of Work and Budget. First of all we should like to thank the Secretariat for their excellent and simplified presentation of the document on the Programme of Work and Budget, taking into account the recommendations of the Technical Committees and Commissions concerned. Here, I should like to emphasize the option of the Zero Real Growth because the current period requires the Organization to implement all its programmes to the utmost, even if this calls for an allocation of additional funds because these programmes constitute the minimum level that would enable FAO to honour its commitments and obligations as spelt out by the World Food Summit, held in Rome in 1996.

In order to provide the necessary allocations, we support the appeal to various Member Nations to fulfil and pay their arrears to enable FAO to fulfil its commitments and obligations.

I should like to emphasize what has been put forth by the delegate of Egypt concerning the provision of sufficient allocations to put on equal footing the various languages used by FAO in providing information and documents. This would actively contribute to expanding the extent of benefit from the bulletins and publications of FAO. It has been previously emphasized that it is essential to place all these languages on an equal footing and consequently Member Nations do not accept anything less because this has been agreed and adopted earlier.

**Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)**

Greetings to you and felicitations to the Members of the Bureau. The speakers before me have highlighted the need to do more by international organizations in the context of the ever-increasing divide between the haves and the have-nots in the world.

People have also pointed out that FAO, as a primary agricultural organization, has a very important role to play in food security and poverty reduction by technology dissemination for increasing agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will lead to rural prosperity. This of course, FAO has to do in addition to the several important normative functions that it is performing at present.

We believe that UN reforms aim to make multilateral organizations efficient and cost-effective, and we strongly support measures towards this end. At the same time, we feel that there is a need to strengthen the UN organizations by making available to them predictable and regular funding. This process has to be there so as not to make these organizations dependent on fluctuations in the exchange rate. We are not able, therefore, to understanding a continuing policy for Zero Nominal Growth.

Organizations such as FAO cannot merely survive in the future on extrabudgetary resources - they need to have a strong regular budget, not only to carry out their mandates but even to attract extra-budgetary resources. A financially insecure organization without predictable resources cannot, in my opinion, attract the necessary extra-budgetary resources. We feel, therefore, that the Organization has to have a growth budget. The ideal would be a Real Growth, but we could have a Zero Real Growth, plus some of the important programmes that are listed under the Real Growth budget, being taken up if we get extra resources.

In this context, I would like to invite attention to the document that was made available today on the authorization to utilize resources arising from the payment of arrears. We have gone through the list of the proposals listing how this extra money, if available, would be made use of. We would like to know from the Secretariat whether we could also have some programmes listed under the Real Growth scenario in the Programme of Work and Budget which are not being taken up because resources are not available; that is, whether those programmes which were recommended by Member Nations in various fora in the FAO, could be taken up as and when arrears or any other resources become available. We would like to know the Secretariat's reaction to this.

The second point I would like to raise is connected to the efficiency and savings issue. We have raised in the Finance Committee that while we deeply appreciate the efforts being made by the Secretariat, in a very complex organization like the FAO, to present a clear budget document to us. We would be glad to see a little more specific information on the outputs, the past performance of continuing programmes. We feel that the Member Nations should have information on this because the budget, the implementation and the evaluation are closely linked. Unless we are able to know clearly the outputs of the programmes in the budget, how effectively they are implemented, which are the programmes we would like to be evaluated on the basis of the implementation, I think we will also not be able to identify very clearly the efficiency and savings involved. This does not mean that the Organization has not attempted this. It has been attempting this over a period of time and it has achieved quite a bit, but we would request a little more clarity and a link-up of these issues in the future presentations.

The other point that I would like to make is with regard to the comparative advantage. We will probably be discussing more about the comparative advantage when we come to the Strategic Framework, but since the Strategic Framework and the budget are inextricably related, I would like just to flag one issue then come back to it when we discuss the other agenda item on the Strategic Framework.

We feel that, while we do realize that FAO cannot be everything to everyone, and cannot be a multifaceted organization, at the same time we have to remember that FAO is a Specialized Agency which is dealing with agriculture, and agriculture is a multifaceted sector. It has several issues to deal with, it is not just the productivity, and sometimes, given the level of development of the Member Nations in this Organization, FAO may have to take up programmes which clearly would not fall under what we call compartmentalized comparative advantages. I think we have to keep this in mind while we discuss the comparative advantage of FAO, and when we look into programme priorities.

We will give a more detailed presentation of this points during the Commission II and also during the Strategic Framework discussion.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)**

Je n'ai pas beaucoup à ajouter à ce qu'a dit la délégation de la Finlande au nom de l'Union européenne des Pays Membres. Je voudrais seulement ajouter quelques remarques. Je voudrais surtout faire suite à la déclaration que j'avais faite au Conseil précédent, le 14 juin de cette année, où j'avais recommandé la rédaction dans un seul tableau d'un cadre complet de l'ensemble des ressources et des dépenses de l'Organisation. Nous en avons discuté avec le Secrétariat et je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat pour les efforts faits, parce que nous sommes en train d'élaborer un nouveau tableau qui pourrait être soumis au prochain Comité des finances.

Nous avons un schéma d'un nouveau tableau qui, d'une façon simplifiée et unique, peut donner un cadre global. Je sais que le Secrétariat a déjà fait beaucoup d'efforts. D'ailleurs, à la page 31 du texte anglais, il y a un tableau assez succinct qui est déjà une amélioration par rapport au tableau précédent. Mais, je crois qu'on pourrait faire davantage et c'est pour cela que les experts du Trésor italien ont apporté une contribution et le Secrétariat est très réceptif. Je voudrais lui en rendre acte et le remercier.

Beaucoup de déclarations ont été faites par d'autres délégations et je ne voudrais pas en ajouter. Je voudrais seulement me référer à deux paragraphes, 173 et 175. (Continue en Anglais.)

In paragraph 173, there is a reference to the reliance continued to be placed extensively on the support of the Italian Government in accordance with the Host Country Agreement and on governmental and corporate donors. Of course I appreciate this phrase, but I think it is not exactly what we are contributing because, as a matter of fact, we are giving contributions beyond the Host Country Agreement. I am very gratified by the thanks I received from the Director-General and the Secretariat but then those thanks are not always reflected adequately on written documents. I wish those *verbo volente* were translated into the written text. Therefore, we would appreciate it if on the next edition of this document, we could just have clearer recognition of what my Government is doing beyond the Agreement. As a matter of fact, we were just looking at the Green Room as something which is not coming from the Headquarters Agreement, something that my Government did graciously. I am very glad of that expenditure, but I would like to have more recognition from the Secretariat in this regard.

In paragraph 175, we managed to attract substantial extra-budgetary resources to support infrastructure improvements. We have all welcomed the new *Espace Gabon* which is the latest restructuring of the Organization, but that brings me back to an idea that I raised some time ago, to try to have more international organizations in the space, if there is room for that. I am afraid that this room is shrinking progressively, because every time there is a spare place you just make a new structure. I think it is difficult to reconcile this possibility and this potentiality that this building has with the continuing restructuring of the Organization.

On the arrears question I could not but support what has been said. One thing I would like to say, in supporting many declarations which were made before me, is the question of this doctrinal discussion between zero real growth, Zero Nominal Growth and Real Growth. As you know, my delegation has always supported, at least, Zero Real Growth.

As a matter of fact, I listened with attention to what our American colleague has said of the budgetary increase to the organization in the 1980s. I have also a table here that I would like the Secretariat to distribute once more because it has been distributed within the Finance Committee whereas I think it is in the interest of all Membership. It is a colour graph that shows that among the UN Organizations, FAO is the one which is decreasing and it is decreasing mainly after the Summit meeting and the new engagements that we took at that time. You see that starting from 1996 you took the bottom line, and it is continuing on the bottom line. In fact, I think the line should be even lower because if you take nominal growth with the increase in cost-of-living and so on, there will still be a decrease, maybe unperceptible but still a decrease.

Therefore, I recommend to the delegations, that even understanding the reasoning and agreeing on the possibility of having some other way of saving money, at the same time, you need more

money to make new programmes. I mean, the Fishery Ministers recommended something more, the Forestry Ministers recommended more, and the budget is shrinking. I think we have to consider something with an open mind and in a more constructive way. On behalf of the Organization, we should believe, for the reasons expressed by India and many other delegations. I would just recommend an open-minded and a constructive approach.

**Marcel IBINGA-MAGWANGU (Gabon)**

Avec l'autorisation de mon chef de délégation, je voudrais pouvoir assurer mon collègue, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de l'Italie, sur deux points: le premier c'est que le Gabon est à jour pour ses contributions à la FAO, et le deuxième est que si Monsieur Omar Bongo a cru devoir prendre les dispositions personnelles pour doter la FAO d'une salle qu'on appelle Salle Espace Gabon-Omar Bongo, ce n'est pas pour donner à la FAO une salle de prestige, une salle d'apparat, un musée, c'est que dans son entendement, il lui a été dit, par la personnalité la plus compétente de la FAO, je veux parler du Directeur général, que la FAO manquait cruellement d'un espace multidisciplinaire pour traiter des questions d'urgence en matière de sécurité alimentaire dans le monde. C'est la raison pour laquelle cet espace a été aménagé et comporte tout l'équipement nécessaire pour faire travailler nos experts, nos fonctionnaires, donc pour donner à la FAO un outil de travail, donc pour accroître l'efficacité du travail que nous attendons ou que nous sommes en droit d'attendre de la part de la FAO. Je pense que cela devrait pouvoir répondre à la préoccupation exprimée tout à fait normalement, logiquement et légitimement par mon collègue de l'Italie, d'autant plus que quand on parle de multidisciplinarité, on doit pouvoir évoquer la possibilité de concourir pour un même objectif, je dirais de plusieurs intelligences, pour ne pas dire de plusieurs organismes ayant une vocation à finalité commune. Je tenais donc à faire cette mise au point, afin de faire comprendre aux uns et aux autres que le Gabon n'a pas voulu jouer, avec le concours du Directeur général, à une opération de prestige, mais plutôt à une opération technique d'efficacité. Maintenant, si nous ne voulons pas que cette salle soit agrémentée de quelques éléments constitutifs de notre culture, je pense que ce serait manquer à l'intégration de la dimension culturelle dans le développement, et je le regretterais beaucoup.

*The meeting rose at 13 hours*

*La séance est levée à 13 h*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 13 horas*





# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Seventeenth Session Cent dix-septième session 117º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 9-11 November 1999 Rome, 9-11 novembre 1999 Roma, 9-11 de noviembre de 1999</b>
<b>SECOND PLENARY MEETING DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>9 November 1999</b>

**The Second Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.45 hours**

**Mr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah**

**Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding**

**La deuxième séance plénière est ouverte à 14 h 45**

**sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah**

**Président indépendant du Conseil**

**Se abre la segunda sesión plenaria a las 14.45 horas**

**bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah**

**Presidente Independiente del Consejo**

### III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

(continued)

### III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)

### III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)

**7. Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (English and Chinese only) CL 117/2; CL 117/3; CL 117/4) (continued)

**7. Programme de travail et budget 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3-Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (anglais et chinois seulement) CL 117/2; CL 117/3; CL 117/4) (suite)

**7. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2000-2001** (C 99/3; C 99/3 Corr.1; C 99/3-Corr.2 (continuación)

#### CHAIRMAN

Italy has asked for a point of order.

#### *Point of Order*

#### *Point d'ordre*

#### *Punto de Orden*

#### **Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)**

Ce n'est pas tellement un point d'ordre, c'est seulement que je voulais répondre à mon cher ami l'Ambassadeur du Gabon. Ce que je voulais dire ce matin, c'est que, naturellement, l'Espace Gabon est la dernière réalisation d'un plan de restructuration de la part de l'Organisation. Je pensais m'exprimer dans ce sens, c'est à dire que toute restructuration devrait être planifiée à l'avance et, justement, on ne peut pas apprendre par une aimable invitation, à laquelle je regrette encore une fois de n'avoir pas pu participer parce que j'avais d'autres engagements, qu'il y a un nouvel espace, une nouvelle salle de réunion, sans que le Conseil ou le Comité financier de l'Organisation en soit informé à l'avance. Je crois qu'une demande avait été faite depuis déjà quelques temps, d'obtenir le plan de ce que l'Organisation était en 1945, et sa structure actuelle, mais nous ne les avons pas encore. C'est peut-être dû à un retard de la part des Autorités italiennes. Je m'adresse donc, encore une fois au Secrétariat, car je crois que c'est dans l'intérêt de l'Organisation qu'on ait une connaissance exacte des lieux et de pouvoir planifier.

#### CHAIRMAN

And now we shall continue with the debate on the Item 7, Programme Work and Budget. I will give the floor to Germany.

#### **Dietrich LINCKE (Germany)**

The point of view of the Member States of the European Community including Germany, was put forward this morning by the Finnish Presidency of the European Community. I want to stress how much we thank Professor Bommer for his excellent presentation and for the thought and work which has gone into the Programme of Work and Budget. Please permit me also to refer to the document which was newly presented to us this morning, document CL 117/LIM/3. I thank the Secretariat for drawing our attention again to this issue. Of course, the Resolution attached is a complicated budget and legal document which will have to be scrutinized thoroughly by the financial experts of the Member States. Unconditional authorization of expenditure should not be based on more expectations. I should also express our opinion that a Resolution should be clear and understandable in itself, and therefore the last paragraph containing a global and a summary reference to a whole chapter of the Programme and Budget does not really serve this purpose.

With these points in mind, we shall continue to examine the Resolution, which is, of course, of a very far-reaching character and touches upon complicated legal matters.

**José Robles AGUILAR (México)**

Deseamos hacer algunos comentarios adicionales a la intervención ya hecha por la distinguida delegación de Haití como presidente de nuestro Grupo Regional. Durante los últimos bienios se aprobaron niveles de gasto que han obligado a la Organización a reducir su personal y sus actividades. Consideramos importante que la FAO continúe realizando actividades en áreas que han sido hasta ahora estratégicas y que están en el marco de su mandato, particularmente en este contexto queremos resaltar los requerimientos en áreas tales como la informativa, la normativa y particularmente en la de cooperación técnica. Nosotros advertimos que mientras se reducen los niveles de presupuesto para la Organización, paralelamente aumentan los requerimientos en los países en áreas que precisamente están en el centro del mandato de la FAO y también considerando el papel que le corresponde realizar a la Organización en el marco del seguimiento de la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación. Como señalaba previamente, estimamos que la FAO debe otorgar una atención equilibrada a sus tres áreas: informativa, normativa y de cooperación técnica, en particular, consideramos que esta última ha perdido un terreno importante durante los últimos bienios.

Para nosotros, los Capítulos 2 y 3 del Proyecto del Programa deben constituir el centro de los esfuerzos de la Organización. En tal sentido, pensamos que debe otorgarse una especial prioridad a algunos sectores como los de Pesca, Montes, *Codex Alimentarius* y Recursos Fitogenéticos, entre otros. Nos preocupa el gran número de países que se encuentran con atrasos, en especial aquellas naciones que siendo sus principales contribuyentes están en condiciones de hacer frente. Estimamos que ello constituye otorgar a la Organización los instrumentos necesarios para que desarrolle sus actividades que por mandato le corresponde.

**El Houssein Ould Sidi ABDALLAH (Mauritanie) (Langue originale arabe)**

Je félicite les nouveaux membres du Conseil de la FAO, je voudrais féliciter également le Secrétariat et le Comité des finances qui ont préparé ce document. La délégation de mon pays est favorable à la Croissance Réelle Zéro, ou une Croissance Réelle. Nous pensons que la Croissance Réelle est plus adaptée pour que l'Organisation puisse faire face aux grands défis et aux grandes aspirations des États Membres pour mettre en pratique les résolutions du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. C'est dans ce contexte que nous appuyons ce qui a été présenté par le Groupe des 77 par la voix de son Président, au nom de tous nos pays, et nous appuyons aussi ce qui a été dit par les délégués de l'Égypte, du Royaume d'Arabie Saoudite, au sujet de l'importance de traiter sur un pied d'égalité toutes les langues officielles de l'Organisation.

**Mohammad Saeed NOURI-NAEENI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

I would like to join others who thank the Secretariat for an excellent document prepared and for an excellent presentation by Mr Bommer and additional comments by Mr Wade which were very useful.

I doubt if I would like to associate my delegations with the statements made by the distinguished representative of Tanzania, Chairman of the Group of 77, and the distinguished Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as the Chairman of the Near East Group. But I do have a few comments which I shall comment on briefly.

The first is on efficiency savings. We believe that after two biennia of reduced budgets, there is not too much space left for efficiency savings. Abolition of posts, understaffing and postponement in recruitment are not really efficiency savings. All of these practices leave some work undone which is important to the poor somewhere in the world. In this respect, I would strongly support the statement made by distinguished representative of Pakistan and India.

On priorities, Mr Chairman, we believe that they are closely related to needs of developing countries on the demand side and to comparative advantage of FAO on the supply side. In this regard, we believe that the comparative advantage of FAO lies in the field activities, especially in TCP, technical cooperation programmes which are tailor-made to the needs of the recipient

countries, and in this regard, I fully agree with the statement of the distinguished representative of Mexico, that Chapters 1 and 2 should receive priorities.

In addition to that, we think that biotechnology is very important and should receive lots of emphasis by FAO, and FAO should facilitate transfer of biotechnology from developed countries to developing countries because we do believe that biotechnology is essential for agricultural development in the future.

We, as a Member of the Near East group, have handed out our original priorities to the Secretariat, and we are sure that it would be considered.

As far as the scenarios are concerned, first of all, I would like to say that I do not understand really the title of the scenarios. If it started Real Growth, Zero Real Growth, and then it suddenly shifts to Zero Nominal Growth. You know that Real and Nominal cannot be compared, so I think for the sake of better understanding we should say "Real Growth", "Zero Real Growth", and "Negative Growth". The steps are under really the Negative Growth. And my question is how is an organization which wants to reduce the number of undernourished by 41 million during the biennium, able to do that with a reduced budget? It is in this regard that we believe that Real Growth is most appropriate and consistent with the needs of the poor and with the goal of the World Food Summit. But after listening to all other speakers, we join those speakers who mention that Zero Real Growth is the absolute minimum level acceptable for this biennia.

And, finally, I would like to ask a question regarding the exchange rate. Mr Wade, my understanding from the comments of this morning is that if the exchange rate is 1860 lire per dollar, then the difference between the Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth scenario would be about US\$7 million. And if that is true, I think US\$7 million for 180 countries for two years is not a big difference. We hope that we can come to a consensus on the Zero Real Growth scenario.

#### **Bill DOERING (Canada)**

There are five points that Canada would like to raise and they refer to the budget scenario, the redistribution of resources among Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, the list of activities protected from resource reductions, the payment of arrears and FAO's role in the present debate on the subject of biotechnology.

This budget has been prepared by the FAO Secretariat with three scenarios: Real Growth, Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth. Canada continues to seek the fiscal prudence and good corporate management within the FAO. We believe that scope still exists for making the necessary economies with which to deliver the needed programmes and we feel that can be done within the ZNG budget. Thus we will continue to pursue that, as noted by our colleagues from the United States and Japan, to seek a budget that maintains the appropriations within the current levels and continues to promote management reform. And let us not forget that the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization are operating as well under ZNG.

With respect to the distribution of resources among Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, we are concerned that the priorities of Fisheries and Forestry ministers is not reflected in the proposed budget. And again we feel that can be done within ZNG.

We feel that a redistribution of resources and a greater share should be going to both Fisheries and Forestry. And specifically, with respect to Fisheries, the FAO has a clear and distinct advantage in this area. The FAO is the only truly global body that can make a contribution to international governance.

With regard to Forestry, the inadequate support the Organization currently provides is inconsistent with the growing attention that forests are receiving worldwide.

On the subject of activities protected from resource reductions, Canada agrees with that list of activities which, in fact, are protected. These include *Codex Alimentarius*, Fisheries and Forestry, women and development.

We also noted that while major programmes were being described according to the new programming model, in most cases, were not, and we stress that results and timebound outputs for specific elements should be included.

Turning to the document, *Authorization to Utilize Resources Arising from Payments of Arrears*, which we received this morning, this document does not request a decision by Council, but we note that Mr Wade urged consideration by Council. Canada cannot agree to Council endorsing this proposal. This is a question we will have to send back to our headquarters for guidance. We have not had the opportunity to review the proposals, however, we certainly have a clear position on the use of arrears. The Basic Texts are quite clear. Cash surpluses, once loans to funds and accumulated deficits are paid off, are distributed back to the Membership in the proportion they were paid, as is done in other UN Organizations like the International Civil Aviation Organization. Countries contributing to a surplus should share in redistribution of that surplus.

While we will have to await guidance from our capital, I will tell you that Canada will oppose the expenditure of the arrears in anticipation of their receipt. We made the mistake in 1993 when approving the budget for 1994-95, and we have been living with the consequences ever since.

The Director-General is proposing to use the surplus to pay the redeployment and separation costs. These are not one-time cash-outs. They will occur each time staff is separated or reduced. We feel this proposal is irresponsible on the part of the Secretariat. If there are cost implications associated with proposed budgets, those costs should be included within that budget.

And the last point relates to the Programme of Work more than to the Budget. In the Programme Committee, Canada stressed the need for the FAO to make a more proactive authoritative contribution to the ongoing debate on the role of biotechnology in general, and in genetically-modified organisms. The debate currently contains elements which are confusing, uninformed, often distort the facts, are not always objective, and confuse rather than clarify the issue. The Membership looks to the FAO as an objective source of information on science as it relates to agriculture and food. We believe the Organization must be more involved in this debate, and as soon as possible, with clear explanations of scientific facts and whatever scientific evidence is available. This is a role we look to the FAO to play. We note that the OECD Website has a page devoted to agricultural biotechnology. It can be reached directly from the OECD home page and it is very difficult if not impossible to find discussion on biotechnology on the FAO Website. We note that the Director-General plans to create a High Level Panel of Experts on Ethics in Agriculture, and we believe this step goes in the right direction, but we need more done sooner in providing that objective, science-based, factual information on this subject.

#### **Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia appreciates the efforts of FAO over the last two biennia to cut unnecessary costs and to increase efficiency in the Organization, and to develop a new Strategic Planning Model to assist FAO to more effectively prioritize its work and budget. We believe, however, that further gains are both possible and essential if FAO is to continue to carry out its key activities efficiently and effectively.

We also consider that further savings within the FAO budget can be found without adversely affecting the Organization's highest priority programmes, and that the process of reform within FAO should be on going.

In this context, Australia strongly supports the adoption of a Zero Nominal Growth Budget in the Programme of Work and Budget for the 2000-2001 biennium, as this will enable FAO to be realistic in setting its priorities. Australia does not consider that either a Zero Real Growth or Real Growth scenario appropriately reflects the realities within which FAO budget must be set - a genuine scope for further efficiency savings in FAO and the on-going need for fiscal stringencies by Member Nations.

In advocating a Zero Nominal Growth budget, Australia would also wish to emphasize that this can be achieved while continuing to protect FAO's highest priority programmes. In this regard,

Australia considers it as important that FAO maintain appropriate levels of funding to the *Codex Alimentarius Commission*, the International Plant Protection Convention, as important standard-setting bodies whose work is vital in underpinning agricultural and food trade. Australia also strongly supports the continuation of FAO's work and programmes in assisting countries prepare for the forthcoming WTO negotiations.

We would also wish to continue to see priority allocated to the Fisheries and Forestry Programmes of the Organization, to enable it to continue its excellent work in ensuring sustainable management of these vitally-important resources. In this regard, we would note the high importance attached in both the Committees on Fisheries and on Forestry and the subsequent Ministerial Meetings held earlier this year, to ensure that these areas are appropriately resourced in FAO's Regular Programme Budget. We appreciate the efforts of the FAO Secretariat to protect funding for these core programmes.

Australia would also wish to see FAO continue to allocate priority to the work of EMPRES and the Convention on Prior Informed Consent, which both bring direct benefits to Member Nations in developing their agricultural and food production systems.

**NI HONGXING (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The delegation of China welcomes document C 99/3 prepared by the FAO Secretariat and the additional introduction.

The Chinese delegation has taken note that since the implementation of reform and decentralization in 1995, FAO has obtained considerable achievements. After the last Conference, Member Nations had put forward many constructive opinions through FAO governing and Advisory Bodies. The formulation of the Strategic Framework is also approaching the final stage. All these have been reflected somewhat in the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001. The Chinese delegation would like to commend FAO for preparing the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001 with a new programming model.

Since the World Food Summit in 1996, FAO has played an important role in improving world food security. The Member Nations have also set up their higher requirements for FAO and many suggestions and priorities have been put forward. The Chinese delegation firmly believes that the FAO Programme of Work and Budget for 2000-2001 should ensure that FAO can perform its duties and meet the increasing requirements of Member Nations. The financial situation in Member Nations should also be taken into account in order not to increase their burden.

Having said this, we think that the Zero Real Growth is quite realistic and practical.

Now, I would like to make three concrete points concerning document C 99/3.

First, FAO should increase the portion of TCP in the Programme of Work and Budget. The TCP has been playing a vital and catalytic role in promoting agriculture and the rural economy in developing countries. We have noted that the portion of TCP in the overall budget is only maintained at 13.76 percent. We hope that the percentage could be increased to reach the set 17 percent to the extent possible.

Secondly, FAO should strengthen the balanced use of languages. At present, languages are not used in a balanced manner in meetings, publications and documents. In most cases, only one or two languages are used, which affect the role of publications and the role of FAO. We are pleased to see that, in the three options in this present Programme of Work and Budget, FAO has been giving consideration to the language balance in terms of policy and resources. We think this is a good beginning. We wish that the balanced use of languages should be a priority for FAO, both in terms of policy and funds.

Thirdly, in Programme 2.3, we think more funds should be allocated to agriculture in order to foster sustainable agriculture. With the development of world fishery, aquaculture is playing a more and more important role in agriculture, employment and food security. This has already

been proven by facts, therefore FAO should increase funds in this respect, especially funds for the Asia and Pacific Region, which is important in world fishery production.

**Khairuddin Md. TAHIR (Malaysia)**

My delegation is pleased to see you again in the Chair, and our congratulations also go to the three newly elected Vice-Chairs.

The Malaysian delegation endorses the statements made by the G 77 Chair and others who advocated that sufficient and additional resources be allocated to the Regular Programme of FAO for the next biennium, so as to ensure its relevance in carrying out its mandate and responsibilities, in particular programmes addressing poverty eradication and food security.

My delegation would also like to reiterate the importance of synergy and complementarity between normative work and operations of field programmes. It is vital for the effectiveness of this Organization that this balance be achieved and maintained. Within the normative programmes, my delegation wishes to see focus and acceleration of efforts in capacity-building and technology transfers to developing countries, in particular in areas of sustainable food production systems, aquaculture, food safety, phytosanitary measures, genetic resources development and forestry. In the forestry sector, we urge FAO to conduct adequate analysis work and provide recommendations to enable increased market access of forest products by developing countries in the global market, as well as to accelerate efforts in downstream and value-added activities of forestry-related activities, especially in developing countries.

On that note, Malaysia supports an FAO budget level of no less than Zero Real Growth for the next biennium.

**Mame BALLA SY (Sénégal)**

Tout en vous renouvelant la joie que nous avons de vous voir toujours présider notre Conseil avec beaucoup de dynamisme et d'efficacité, je voudrais saisir l'occasion pour saluer les Membres élus, les Vice-présidents, et dire combien la délégation sénégalaise sera toujours, comme d'habitude, à vos côtés, pour contribuer à l'évolution des travaux de notre Conseil.

Je voudrais m'associer, et faire mienne la déclaration faite par le Président du Groupe des 77, à propos du Programme de travail et budget 2000-2001 de la FAO. L'Ambassadeur d'Italie, a fait remarquer, comme d'autres d'ailleurs, qu'il est assez remarquable que la FAO - dans le rôle très noble au demeurant de soulager les populations de fléaux aussi durs et éprouvants que la faim à travers le monde, à la suite du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation tenu à Rome en 1996 - a vu pendant les années successives son budget diminuer. C'est vrai, ce paradoxe peut faire penser à une analyse ou à une appréciation assez simpliste, de croire que ce serait une désaffection des États Membres pour ce que fait la FAO. Cela est une vue assez simpliste, parce que le fait que les pays ne contribuent pas, ou n'arrivent pas à payer, trouve d'autres explications, surtout si l'on sait qu'au moins les deux tiers des pays dans cette situation sont des pays en développement et les plus grands bénéficiaires des services de la FAO. Cela ressort des déclarations que nous avons entendues et ne saurait non plus être lié à la gestion de la FAO qui a connu, il faut le reconnaître, beaucoup d'améliorations avec la décentralisation. C'est vrai qu'une œuvre aussi importante et complexe que la décentralisation mérite naturellement un processus de mise en place de renforcement demandant un délai tout à fait raisonnable. Mais je crois que les progrès déjà effectués, pour ceux qui veulent voir la réalité en face, sont des éléments encourageants. Je voudrais simplement dire que la nécessité sociale, économique et morale imposée à la FAO de réduire la pauvreté dans le monde, comme indiqué dans le Programme d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, et si l'on considère également l'importance fondamentale de l'agriculture et de l'économie rurale pour la croissance et le développement des pays en développement, et en particulier, les pays les moins avancés, explique, à la lumière des phénomènes de globalisation et de libéralisation des marchés, que les pays en développement sont ainsi confrontés à un grand nombre de défis et de risques, dont les coûts, ou en tous cas, les moyens de redressement, nécessitent une assistance accrue et de qualité de la part de la FAO.

La Croissance Réelle Zéro est un minimum qui ne devrait pas être l'objectif en soi, mais plutôt la Croissance Réelle Positive. Nous en sommes d'autant plus persuadés que l'argument des importants arriérés dont on parle souvent pour soutenir la Croissance Nominale Zéro, est un argument qui ne tient pas, dans la mesure où comme on le disait, il s'agit de 82 pays se trouvant dans cette situation, dont 70 sont des pays en voie de développement. Cela est donc lié à un contexte de pauvreté grandissante dans le monde, qui nécessite d'être relevé, et cela ne pourrait être fait qu'avec l'apport d'organisations aussi performantes et aussi qualifiées que la FAO ayant besoin de moyens pour remplir leur mission.

Dans ce cadre, nous nous félicitons qu'un grand nombre de pays, y compris des pays donateurs, témoignent ici des efforts qualitatifs accomplis au cours de ces dernières années par la FAO, ceci grâce à une gestion beaucoup plus rationalisée, une réduction drastique de postes et des économies ayant atteint cependant ses limites pour qu'on ne puisse plus demander à la FAO de faire des sacrifices supplémentaires, si notre désir est vraiment de respecter ce que le Plan d'action et la Déclaration du Sommet de Rome nous ont indiqué, à savoir de réduire le nombre de personnes qui ont faim d'ici 2025. Ainsi que le Directeur général nous l'a indiqué, nous en sommes encore à 40 millions, et à raison de presque 8 millions par an, alors qu'il en faudrait 20 millions. Cela indique que nous devons essayer d'être beaucoup plus conséquents avec nous-mêmes, en agissant, en donnant des missions à la FAO, en mettant à la disposition de celle-ci les moyens dont elle a nécessairement besoin.

Voilà quelques-uns des arguments, déjà évoqués par un grand nombre de pays, du Groupe des 77 et des pays occidentaux, que nous tenions à souligner pour dire notre nette préférence pour la Croissance Réelle Positive, étant entendu que la Croissance Réelle constitue un minimum qui devrait être le dernier recours.

**Johannes N. de KLERK (Namibia)**

Namibia wishes to welcome you back in the Chair and also wishes to congratulate those who have been elected as Vice-Chairpersons and those who will be chairing the different Commissions.

Namibia supports Tanzania, who spoke on behalf of Group 77, Pakistan, South Africa and all the others who are in favour of a Zero Real Growth budget. Realising the overall economic situation, it would be unrealistic to expect much more but looking at the challenges proposed in the Programme of Work and Budget prepared by the Secretariat, as well as the magnitude of the needs in developing countries, one can hardly expect anything less than Zero Real Growth. It is against this background that Namibia wants to join those Members who urged Member Nations who are in arrears to settle their accounts. We are therefore partly in support of the proposal of the Secretariat to utilize funds in anticipation of arrears which are expected to be paid. In this regard, we wish to caution that a very low risk approach should be followed.

We can just agree with all the views expressed in favour of support so we can hardly cut the activities that have been proposed, but with these few remarks we just want to voice our support in favour of Zero Real Growth.

**A. Syarifuddin KARAMA (Indonesia)**

Mr Chairman, thank you for giving our delegation the floor to provide comments and suggestions on the subjects under discussion.

First of all, on behalf of the Indonesian delegation, I would like to congratulate you and the three elected Vice-Chairpersons for the Hundred and Seventeenth Session of the FAO Council.

Regarding the subject under discussion Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001, my delegation would like to associate itself with the statement made by the delegation of Tanzania, Chairman of the Group of 77. As additional to the Chairman of the Group of 77, the Indonesian delegation is focusing its attention on the importance of the work of the Organization in reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition in the world as part of the implementation of the World Food Summit and its Plan of Action 1996. Therefore, in our national economic development efforts in Indonesia, the highest priority has been put on agricultural development as the central driving



force with primary focus on providing sufficient food to the population by increasing rice production and encouraging the high consumption of other traditional staple foods.

Secondly, priority is also being placed on Agribusiness to increase the income of farmers, to alleviate poverty, to increase job opportunities and also to increase value-added and national earnings based on specific comparative advantages of different agro-systems of different regions of Indonesia.

Regarding the three scenarios of the budget level of the Organization for the year 2000-2001, the Indonesian delegation would like to inform the Council that the newly-elected Government and its national unity cabinets will put as the highest priority to solve the economic crisis by strengthening cooperation with all donors, especially IMF, World Bank and other bilateral donors.

The Indonesian Government is still facing budgetary shortages, and consequently our ability to meet our international commitments is limited.

In general, the Government of Indonesia has difficulty in meeting any increase of contributions to any international organization, including the UN Agencies such as FAO. For the continuation of the work and operation of the organization in the Member Nations, especially in the developing countries, such as through various programmes with special focus given to the grass-roots level, namely the small farmers and small fishermen, the Indonesian delegation would also like to join other speakers before us, mainly from the developing countries, in supporting and accepting their Zero Real Growth scenario.

**Lyall W. SMALL (Barbados)**

First, allow me to congratulate yourself and the three newly-elected Vice-Chairpersons and secondly on your efficient chairmanship of the meeting.

Allow me to add my voice to those countries which have indicated their support of the Zero Real Growth scenario. My delegation would wish to support that scenario as a realistic one inasmuch as, as has been stated earlier, it represents only a US\$7 million difference from the levels of the ZNG scenario if the current exchange rate between the Italian lira and the US dollar is taken into account. However, in the eventuality of the ZNG budget being passed, we would hope that the following areas would be protected; Fisheries, *Codex Alimentarius*, Women in Development and Gender Mainstreaming, the Agricultural Information Center, the Technical Cooperation Programme, Integrated Pest Management, IPPC, FIVIMS, the Global Information and Early Warning System, Agriculture Statistics in Africa, and last but by definitely by no means least, the Support of Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

**CHAIRMAN**

I see no other delegation that wants to intervene in the debate. Then I would like to invite Mr Wade if he would like to respond.

Mr Wade has the floor.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme Budget and Evaluation)**

I would like to start with the issue of savings and efficiency on which a great deal was said by all sides of the Council.

First of all, our definition, when we talk about efficiency savings, are those reductions in cost that do not result in reductions in programmes or in the volume of programmes produced. This definition came from the Council at its session following the Conference where we had a major budget reduction in 1995, and has been applied since then. Since that time, the Organization has made great progress in trying to find ways to reduce costs without reducing programmes to create such efficiency savings. It is also interesting to note that if you look at the decline in posts since 1 January 1994, the Organization has reduced its total establishment by something like 670 posts and that, of those, 600 were General Service posts largely achieved through improvements in efficiency in the areas of office automation, outsourcing, etc.

Now, several delegates made the point that there is a limit to efficiency savings and, while I would agree with that remark, I would also say that we have not stopped trying. In fact, in this document we try to make further efforts, and we also note that there is a risk in making the efforts that we are proposing because of the fact that we are accelerating certain cost reduction activities so as to try and meet the constraints of budgetary stringency.

In the document you will find under ZRG significant savings - US\$7.5 million arising from the creation of this Central Management Support Unit and the abolition of Departmental Management Support Service. How are we doing this? We are doing this partly through the implementation of new systems which allow us to track transactions much earlier in the process, and partly by streamlining procedures. The important thing is that we believe that we can save US\$7.5 million in that process, and we do not believe that it will result in reductions in output.

We have made savings in other areas, for example, by phasing out the AGRIS processing center in Vienna and taking on the work here at Headquarters, with a saving of approximately of US\$1.5 million.

Under ZNG, we make further proposals to try and obtain the synergies between the work of the technical groups in regional offices, of the operating branches and of the Management Support Units. Synergy is an awfully overused word, so let me explain a little bit of what we are trying to do. Technical offices are involved in project implementation. They specify inputs to be procured. They define the terms of references of experts. They assist in the selection of technical products and of experts. They then pass the information on to the operations branches, who are the sort of managers of projects (they monitor and oversee the project implementation process), also pass the information on the Management Support Units that actually process transactions. Now, this is a relatively new structure that was created through decentralization. With the combination of new financial systems and the consolidation of that structure, we believe there are real efficiency savings to be made.

Frankly, they would have not been introduced into this budget if it had not been for the insistence of the Council that we give you a ZNG scenario. We were not ready to produce these savings. We are taking a risk by proposing them now. We may not achieve everything we hope to achieve, but the budget assumes US\$4.7 million of additional savings there.

This does not deny the argument that ZNG, as opposed to ZR, or ZRG would result in pain to the Organization and to its programmes. There are additional requirements which are being covered in this Programme of Work and Budget: language coverage, the outcome of various Technical Committees and the Ministerial Meetings, which, I might add, have been addressed, not as much as you would like, but they have been. And, all in all, the consequence is that we have not been able to find enough savings to cover the impact of the reductions that are being sought.

On the question of allocation of resources particularly between Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, I think it is true to say that a lot of preference is being stated in broad terms for the sectors of Fisheries and Forestry, and in broad terms less so for Agriculture. However, when you study the statements of delegates, including the European Union, who made this particular point, you see that of the priorities they mention, a large number are, in fact, in the fields of agriculture and the economic and social area. The role of women in agriculture, *Codex Alimentarius*, IPPC, Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Early Warning, Rehabilitation, Regional Activities to Combat Animal and Plant Diseases or, as emphasized by Australia, EMPRES and Prior Informed Consent. All of these things do not appear in Fisheries and Forestry. So, increases in Fisheries and Forestry, which we fully support (the demand greatly exceeds our capacity), are very difficult to achieve without cutting other priorities.

The European Union tried to help by suggesting areas where reductions might be made; reducing the number of days of meetings. Can I say I think this is an example which is covered by the distinguished delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran's remark that we cannot go much further. This Council itself has complained about the reduced length of the meetings. The Programme Committee complains about the fact that the meeting times are too short. There is really an

absolute limit to how much we can do. The Intergovernmental Committees on Commodities have all been subject to major reductions over the last four years, and the question of country officers of course is more one of a lack of political acceptability for the proposal. So, we have to find other areas in which we can reduce costs or, alternatively, you have to increase the budget if you want your additional priorities attended to.

Turning to the two areas mentioned by the European Union which is, I am sorry, I always forget the term or get it in the wrong order but I am referring to Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fisheries. The concern was that there was nothing done by FAO in this area. That really is incorrect, I'm afraid.

First of all, there are both Regular Programme and extra-budgetary resources being dedicated to this area. There is proposed to be an Expert Consultation in May 2000 which should be funded, as I understand it, and sponsored by the Australian Government but with FAO inputs. They are also financing six months of an expert who is already in position. FAO proposes to hold a Technical Consultation in October 2000 to consider a Plan of Action which would be developed from the proposals of the Expert Consultation, and then finally proposals should be made to the Twenty-fourth Session of COFI in February 2001.

In the case of the other recommendations arising out of the Ministerial Meeting, particularly with regard to the Plans of Actions on Sharks, Seabirds and Fishing Capacity, it is true that US\$3.2 million has not been covered; we were not able to find space within the ZRG budget for the US\$3.2 million. We did find space for it in the Real Growth proposal, but within the base ZRG we do have US\$335 000 contributing to this work.

I think it was Argentina and maybe some other Members who referred to the need for a continuous process of evaluation with reference to various areas of our work. Can I say that the Director-General agrees entirely with that concept, and presented a paper to the Programme Committee at its last session on the New Programme Evaluation Regime, taking into account the Strategic Framework and the new programme model. That, in fact, is the subject of the Programme Committee's Report, which is CL 117/3. I refer you to paragraphs 48 to 54, and of course note that that will be discussed on your agenda tomorrow.

Turning to the question of the Resolution that appears in CL 117/LIM/3, first of all, a minor clarification for the distinguished delegate of Germany. I may have misunderstood you, Sir, but I think you said the last paragraph refers to Chapter 9 of the Programme of Work and Budget. There are two further paragraphs overleaf on the other side of the page which might help clarify that. I would like to talk about that chapter.

Chapter 9 is not an existing chapter in the budget. What we are proposing is an additional chapter for the purpose of managing these resources. Now, our objective there was transparency, it was to actually separate out these resources from everything else, manage them separately and report to you separately. It could be done the other way, if you believe it is important that it be included in Chapters 1 to 8, that is not impossible; we can do that. I just personally was of the view that you would find that even more confusing and less certain than the proposal we make.

The distinguished delegate of Canada made a couple of remarks, one of which was suggesting that the Secretariat was irresponsible. I have to respond to that, Sir, because really we do not intend to be irresponsible, and in fact the proposal we make in this Resolution to cover US\$9 million worth of separation and redeployment costs was precisely to try and present a budget which was acceptable to the majority of Members of the Organization. To do as you suggest, to take the US\$9 million out of the ZNG budget, would have put US\$9 million more stress on the programmes and would have resulted in substantive programme reduction, which I suspect would be unacceptable to the vast majority of Members. So, it seemed to us that the responsible approach was to try and find something that delegates might find acceptable, and not to create a ZNG scenario that was totally impossible and out of this world.

As to the concern that we were repeating what happened in 1994-95, something that we have regretted ever since then, and I agree with the regret: this is not the same thing. In 1994-95, the

then Director-General proposed to use US\$38 million worth of arrears to contribute to the regular ongoing budget. If you put it into today's terms, that is 1998-99 terms, US\$38 million would have contributed to the US\$650 million budget to contribute to on-going expenses which in the following biennium we would have had to address, and in fact that is exactly what happened. In the following biennium, we still had expenses but we did not have that source of income.

In this case we are not doing that, and we have emphasized the fact that every item in the list to be funded from arrears is of a one-time nature. It is expenditure which will not need to be repeated in the following biennium because that would have been irresponsible. I agree with you. It would have been irresponsible to have created new programmes which then in 2002 would have had to die because we could not find the resources to support them.

All of the items listed in the Arrears Resolution as drafted are one-time capital type items. I include in that the amount of US\$9 million for redeployment and separation costs because that US\$9 million is for the separations arising out of restructuring, not for the separations and redeployments arising out of the normal course of business. In fact, within the Cost Increase section of the budget, you will see reference to the amount that is included in the budget for redeployment and separation costs, US\$1.9 million, a reflection of what we expect at normal levels of operation. This US\$9 million is an exceptional and, I hope, one-time cost. I say "I hope". If Members insist on negative budgets in the future, there will be more separation costs, but if this is the last time Members are going to insist on such a thing, then quite clearly separation costs will return to the normal level that arises from the day-to-day management of the business.

The distinguished delegate of Namibia, first of all, thank you for your support of the concept, and your warning that we should take a low-risk approach is heeded very much. If it is any comfort to you, the arrears at the moment outstanding from all Members total at US\$151 million. The amount we intend to fund in advance is US\$9 million. Of the US\$151 million, US\$93 million can, I think, be said to be with one of the safest debtors in the world and, therefore, I think that we really are making a low-risk approach.

Turning to the decline in extra-budgetary resources, an issue which I think the distinguished delegate of Argentina raised and queried as to what could be the reasons for that. I will not address the reasons he suggested, but I would note a couple of facts.

First of all, as was reported in CFS 99/INF/7, which was the document that went to the last CFS on this subject, overseas development assistance commitments to agriculture have been declining dramatically over the last 10 to 20 years, but if we take a recent period, say from 1989 through to 1996, we find that there is a 35 percent decline if you use the narrow definition and a similar figure if you use the broader definition. So, one contributing factor is certainly that the world at large is putting less resources into this work.

The second one that affects us rather dramatically is that the major part of our decline is seen in projects funded by the United Nations Development Programme. This is not largely due to the decline in their resources, although there has been a decline in their resources, but they have shifted mode of execution from use of agencies to execute their projects to national execution. This means the delivery no longer go through our books but they still benefit from the agricultural development process. For your information, I do not have the figures for agriculture in front of me, but for your information national execution has risen from 32 percent of their interventions in 1995 to 54 percent in 1997. Those just happen to be the figures I have. I think that if you go back further to the sort of period we were discussing, there it will be much higher figures than that. So there are some very practical reasons why the Field Programme will decline to a certain extent, and in a way it may be said to be remarkable that we, in 1999, would be appear to be maintaining the Field Programme at its same level.

Several delegates mentioned the thorny problem of the Secretariat for the Near East Locust Commission. This is an old issue. The post was abolished in 1992 by the Conference when the activities of that Commission were at a low level. It is true to say that the activities of that

Commission have been growing and certainly at a much higher level than it was at that time, and there may well be increasing justification for such a post. I have to say, it was seriously considered in this set of budget negotiations internally. I'm afraid it did not make it. It was one of those which we did not manage to squeeze into the budget proposal, and I regret that that was the case, but certainly we will again consider it in the next round.

A few of the supporters for the ZNG scenario made the point that ILO and WHO had agreed to ZNG. This is perfectly correct, but perhaps it is only fair to point out that in the case of ILO, ZNG and ZRG were the same thing. So, it was like the lira rate of exchange being 1906. And I have a feeling that we can reach a compromise relatively easily in this body if the lira rate of exchange was at 1906, because that is when ZRG would be US\$650 million.

WHO was not in the same situation. ZNG did touch them but they managed to convince their Governing Bodies to appropriate an extra US\$15 million, and I quote "to high priority programmes", which were to be funded from the balance of casual income. Now, I am simply saying that compromises are involved in finding other solutions on some occasions, and that may be something we may need to bear in mind.

The distinguished delegate of Italy first of all thanked us for adding new tables to the budget. Can I ask him that we meet together afterwards because I am not clear on what the next step is in that particular area, but of course we will be responsive to your needs. The graph that you referred to, Sir, is being circulated to all Members of the Council. It will be around by tomorrow. And we would of course like to recognize the tremendous input of the Italian Government into this institution, both within and beyond the Headquarters Agreement.

With regard to the questions or comments by the distinguished delegate of India, I think that this was probably echoed by others', which was, can we try and see more in the documentation which reflects outputs and performance indicators and the relationship between what has been achieved in the past and what we are proposing in the future. Something I might add that the Chairman of the Programme Committee has been making a point about for some time. The problem, to a great extent, is not the way we work; we certainly have lots of information on this. The problem is how do we transmit that sort of information to Members. And I think that with new technology, maybe there are possibilities for further improvement. For example, at the moment you can go into Internet and see all of the 1996-97 planned outputs of FAO and what their status is, what happened to them, whether they were produced or not. But that is not terribly convenient if you are reading the 1998-99 PWB, which has another list of outputs which are also on Internet. So, maybe there needs to be some sort of extractable report from the system so that you can look at the total historical picture of a particular programme activity or project and see what it is we have been doing in the past, what we have achieved, what we have failed at and what we are proposing for the future. So we will look further into that possibility to try and respond to this need.

The distinguished delegate of India also raised the question as to whether the list of items in the Arrears Resolution could be changed. Well, of course this is a Draft Resolution and the Conference is sovereign, so certainly it could be changed. I make one caveat which is that you suggested that maybe some of the items in the Real Growth scenario could be brought into the Arrears Resolution. That is correct, but I would urge caution if there is an on-going requirement for resources beyond 2001, beyond when arrears are paid, should I say, because that may not be in 2001, then we would be making the very mistake that Canada accused us of, which is that we would be funding on-going expenses from a one-time source of income. So, I think we can only do to the extent that we are dealing with one-time expenditures.

I wish to make one clarification for the distinguished delegate of the United States. It is US\$3.3 million per 25 thousand lire, not US\$3.7 million. One last minor point I did want to make. The distinguished delegate of Japan made a comment which suggested that there should be more consultation with Technical Departments in the development and preparation of the budget. I may not have understood you correctly, Sir, but if that is what you said, I think it is important to point out that this budget is prepared by the Technical Departments of this Organization. They prepare submissions that come to our office and we review them and prepare an analysis, we give them

back the analysis that we made, which may be even critical of what they proposed. The Deputy Director-General chairs meetings with every Department and discusses all of the proposals and makes recommendations to the Director-General, and the Director-General arbitrates on issues on which agreement could not be reached. So, there is very much a participative approach to the development of these budgets.

On the other hand, if you ask any one of them did they get what they wanted, you are quite correct, they did not.

I will close there, I am sorry if I have missed any questions. Please feel free to come back and make further comments

**Bill DOERING (Canada)**

I just wanted to make one point of clarification. What I was referring to here was paying before the arrears are received. The question I would have is, what would you do if you did not get the arrears? That is the point I am trying to make here.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation)**

I guess what we are saying is that FAO is a going concern and that there is a good chance that we will be here for some time to come and out of that US\$151 million, US\$9 million is highly likely to come in and as US\$93 million are from your own Region, we are very very confident that we will receive US\$9 million of it in a reasonably near future.

**II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO**

**II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO**

**II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO**

**5. Outcome of the Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land (Maastricht, September 1999) (C 99/INF/20)**

**5. Conclusions de la Conférence sur le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture et des terroirs (Maastricht, septembre 1999) (C 99/INF/20)**

**5. Resultados de la Conferencia sobre el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura y la tierra (Maastricht, septiembre de 1999) (C 99/INF/20)**

**CHAIRMAN**

We should move on to Item 5, that is the Outcome of the Conference on the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land, (Maastricht, September 1999). The document now before you, C 99/INF/20-Rev.1, constitutes a revision of the previous document. The Secretariat informs me that the only substantive change is the deletion of paragraph 12 from the previous version, the rest is unchanged, except for a few editorial modifications.

In response to the question of the Canadian delegation this morning, I wish to point out that as decided by the Council in June, the document is now before you for information and guidance.

The Council is called upon to consider the status of the Summary Report of the Conference and to decide whether it should be upgraded to that of a Conference document for discussion and decision.

Finally, in view of the difficulties of some delegations with the timing of this Item, I would like to propose that those delegations, whose experts are not here today, be permitted to speak tomorrow after the conclusion of Item 8, namely, FAO's Strategic Framework 2000-2015. The item will therefore remain open until tomorrow if the Council agrees.

As I see no objection, I should like to open the discussion and I have a request from the European Group that Mr de Leeuw, from the Netherlands, representing the Chair of the Maastricht Conference, be given the floor in the first place to introduce this Summary Report as Post and Chair of the Maastricht Conference.

**J.F. de LEEUW (Observer for the Netherlands)**

It is an honour for me to have the opportunity to summarize the results of the Conference cultivating our futures, the FAO/Netherlands Conference on Multifunctional Character on Agriculture and Land, held in Maastricht from 12 to 17 September 1999.

The full report of the Chairman is available as an annex to the FAO document on the table. Originally the Chair of the Conference, Mr Hans Alders, was meant to present his Report here today. Unfortunately, his activities as a Queen's Commissioner, prevented him from coming here to Rome today. That is why he asked me, as Head of the Delegation of the Netherlands during the Maastricht Conference, to give an overview of the Report of the Chairman.

All in all, I think we had at Maastricht, a fruitful Conference with some 260 delegates from more than one hundred countries and 26 international organizations and international NGOs participating.

Before actually starting to summarize the Report of the Chairman, I want to revive your memories on the positioning, the objectives of the Conference. This Conference was, and, already for the third time, in cooperation between the Netherlands and FAO, an inter-sessional event in the CSD-8 process. This time in preparation of CSD-8, which we will discuss next year, the Chapters: 10 on Management of Land Resources and 14 on Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development of Agenda 21.

Inter-sessional events like this Maastricht Conference are very important in the process of furthering the progress on subjects as, in this case, Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development. They are meant to contribute to the exploration and deepening of the understanding and knowledge of, in this case, Sustainable Agricultural and Rural Development. An inter-sessional event like this Conference prepares the ground for discussions and agreements on the subject in the process further on, in this case, during CSD-8.

I want to stress that the Maastricht Conference was not a meeting where decisions were taken, nor where delegates were engaged in committing their Member Nations whatsoever. Decisions on how to further Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development are to be taken during CSD-8. Moreover, the Conference also offered an excellent opportunity to link the results of the World Food Summit of 1996 to the total CSD process.

In the preparation of the Conference, one of the important starting points was the fact that the goals and targets for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development, as well as food security, were set in Agenda 21 and the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit.

The main challenge of the Conference was, therefore, to identify concrete policy options and practical methods in order to make progress in reaching the goals and targets mentioned. In other words, translation of goals and targets in ideas and proposals for concrete actions were the core business of the Conference, to be done in a participatory and transparent process. In that manner, results of the Conference can easily contribute to reach action-oriented decisions from CSD-8 on the implementation of the already-agreed goals and targets.

At the same time, another starting point of the organizers of the Conference was the growing international understanding of the importance of the relationship between agriculture as a producer of food and fibres on the one hand. On the other hand, the importance of agriculture for the socio-economic, biological and physical conditions of production units, communities and countries, and also the production of environmental and cultural benefits. This recognizes the substantive contributions that agriculture can make towards goals and sustainable development in general. Therefore, reference was made in the sub-title of the Conference to the already known, but nevertheless inefficiently-analysed role, of the multifunctions of agriculture in reaching sustainable agriculture. These are goods and as well services that can contribute directly to Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development and to food security.

It was, therefore, another challenge of the Conference to identify ways of maximizing these positive effects on reaching goals and targets of Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development and food security. In that way, so was the assumption, awareness at all levels could be raised of the multiple contributions that can be made by agriculture and related land use in enhancing sustainability and food security by discussing the agricultural aspects of the multifunctional character of agriculture and related land use. It was not, and I stress the word not, the intention to start a discussion on the trade-related aspects of the multifunctional character of agriculture, because that discussion belongs completely to the mandate of the WTO.

The preparation of, and the Conference itself, was characterized by a very participatory process - you can say an innovative way of preparing and handling the Conference. At this point, I would like to draw your attention to the positive experiences we had with the use of the modern media, like the Worldwide Web, and in several stages of the preparation of the Conference and also during the Conference. Not only was it a very useful way of gathering information from all over the world and disseminating that information, but also of discussing the available information and Conference results with people from all over the world.

I now come to discussing in general the main results of the Conference. These results could be used as building blocks for enhancing Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development and food security. In my view, there are sufficient opportunities for the results of the Conference to leave their mark on the decisions of CSD-8.

The Conference has provided an opportunity for the participants to increase the understanding and raise the awareness of the rights of multiple functions of agriculture and their contribution to reaching the goals and targets of Agenda 21 and the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit.

The case studies analysed in the preparatory phase of the Conference, and presented during the Conference, made some fine practical conclusions possible in this field, and therefore the main recommendations of the stocktaking paper were included in the Report of the Chairman.

Other results I want to highlight are, first, the understanding that agriculture has multiple objectives and functions within the framework of Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development with, however, the marginal note that different perceptions were expressed regarding the definition, scope, utility, added value and coverage of the idea of the multifunctional character of agriculture and land.

Second, I wish to highlight the case study showing successful ways of implementing Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development by way of the multiple functions of agriculture and related land use and the needs for a more systematic analysis to extract lessons learned in achieving sustainable agriculture and rural development.

Third, there is the need to establish an agricultural network which integrates policy in the institutional circumstances at all levels within a country.

Fourth, there is also the need for an open and participatory process with all stakeholders involved as a key for a successful and tailor-made implementation of the goals and targets mentioned.

Fifth, I wish to note the need to give high priority to research, training and extension services and also capacity-building in that field, including local and indigenous knowledge.

Sixth, the need for an integrated approach to market, as a way of furthering rural development.

Seventh, the need to ensure access to productive resources of land as well as land tenure, tradits, seed supplies, agricultural biodiversity, organic agriculture and ecological methods of food production.

Eighth, the need for furthering progress in integrated pest management.

Ninth, the need for strengthening regional and international cooperation by way of developing partnerships, but also twinning processes between developed and developing countries on a public and/or private basis.



I conclude my overview of objectives positioning, but also the results of the Maastricht Conference.

Finally, I would like to thank the Director-General of FAO and all the people involved in the FAO Secretariat for their valuable cooperation in this joint operation. I also want to thank all the delegates, who in a lively way, contributed to the discussions and to the results of the Maastricht Conference. Thank you for your attention.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Before opening the debate, I would like to remind you that the Council in June has decided that the document is now before you for information and guidance. This Council is called upon to consider the status of the Summary Report in the Conference and to decide whether it should be upgraded to that of a Conference document for discussion and decision. So please when you make your interventions take that into consideration too.

I now open the debate.

#### **A.M.M. SHAWKAT ALI (Bangladesh)**

The issue before us is whether we should consider the upgrading of the status of the Summary Report into a document for discussion and decision. I find that on page 3 of the document C 99/INF/20 Rev.1, para 9, it says "the main Conference Report will be prepared by FAO and is expected to be widely distributed, in both printed and electronic versions, in early 2000". If that is going to be the case, I do not know why it is necessary to upgrade the Summary into a full-fledged document, because the main Conference Report is not before us.

The second point that I wish to raise regards paragraph 11 of page 3, all the bullets, except the first one. These are the very issues which many FAO documents, including the World Food Summit document have noticed and drawn attention to. I think the upgrading of the Summary Report into a full document, would merely be repetitive, and would not in any way contribute to our knowledge.

#### **Júlio C. GOMES dos SANTOS (Brasil)**

No podía ser más oportuna la intervención del distinguido delegado de Bangladesh pero antes de hacer cualquier comentario me gustaría pedirle permiso para que la Presidenta de nuestro Grupo, la Representante de Haití, lea una declaración de nuestro Grupo a ese respecto.

#### **Sra. Suze PERCY (Observador por Haití)**

En primer lugar quisiera agradecer al Embajador de los Países Bajos por la presentación del informe del Presidente de esta Conferencia sobre la multifuncionalidad de la agricultura. El Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe desea expresar su posición regional respecto al documento C 99/INF/20 que está incorporado en la Agenda del 117º Consejo y al 30º Período de Sesiones de la Conferencia.

Renovamos el compromiso adquirido en la Declaración de Río sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo suscrita por más de 178 estados. Igualmente recordamos que sus 27 principios orientativos constituyen la base fundamental con la cual los Estados Miembros del Sistema de Naciones Unidas deben guiarse para aplicar la Agenda 21 revirtiendo de esta manera el impacto negativo del comportamiento humano sobre el medio ambiente físico y promoviendo un desarrollo sostenible.

Reiteramos que las políticas que aplica un país no deben menoscabar los objetivos sociales, rurales y de desarrollo sostenible de otros países. Reconocemos el papel único que debe cumplir la FAO como la Agencia Especializada de Naciones Unidas en el ámbito de la alimentación y la agricultura y asimismo su responsabilidad como organización líder para la aplicación, dentro de su respectivo campo de competencia, del Capítulo 14, referido a la promoción de la Agricultura Sostenible y al Desarrollo Rural y del Capítulo 10, encaminado al desarrollo de Enfoques Integrados para la Planificación y Administración de los Recursos de la Tierra. Reconocemos que

todas las actividades productivas derivadas del desarrollo humano son multidimensionales o pueden ser identificadas de manera funcional, es decir contribuyen en diversas medidas a satisfacer un variado tipo de necesidades y valores de la sociedad humana además de cumplir una función primaria que es su razón de ser.

Con respecto al Programa de Acción para el Desarrollo Sostenible, consideramos que la FAO deberá establecer un eficiente y pragmático sistema de informe que permita a sus Estados Miembros comprobar y catalizar los avances alcanzados en todos y cada uno de los programas específicos de los Capítulos 14 y 10. Apoyamos el objetivo último de la Agenda 21 en la búsqueda y promoción de un desarrollo agrícola y rural sostenible. Para tal fin, es esencial la eliminación del uso de subsidios a las exportaciones agrícolas así como también una significativa disminución en los presupuestos públicos orientados a implementar medidas de ayuda a la producción interna de aquellas calificadas como sujetas a reducción en el marco del acuerdo sobre agricultura de la OMC y que afectan la asignación eficiente de los recursos naturales en los países en desarrollo dado los limitados recursos disponibles, impactando al mismo tiempo de manera adversa sus posibilidades de aplicar medidas eficaces dirigidas a alcanzar un desarrollo sostenible y contar con los ingresos necesarios para garantizar la seguridad alimentaria nacional. Precios adecuados en los productos agrícolas y estables oportunidades de mercado son ingredientes esenciales para un crecimiento agrícola sostenible en los países en desarrollo en los cuales las producciones agrícolas gravitan fuertemente en sus economías nacionales. Apoyamos en el contexto anteriormente definido las recomendaciones expresadas en el párrafo 10 del documento C 99/INF/20, puesto que éstas ya están comprendidas en la Agenda 21.

Con relación a la Conferencia de Maastricht, la Región de América Latina y el Caribe considera que el resultado se debe situar en el entorno más amplio ya precisado anteriormente. Asimismo consideramos que el principal resultado de la Conferencia Técnica mencionada es el Informe del Presidente el cual representa para nosotros el informe principal. Habida cuenta que la UNCTAD y la OMC son los ámbitos competentes para el tratamiento de las políticas comerciales, la FAO debe concentrar sus actividades y sus recursos en las esferas contempladas en su mandato.

Finalmente, la Región de América Latina y el Caribe propone que el documento conserve su carácter informativo y manifiesta que por ahora no ve la necesidad de que se exploren posibles modalidades que permitan mejorar la comprensión del concepto de la agricultura multifuncional.

**Kazumasa SHIOYA (Japan)**

First of all, taking this opportunity, I would like to express my appreciation to the FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture of the Netherlands for having organized a Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land and to the effort made by Mr Hans Alders, its Chairman, to reach a successful result from this Conference.

However, during the Conference, there were too many trade-related issues raised. In fact, the majority of the participants did not expect, and they are not ready to discuss, trade issues in that Conference. Trade-related considerations are to be dealt with by the WTO.

So, I propose that the status of this Report should be kept as simple information for the coming FAO Conference. Apart from the Chairman's Report, the Conference itself has a significant meaning, since this is the first international conference with the title of MFCAL and with participants from many developing countries. As everyone knows, the importance of the multi-functional character of agriculture was referred to in the Rome Declaration adopted at the World Food Summit in 1996.

So, I believe that FAO should continue this initiative, therefore I support that FAO explore possible modalities to improve understanding of the multi-functional character of agriculture and land with its deep knowledge and expertise in this field. In this exploration the emphasis should be placed upon the cases of developing countries; since the multi-functional character of agriculture has been discussed among developed countries, very few case studies have been carried out for developing countries except ones in the Maastricht Conference.

**Ms Adela BACKIEL (United States of America)**

I would like to thank, first, the Government of The Netherlands and FAO for sponsoring this important CSD Inter-Sessional Meeting on Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in Maastricht. We would especially like to note the extraordinary effort on the part of the Chair of the Maastricht Conference for his work on the Chair's Report, which did its best to reflect the general ideas and issues discussed.

We would also like to highlight the work of FAO in preparation for the Maastricht Conference, especially the co-operative approach among FAO Departments, compilation of case studies and lessons learned in the stocktaking report and the creation of the Electronic Conference and the Web Forum to more fully engage individuals and NGOs from across the world to engage in a more participatory process.

The United States believes that the Chair's Report should be presented at CSD-8, with hopes that it will serve as an initial starting point for what will be more specific discussions at CSD about necessary tools for implementation of Chapter 14 of Agenda 21, Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development.

With respect to the request for guidance in the FAO Summary Document: first, we do not believe that discussion on the outcome of the Maastricht Conference needs to be elevated to the FAO Conference. The views of the Maastricht Conference participants are represented in the Chair's Report, which The Netherlands will present at CSD-8.

Second, FAO should work to develop analytical and decision-making tools and methodologies for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development, particularly the interlinkages of the economic, environmental and social costs and benefits of Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development. This work is part of FAO's responsibilities as Task Manager of several chapters of Agenda 21. This work is also part of FAO's basic mandate of work. We believe that FAO's approach to this work requires that the Sustainable Development and Agriculture Departments of FAO work together in a cooperative, interdisciplinary and open and participatory manner, with the involvement of other Departments as appropriate.

**Sra. Ileana DI GIOVAN BATTISTA (Argentina)**

Es preciso agradecer a la delegación de los Países Bajos por haber albergado la Conferencia de Maastricht que sin duda ha sido un aporte al análisis de las dimensiones multifuncionales de la agricultura. La delegación de Argentina por supuesto se ve plenamente expresada por el documento preparado por el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe y leído por la Representante de Haití en nombre de todo el Grupo. Sin embargo quisiéramos agregar, a los efectos simplemente de clarificación, que a esta altura del debate los comentarios que ha hecho el Representante de los Países Bajos que ha traído realmente una pertinente aclaración sobre los alcances y los propósitos del informe del Presidente de la Conferencia, creemos que el informe se explica por sí sólo. Creemos que si bien estos nuevos análisis sobre la multifuncionalidad de la agricultura son absolutamente necesarios y convenientes para los países desarrollados, no debemos olvidar, dentro del ámbito de la FAO, las prioridades establecidas en el Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. Creemos que el Capítulo 3° del Plan de Acción debe ser el mandato de la FAO y que la FAO no debería perder su tiempo o sus energías en explorar nuevas acepciones o nuevos criterios para los cuales ya existen expertos en el mundo industrializado que pueden perfectamente ilustrarnos sobre estos temas. Realmente la FAO debe concentrarse en los mandatos claramente establecidos. Como dijo el Director General esta mañana, el avance entre el 1995 y el 1997 con respecto a la disminución de personas que sufren hambre en el mundo, debe ser acelerado; y esta aceleración no es más que el desarrollo agrícola y el desarrollo rural integrado en los países en desarrollo.

Nosotros queremos recordar que salvo poquísimas excepciones de países que han logrado superar varias etapas de desarrollo en un tiempo brevísimo y a los cuales todos admiramos, la gran mayoría de ellos no habría obtenido un desarrollo económico sin un desarrollo agrícola; quiero

decir que no se mejorará la situación alimentaria mundial sin desarrollo agrícola y no habrá desarrollo agrícola si no hay un empuje a la producción, si no se estimula la producción de tal manera que se evite que los campesinos despoblen el campo, que las tierras queden desiertas, que la exclusión de los campesinos del sistema económico contribuya a crisis económicas y políticas recurrentes. Ese es nuestro problema como país en desarrollo y creemos que la FAO no debe perder de vista que éste es el mandato principal; por lo cual recomendamos que el informe sea mantenido como informe y que la FAO limite sus esfuerzos a los mandatos claramente establecidos por la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación y por las conferencias que se sucedieron.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

My delegation wishes to thank the Secretariat's for providing these informative documents, with the Chair's Report attached.

Furthermore, we also appreciate the Secretariat's and The Netherlands Government's many efforts for the three conferences held in South Africa last June and in The Netherlands last September.

If the main Conference reports shown at paragraph 9 of C 99/INF/20-Rev.1 could have been reported and the views in this Council presented to the forthcoming Thirtieth Session of the Conference, it would have been much better.

However, we would like to make some important comments here because we have found several problems with the Chair's report, attached. As you are well aware, FAO and The Netherlands, co-organizers of the Conference, define the Conference as not being a political, but a purely technical, forum in character. During the process of the Conference, the Chairman of the Conference had invited the participants to discuss trade-related issues, on which many of them did not prepare their positions. In this sense, we consider that the Chair's report should include such sentences as "undesirable in terms of the regional purpose of the Conference". In addition, the Chairman reflected in his Report only the opinion of some participants about several issues on which strong disagreement had been expressed, for example, the paragraphs 8, 16 and 19 of the Chair's Report.

Having failed to achieve a balance in the reflection of the view of the participants, the Chair's Report states in paragraph 38 that it was prepared in a transparent and a participatory process, and that it reflects the discussions at the Conference. In this light, we consider that the Chair's Report is not appropriate as the main finding of the Conference.

Furthermore, we cannot agree to paragraph 9 document C 99/INF/20-Rev.1, saying that the Chair's report was recognized as the only document that directly resulted from the Conference consultative process, and that it was intended to reflect the views and opinion of the participants. We understand from the same paragraph that FAO is reviewing the main Conference Report, and that its sole section, that is the main findings and conclusions of the Conference, will be the Chair's Report.

As is strongly implied earlier, however, we object to the suggested way of FAO making the main Conference Reports and, along the same lines, would like to request a favour - to consider that adequacy and appropriateness of the Chair's Report as the main finding of the Conference.

We hope this Summary Report will be provided to the Thirtieth Conference as an information document. In the line of our previous comments, we would like to suggest some guidance relating to four matters requiring Council guidance, shown in Paragraph 12 of C 99/INF/20-Rev.1.

First, we strongly support the need for FAO to explore the possible modalities to improve the understanding of the multi-functional character of agriculture and land and to develop the practical tools to assist the Member Nations, as proposed by Japan, suggested at the second sentence of the same paragraph.

Second, that recognizing the Maastrich Conference was a fully technical forum, the technical expressions shown in paragraphs 8, 16 and 19 of the Chair's Report should be complemented,

through the addition of the Member Nations' comments at the time of the preparation of the main Conference Report.

Further, the main Conference Report could be distributed to the Member Nations and the results, or comments received, before it is sent as the final report at the CSD-8. And also we think there will be the CSD meetings next April 2000. We think, if FAO is preparing the Summary Report to be submitted to CSD-8, here I would like to ask the FAO Secretariat what kind of reports will be submitted to CSD? Will they be different from those of the Maastricht Conference or the same? If they will be different, could FAO distribute them for comments from the Member Nations before submitting them to CSD-8?

**Yohannes TENSUE (Eritrea)**

Since most of the substance has been covered by the previous speakers, I would like only to express the point I want to refer in this issue, as to the multifunctionality of agriculture. It covers a lot of fields and subjects, and different subsidiary boards, committees and departments have been established to cover all these fields at FAO or other regional groups. So this one Conference or the Maastricht Treaty as in The Netherlands or as has been done in South Africa, has served to remind us of what has been going on for the last thirty, forty years, and all the activities cannot be covered in one paper. Sustainability remains in the hands of the rural people who remain in the fields, who cannot keep sustainable agricultures through Internet or e-mail. It remains only in the hands or on the shoulders of the rural people, and that has been addressed also in the World Food Summit. So, this paper should only be an information paper because it cannot set objective criteria. It is a reality, it is not a scope. There is no confusion. There is no need for upgraded reports. What needs to be done is to abolish poverty, and that is only to meet the demand of the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit. So, this is to say that this paper should remain as an information document only.

**Bill DOERING (Canada)**

I will keep my remarks short. We also support those delegations that have already indicated that the document prepared by the Secretariat should not be presented to the Conference for discussion, but remain an information document. We also believe the Secretariat should concentrate on the work required to implement the sustainable agriculture and rural development activities.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Sólo para referirme muy brevemente a este tema que preocupa a mi país y que estoy seguro que preocupa también a muchos otros.

Tuvimos la suerte de participar en la Conferencia de Maastricht y les puedo asegurar que fue un interesante debate; a diferencia de lo que aquí se ha planteado hubo un rico intercambio de ideas llegando a una muy buena conclusión. Una Conferencia muy amplia, con larga preparación, donde los técnicos allí presentes reflejaron perfectamente un vasto número de intereses de los países respecto al tema del desarrollo agrícola sostenible y rural. Creo que la conclusión de Maastricht es importante. No es necesario que, por ahora, sigamos abundando sobre el desarrollo de un concepto que no está del todo clarificado. ¿Cuál es el problema? El problema está que tenemos la Agenda 21 con objetivos y con acciones. Los Gobiernos que suscribieron este gran acuerdo definieron los medios de implementación. ¿Qué ocurre hoy día cuando hablamos por ejemplo del Capítulo 14 o del Capítulo 10 ?, Ya ni siquiera hablamos de los medios de implementación de todas las medidas que están contenidas en el Capítulo 14 o el Capítulo 10, sino que focalizamos toda la capacidad que tiene la sociedad humana de efectivamente obtener un desarrollo agrícola y rural sostenible a través de este concepto cuando aún no se ha agotado.

Me parece que lo que esta Organización puede hacer sobre el desarrollo rural es acentuar y aunar los compromisos políticos para que efectivamente estos medios de implementación, bajo cada una de las acciones que están indicadas en los Capítulos 14 y 10, se realicen. Dicho esto, hago un llamado para que la discusión sobre este tema sea un alto en este caminar por lograr un desarrollo

rural y agrícola sostenible justo cuando estamos celebrando el que se haya derribado un muro, el muro de Berlín y pareciera ser que estamos tratando de crear un nuevo muro, un muro que pueda proteger a determinados países con un determinado tipo de agricultura y a otros países en desarrollo necesitados de mercados. Por lo tanto, quisiera que este informe, como delegación de Chile, tuviera carácter informativo y que la FAO nos pusiera al día sobre los avances que hace al desarrollar tanto el Capítulo 14, como el Capítulo 10 y que por ahora fuera éste su acento esencial.

**Mme Vilma DU MARTEAU (European Community)**

I would like to express my compliments to the FAO and the Netherlands Government for having organized this Conference with the support of IFAD and other countries and organizations on the important issue of the multifunctional character of agriculture and land. The course and outcome of the Maastricht Conference have clearly shown that the multifunctional character of agriculture and land is of fundamental importance to many Members of the FAO. Reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture and land has been made in different fora. This reflects the general recognition by countries that all activities are multifunctional, and that they contribute to a varied set of needs and values of society in addition to fulfilling their primary function. However, the specific contribution of agriculture, including fisheries and forestry to society, because of its special dimension, as well as the consequences of the changing nature of agriculture and its context, must also be considered.

The FAO concentrated its work in Maastricht on technical aspects with an analysis of successful examples of sustainable agriculture and rural development, and with the identification of a series of conditions necessary for development and progress towards sustainable agriculture and rural development. All countries need to assess comprehensively the impacts of such policies on food and agriculture sector performance, food security, rural welfare and international trading relations as a means for identifying appropriate offsetting measures.

Multifunctionality does provide an analytical tool with regard to agriculture policies, allowing them to be placed in the context of the objective of sustainable development within the framework of the real process.

Agriculture is multifunctional because it is not limited to the sole function of producing agriculture commodities at the lowest possible cost. It has a number of other functions, for example the stable and secure provision of safe and high-quality foods, environmental protection, safe and infinite resources, preservation of rural landscapes and contributions to the socio-economic development of rural areas, including employment generation.

Beyond its primary function of producing food and raw materials, agriculture contributes, therefore, to the achievement of a number of other important societal goals that need to be addressed adequately. Multifunctionality does take account of the interaction of this function and the central role that the agricultural activity places in achieving social goals.

Priorities in the provision of these social goals may differ according to national circumstances. For the European Union the multifunctional character of agriculture rests on three main functions which are largely interlinked and provide a range of marketable and non-marketable outputs in interest to society. These three main functions are: producing food, feed and raw materials, including industrial use of agriculture products; preserving the rural environment and landscape and soil from desertification; contributing to the viability of rural areas and a balanced territorial development.

The European Union acknowledges the Chairman's Report of the FAO-Netherlands Conference on the multifunctional character of agriculture and land in Maastricht as a valuable contribution to the CSD process. It indicates that progress has been made in implementing Chapters 10 and 14 of Agenda 21 dealing with planning and management of land resources and sustainable agriculture and rural development. The Report contains certain concrete results that have been achieved in this field. It also contains a set of recommendations that are useful for further consideration by the Commission on Sustainable Development at its next session in April 2000. It is understood that the main objective of the Maastricht Conference was preparation for this session of the CSD. The

outcome of the Conference serves this purpose well. We recommend, therefore, that the Summary Report contained in document C 99/INF/20 be submitted to the Thirtieth Session of the Conference next week for information.

In the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit, all countries have committed themselves, among other things, to pursue participatory and sustainable food, agriculture, fisheries, forestry and rural development policies and practices which are essential to adequate a reliable food supply at all levels, considering the multifunctional character of agriculture. There is thus a need for improving the understanding of the concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture and land in order to achieve the goal of the CSD, and FAO has to play an important role in this. FAO should explore possibilities for further development of practical solutions for problems encountered in countries. The case studies collected during the preparation for the Maastricht Conference and their analysis are useful in this connection.

**Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

Je voudrais d'abord, prenant la parole pour la première fois au nom de notre délégation, féliciter également ceux qui vous accompagnent dans la direction des travaux de cette session du Conseil. Je voudrais attirer l'attention du Conseil sur certains aspects du rapport du Président. Nous avons eu la chance de participer à la Conférence de Maastricht et nous y avons découvert qu'il y a des préoccupations sur le terme, qui pour nous est quelque chose de quotidiennement vécu dans l'environnement qui est le nôtre, et je crois que c'est le cas pour la plupart des pays en développement.

Cependant, le rapport du Président a permis de souligner un certain nombre de recommandations adressées aussi bien aux États qu'aux organisations internationales ou sous-régionales, et nous pensons que ce document d'une grande importance devrait être déjà diffusé, dans son état actuel, au niveau des États, à titre d'information. Il est bien entendu que le rapport complet, que la FAO se chargera de rédiger, peut-être même les minutes de la Conférence, comportera certainement assez d'éléments, de détails, pour permettre aux États de profiter davantage des conclusions de cette Conférence. Dans son état actuel, nous adhérons à l'idée de considérer ce document comme un document d'information à soumettre à la Conférence, et nous espérons que le Rapport de la FAO sera également diffusé au niveau des États.

**Paul ROSS (Australia)**

Australia welcomes the opportunity to make comments on the outcome of the Maastricht Conference as anticipated by the June Council. The Australian Government understands and supports the need for an integrated approach to agriculture policy development. Australia, like other countries, faces a range of agri-rural issues, such as migration from rural areas, breakdown of rural communities and environmental degradation, and in this regard we pursue a policy of ecologically-sustainable land management to support diverse social, cultural and economic activities. Our policies are transparent, targeted and decoupled. They do not distort production and trade, a model we would like to see all countries follow.

We accept that agriculture contributes in multiple ways to the economy, just as do all forms of human activity. Agriculture is not special. Australia considers that the so-called new analytical approach and interpretative framework of the multifunctional character of agriculture and land, MFCAL, that was the subject of discussion at Maastricht, does not provide any real advance in the development of public policies to address the issue of sustainable development in agriculture. We consider the concept does not move us beyond the SARD framework as it purports to do. The MFCAL articulated at Maastricht, failed to either demonstrate or substantiate any added value of the multifunctional perspective, or how it can contribute to achieving greater sustainability in agriculture. That said, we can nevertheless consider that there were some very positive outcomes from Maastricht. The Conference reinforced the importance of the SARD concept, and the scope for further development of this concept as reflected in the follow-up actions listed in paragraph 11 of the document before us. There has also been a very comprehensive database of SARD success stories compiled by the Secretariat through the innovative preparatory process for the Conference.

This is a very good contribution towards helping our understanding and in furthering SARD. We would be happy to see FAO utilize this information on success stories to help in furthering its work on SARD.

Turning to the document before us, with regard to paragraph 12, we do not however support FAO's doing any further work on the MFCAL approach. We are pleased with the Chairman's Report from Maastricht. It represents the main product from the Conference and is a balanced, accurate and comprehensive reflection of the discussion there. We see no need to elevate it beyond an information paper. We therefore support the GRULAC Region and those many others who have spoken, that this document be sent to the FAO Conference as an information paper, noting that there is no consensus on FAO doing further work on MFCAL.

**Marek GRELA (Poland)**

My delegation would like to thank FAO and the Government of The Netherlands for convening the Maastricht Conference. We congratulate the Dutch Chairman for a very able chairmanship of the Conference and for preparing the Report on the outcome of the Conference on the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land.

On a number of occasions, my country has already expressed interest in the concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture. I am not going to enter into details but I would like to emphasize that, as a country in transition, we attach great importance to the concept and the implementation of this concept. In our view, the Report should be submitted to the Conference for discussion.

Finally, I would like to express the interest of my country that FAO should continue elaboration of this issue.

**Ms Beata I.T. NAMBUNDUNGA (Namibia)**

We speak under correction, but reading from the document in front of us, it says on the first page that the document was approved. We believe that the document was a concession document, rather than an approved document.

As I said, we speak under correction.

We also noted that the MFCAL has been dropped from the document and is now being regarded as a way of achieving SARD. While we fully understand some of the reasons for its absence, we however consent, depending on what status the Report is given, that the Report in its current form presents the papers of the MFCAL in a very subtle way and hides its implications. Indeed, the second bullet under point 12 on page 4 indirectly demonstrates this consent. Therefore, we feel that the document cannot be decided upon when there are still different perceptions about the concept.

We also understand that the decisions on how to further the SARD would be taken during the CSD-8, which could include the adoption of MFCAL. We would like to be enlightened on the procedures and implications regarding the status in the forthcoming CSD-8 and would like to know what happens if the document is presented to the Conference as an information document only and what will happen to it if it is presented for discussion and decision at the Conference. What will happen? Will CSDA be presented in any way? What will the CSDA do then? Our understanding is that it is going to be an important input but we would like to know what would happen to CSDA from there, in whichever way it is presented.

We would like to have clarity on that.

Finally, we support the previous delegates who said that it should remain as an information document. However, we would still like to have clarity on that.

**José Ignacio TRUEBA JAINAGA (España)**

En primer lugar, mi Gobierno quiere dar las gracias al Ministerio de Agricultura holandés por la organización de la Conferencia de Maastricht y de la misma manera quiero agradecer muy



sinceramente también los trabajos realizados por la FAO en la preparación de los documentos correspondientes.

En primer lugar, quisiera prestar la conformidad de mi Gobierno a la declaración que ha hecho la Representante de la Comisión Europea. Sin embargo, me gustaría hacer algunas consideraciones complementarias.

La Cumbre de la Tierra y el Programa 21 constituyen referencias fundamentales para esta Organización. La Comisión sobre Desarrollo Sostenible es un ente que puede tener y que va a tener una relevancia sobre estos temas. Sin embargo me gustaría decir que la Comisión sobre Desarrollo Sostenible en 1995 observó con preocupación que, aunque se había informado de algún progreso, había habido una expresión general de desaliento por el lento avance hacia el desarrollo agrícola y rural sostenible en muchos países. En el escenario mundial que tenemos en el umbral del siglo XXI hay graves problemas de hambre, de pobreza, catástrofes naturales, desigualdad, discriminación en 176 países para seis mil millones de personas. Es importante, teniendo en cuenta un crecimiento de dos mil millones de personas más para el año 2025, producir más alimentos dentro de un planteamiento de respeto a la naturaleza y la conservación de los recursos naturales; esta difícil situación requiere un desarrollo que sea multifuncional o multidimensional que pueda atender a la resolución de estos graves problemas que tiene la agricultura y que tiene la humanidad en estos momentos. Yo creo que llevar a cabo este tipo de desarrollo es difícil, es mucho más fácil llegar a acuerdos en las finalidades y en los objetivos que ponerse a desarrollar aspectos que tengan que ver con las metodologías, que tengan que ver con los procedimientos, con los instrumentos para hacer un desarrollo agrícola sostenible de verdad, o un desarrollo rural sostenible en este sentido. Como para hacer este tipo de desarrollo hace falta capacidad técnica y experiencia, yo creo que la FAO, como antes han apuntado los distinguidos Representantes de Japón y de los Estados Unidos, debe seguir considerando ampliamente entre sus actividades este tipo de trabajo, este tipo de acciones, porque sino vamos a tener muchas declaraciones y pocos resultados, y la verdad es que los problemas de la humanidad son importantes, por lo tanto quería animar a la FAO en el desarrollo de esta tarea.

Creo que aquí hay un problema semántico importante en relación con el tema de la multifuncionalidad o del desarrollo rural sostenible, o como lo queramos llamar. Sabemos muy bien lo que queremos hacer pero unos lo llaman de una manera y otros de otra, lo que sí es importante es que este carácter global, multifuncional o multidimensional, es vital para los países en vías de desarrollo en el proceso de resolución de los grandes problemas que los afectan, ya que gracias a este aspecto multidimensional, se consideran no sólo aspectos de producción y de comercialización sino también de resolución de problemas de seguridad alimentaria, de discriminación y de una mayor participación de aspectos sociales y ambientales, entre otros.

**Noel D. de LUNA (Observer for the Philippines)**

Thank you for giving the Philippines the opportunity to speak. We simply want to go on record to identify ourselves with those Council Members who would prefer that this document, C 99/INF/20-Rev.1, remain only for information and should not be upgraded or elevated to the FAO Conference.

**Felipe H. PAOLILLO (Observador de Uruguay)**

Como miembro del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe, Uruguay suscribe en su totalidad la declaración formulada por la distinguida delegada de Haití en nombre del Grupo. No obstante ello, quisiera poner el énfasis en algunos aspectos particulares de este problema.

Entendemos que el informe de Maastricht al ser transmitido a la Conferencia debe mantener el carácter que tiene al presente, es decir el de un informe puramente descriptivo de la Conferencia hecho por su Presidente. Nuestra posición se fundamenta en lo siguiente: primero, el informe no es más que la percepción personal del Presidente de la Conferencia sobre el desarrollo de los acontecimientos, aún cuando pueda ajustarse a los hechos, no fue aprobado ni endosado por los representantes de los países presentes; en segundo lugar, cuando se intentó incluir una recomendación para que la FAO continuara profundizando el estudio de este tema, la idea fue

rechazada por los concurrentes y debió ser retirada. Resulta claro entonces que la voluntad de las delegaciones fue que la FAO no continuara ocupándose del tema. Pero hay una razón más profunda, la tercera que justifica nuestra oposición a que se le otorgue al informe un carácter diferente y más elevado del que tiene ahora, y esa razón es que el contenido del informe gira en torno a un concepto, el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura y la tierra que es innecesario, confuso y peligroso. Es innecesario porque, como lo reconoce el propio informe, todas las actividades humanas son multifuncionales, la multifuncionalidad entonces deja de ser un carácter peculiar de la agricultura para convertirse en un elemento natural que forma parte integral de toda actividad humana incluida la agricultura, ello hace innecesaria la consideración como concepto autónomo y peculiar de la agricultura.

El Capítulo 14 de la Agenda 21, que se ha invocado para justificar esta tentativa de convertir al concepto de multifuncionalidad en una base para la adopción de programas y políticas agrícolas, prueba precisamente lo contrario; tanto en el Capítulo 14 de la Agenda 21 como en el Compromiso Tercero del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, la palabra multifuncional aparece solamente en el título, lo que quiere decir que dicha palabra no designa nada diferente de lo que contienen los respectivos capítulos, los cuales se refieren primordialmente a la Agricultura Sostenible y al Desarrollo Rural. Inclusive en el informe del Presidente de la Conferencia de Maastricht, los dos capítulos más importantes donde se recogen las conclusiones y las recomendaciones, el tres y el cuatro, capítulos que nosotros entendemos interesantísimos, excelentes, no se menciona ni una sola vez la palabra multifuncional. Eso quiere decir que este concepto aparece ser completamente innecesario y es confuso porque nadie sabe con precisión que significa multifuncionalidad de la agricultura. ¿Cuál es su naturaleza? ¿Cuál es su alcance? ¿En qué se diferencia de otros conceptos que se manejan en la esfera de las actividades agrícolas y del desarrollo de una agricultura sostenible? El propio informe del Presidente nos dice que la Conferencia Técnica reconoció que no existen definiciones internacionalmente acordadas del carácter multifuncional de la agricultura. Por el contrario, existe más de un enfoque de este concepto y entre estos distintos enfoques hay diferencias y discordancias.

Por último, es peligroso porque el concepto es susceptible de ser utilizado de un modo que lleve a la adopción de políticas que distorsionen el mercado agrícola internacional, sean esos subsidios a la exportación o a la producción, o barreras al acceso de los productos agrícolas de los Países en Desarrollo a dicho mercado. Estos temores no son el resultado de un exceso de susceptibilidad de los países en desarrollo, sino que se basan en signos que vienen del grupo de países que promueven el examen y el desarrollo de este concepto. Nuestras sospechas se justifican aún más si recordamos que en la Conferencia de Maastricht dichos países se opusieron a una propuesta hecha por la delegación de mi país para incluir en el informe del Presidente la afirmación de que los participantes estaban de acuerdo en que la multifuncionalidad no sería utilizada para justificar subsidios a la exportación y la producción. Esto no fue aceptado por los partidarios de la multifuncionalidad. ¿Qué motivo puede existir para oponerse a una declaración que condena a estos subsidios? Por lo tanto, señor Presidente, no entendemos cómo un análisis de este concepto que se aplica a todo lo que el hombre hace, que carece de definición, que tiene distintos significados según la Organización que la utiliza y cuyas consecuencias se desconocen, puede contribuir a alcanzar los objetivos fijados en la Agenda 21 y en la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación. El concepto de agricultura y de desarrollo sostenible ha sido ampliamente desarrollado, cuenta con aprobación universal y proporciona un marco de análisis y de acción adecuado para promover el desarrollo rural y la seguridad alimentaria. No debemos distraernos con nuevos conceptos confusos y controvertidos que nada aportan y restan recursos a otras acciones. Por todo lo expuesto, mantengamos el carácter de mero informe del Presidente de la Conferencia Técnica y ocupémosnos de temas importantes.

**Jostein LINDLAND (Observer for Norway)**

Let me first of all express my compliments to FAO and to the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture for having organized this Conference on the important issue of the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture.

I would also like to thank the Dutch delegate for a very clear and pointed presentation today of the outcome of the Conference.

Norway believes that the various food and non-food functions of the agricultural sector are dimensions of vital importance, and these dimensions should be fully taken into account in agricultural policy design and implementation. In most countries, agriculture is, and has always been, multifunctional. Agriculture is the basis of domestic food security. It ensures the livelihood of hundreds of millions of rural dwellers. It is deeply embedded into the cultural heritage and identity of most nations and it contributes to the preservation of agricultural landscapes, agro-biological diversity and other important environmental qualities.

This multifunctional character is a distinctive characteristic of the agricultural sector in developing, as well as in developed, countries. The concept of multifunctionality helps us understand this reality and facilitates the design of appropriate policy instruments to safeguard the various functions of the sector. The multifunctional character of agriculture was recognized at the Earth Summit in 1992 and referred to in Agenda 21. The concept was further acknowledged at the World Food Summit in 1996 and reflected in the Rome Declaration and the Plan of Action.

Based on the discussions that took place at the Maastricht Conference, there seems to be a need for additional analysis on the multifunctional character of the agricultural sector, in particular in the case of developing countries. Therefore, with respect to the matters requiring Council guidance, FAO, as a centre of excellence and within its mandate, should continue its normative work on multifunctionality, developing its understanding of the various functions of the agricultural sector, as well as their relationship to the primary function of producing food and fibre.

This work should be undertaken in an analytical and technical manner, providing governments with the necessary tools to assess multifunctionality and design appropriate policy instruments. A preliminary list of possible follow-up is contained in paragraph 11 of the Summary Report and I would, in this respect, like to stress that, concerning the second last bullet in that paragraph, "... effective internalization ..." should include both production costs and benefits associated with agricultural activity.

Regarding the reporting to the CSD 8, Norway trusts that FAO will use its competence to ensure that the various issues of concern that are presented are based on rigorous and thorough analysis. In this respect, I would like to note that, in our view, the Chairman's Report of the Maastricht Conference, at present contained in the Appendix of the Summary Report, does not reflect the discussions that took place at the Conference on issues related to policy instruments and trade reform.

Also, we regret that issues of a trade policy character were extensively addressed during the Conference. Many participants were not prepared for such discussions.

FAO should therefore carefully consider the further use of this Report. In any case, it must be made clear that the Report remains the sole responsibility of the Chairman and does not commit any of the FAO Member Governments.

Finally, on the issue of the status of the present Summary Report, it seems sensible to us that, given that the FAO work on multifunctionality is in its early stages, this Summary Report should be submitted to the Conference for information. Such a procedure would, of course, by no means reduce the importance that FAO should attach to this issue in the future. We hope that the Conference at a later stage, and based on substantial input from the Secretariat, would have the opportunity to discuss more in detail these issues, that are so vital to the FAO mandate of ensuring food security and sustainable agriculture.

**Peter FERGUSON (Observer for New Zealand)**

First, we join others in thanking the Dutch Government for their very professional organization of the Maastricht Conference and also to acknowledge the able chairmanship of Mr Hans Alders. The Report produced by him reflects the wide range of views expressed at the Conference. As

others have mentioned, it was very evident from the Maastricht discussions, just as it is evident today, that there was no agreement among participants on either the utility or the need for further work on the concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture and land, or MFCAL. Further work on MFCAL was not supported by the Maastricht Conference, that was clear. This should be fully factored into the Council deliberations.

Maastricht showed that MFCAL added nothing new to what is not already inherent in the framework of sustainable agriculture and rural development, SARD. What became clear from the case studies presented at Maastricht was that sustainable agriculture and rural development is being delivered, in both developed and developing countries, without reference to MFCAL. This underlined the real doubts that many delegations had about the value of the MFCAL approach and whether it added significantly to the existing situation. In this regard, we think it is important that the Secretariat not embark on an exercise in duplication.

There were some very positive outcomes from Maastricht. The case study database prepared by the Secretariat, its innovated consultative approach through Internet, the case studies presented at Maastricht itself, and the field trips, brought out a range of valuable insights and practical suggestions on how we can make further progress in sustainable agriculture and achieving the goals of Agenda 21.

My delegation considers that that is where the Secretariat should focus its efforts on the practical application of ideas identified in the case studies. This would help in furthering understanding of sustainable agriculture and rural development, SARD, and its three pillars, as was called for by a number of countries at Maastricht and mentioned specifically today by the United States.

In this regard, we, like others, do not support further work by FAO on MFCAL as a concept, and the reference to this should be deleted from paragraph 12 of C 99/INF/20-Rev. 1.

We also support the views expressed by many others, including GRULAC, that this particular document should remain an information paper and not be submitted to the Conference for consideration. It has been noted here, and should go forward to the CSD.

**Gudmundur HELGASON (Observer for Iceland)**

I wish to join others in complimenting the Government of the Netherlands and FAO for the organization of the Maastricht Conference.

For the sake of brevity, my delegation would like to align itself with the statements made earlier by the European Community and the delegation of Norway. We certainly share their assessment of the central importance of on-going work in this area in FAO and other fora, and we would strongly encourage FAO, as perhaps the most relevant body dealing with this issue, to continue its work on multifunctionality as a matter of priority. If anything, the Report before us underlines that this work is far from complete.

With respect to the status of the document before us, we feel that it would most appropriately be submitted to the Conference for information purposes only.

**CHAIRMAN**

We have agreed that we should stop and adjourn at 17.30. At the same time, we have also agreed that, if necessary, we can open up discussion tomorrow, and there is at least one country that has requested time tomorrow for its expert to come and explain his position to us. I think we should adjourn now, but at this point it is clear to us that the general consensus is that the document should be kept as an information document, and not submitted to Conference for discussion and decision.

*The meeting rose at 17.35.*

*La séance est levée à 17 h 35.*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 17.35 horas.*

# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Seventeenth Session Cent dix-septième session 117º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 9-11 November 1999 Rome, 9-11 novembre 1999 Roma, 9-11 de noviembre de 1999</b>
<b>THIRD PLENARY MEETING TROISIEME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>10 November 1999</b>

**The Third Plenary Meeting was opened at 9.50 hours  
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding**

**La troisième séance plénière est ouverte à 9 h 50  
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah  
Président indépendant du Conseil**

**Se abre la tercera sesión plenaria a las 9.50 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo**

**II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO****II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO****II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO****5. Outcome of the Conference on the Multi-Functional Character of Agriculture and Land (Maastricht, September 1999) (C 99/INF/20)****5. Conclusions de la Conférence sur le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture et des terroirs (Maastricht, septembre 1999) (C 99/INF/20)****5. Resultados de la Conferencia sobre el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura y la tierra (Maastricht, septiembre de 1999) (C 99/INF/20)****CHAIRMAN**

We are now ready to start the Third Plenary Meeting this morning. As you will recall, we will continue with interventions on Item 5. We have a request from Switzerland, an observer, to take the floor for an intervention on the outcome of the Conference of the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land.

**Anton KOHLER (Observer for Switzerland)**

First I would like to thank FAO and the Dutch Minister of Agriculture for having organized the Maastricht Conference on the important issue of the Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land. I would also like to compliment the Dutch delegation for the analysis of the Maastricht results delivered yesterday, even if we cannot agree, if we cannot join the Chairman's statement as a whole.

Allow me to make a few comments on the concept of multifunctionality.

Multifunctionality is well rooted in the Swiss agricultural policy. In a referendum in 1995 the Swiss electorate even integrated it into the Constitution. Multifunctionality is an analytical framework which tries to operationalize sustainability, as well as other societal goals. The discussion in Maastricht often confused multifunctionality and sustainability by taking the three pillars of sustainability and making them the three functions of multifunctionality. In our understanding, multifunctional agricultural activities contribute to fulfil multiple societal goals, such as sustainable development, the provision of public goods, as well as food security.

The following question is very pertinent for developing countries. In how far is the concept of multifunctionality of agricultural policies relevant for them as well? Does the implementation of an appropriate concept of multifunctionality of agriculture help to improve food security, reduce rural poverty and slow down the rural exodus? Our reply is that the multifunctional character of agriculture helps operationalize sustainable rural development which comprises the economic, social, ecological and food security dimensions.

Let me put forward very briefly some arguments. More than 50 percent of the more than 800 million hungry and undernourished people living in utter poverty are living in less favoured and ecologically-fragile areas on degraded land. If rural urban migration has to be slowed down, which is a social culture objective of multifunctionality, these ecological fragile regions have to be rehabilitated which comprises the food security and ecological objective of multifunctionality. It is a well known fact that poverty stricken, small and marginal farmers, cannot take into account ecological considerations, therefore, driven by basic needs, continue to mine their soils, ground water and natural resources in general.

On the other hand, it is also a well-established fact that farmers in developing countries are reacting much the same way to economic incentives as farmers do in the rest of the world. Benefiting from such incentives, which induce ecological rehabilitation measures, the farmers of developing countries can return to sustainable management of natural resources and to sustainable agricultural practices, thereby inducing more food security. In this way, based on sustainable management of natural resources, and SARD, the concept of the multifunctional character of

agriculture and land can be built. Sustainable management of natural resources and multifunctional character of agriculture and land are directly linked.

Sustainability of agricultural land is a precondition for the economic survival for more than 50 percent of undernourished people, the main goal of the World Food Summit's commitment in the Action Plan.

I have clear evidence at hand that the system of incentives in environmentally-degraded, drought-prone areas in developing countries, based on a concept of multifunctional character of agriculture, can re-establish the ecological balance, improve food security and motivate people to return to their villages.

Let me wind up in referring again to the Maastricht Conference. In our view, the Chairman's report of the Maastricht Conference does not contain important elements that were presented and discussed there. FAO should therefore carefully consider the further use of this document. The Summary Report should, for this reason, be submitted to the Conference for information only.

As the delegation of Korea mentioned, Switzerland would also be interested to review before hand the FAO document to be submitted to the CSD-8. My country could by no means accept the Australian recommendation not to invest any further effort by FAO promoting the multifunctional character of agriculture. Multifunctional character of agriculture and land can be very beneficial to farmers not only in EU and Switzerland but in developing countries generally, promoting thereby food security if properly applied.

**Henri CARSALADE (Sous-Directeur Général, Département du Développement Durable)**

Permettez-moi, tout d'abord, de remercier les Membres du Conseil et les pays Membres observateurs ici présents pour les paroles de remerciements et de félicitations qu'ils nous ont adressées pour la qualité du travail fourni par l'Organisation à cette occasion, pour la quantité d'informations recueillies, désormais à votre disposition, et pour la modernité des méthodes et des démarches utilisées. Je voudrais également profiter de l'occasion qui m'est donnée pour remercier, au nom de l'Organisation, le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas qui a permis cette opération pour une longue et fructueuse collaboration.

Je n'ai pas à rentrer dans le débat qui a marqué la session d'hier et la session d'aujourd'hui, je voudrais simplement répondre à deux questions des Représentants de la Corée et de la Namibie sur la nature du rapport que fera la FAO à la Commission du développement durable et sur le processus qui sera suivi pour cela, le processus préparatoire à cette même réunion de la Commission du développement durable. La réponse est d'ailleurs pour l'essentiel donnée, page 13, à l'Annexe A du document C 99/INF/20-Rev.1, du document qui vous a été soumis. La FAO adressera, début décembre, un rapport au Secrétaire général des Nations Unies en tant que maître d'œuvre des Chapitres 19 et 14 de l'Agenda 21. Ce rapport contiendra le rapport du maître d'œuvre du Chapitre 10. Le rapport du maître d'œuvre du Chapitre 14 et un rapport sur la Conférence de Maastricht. Le rapport sur la Conférence de Maastricht sera composé de la note de présentation qui vous est soumise, c'est-à-dire, de la note C 99/INF/20-Rev.1, sans bien entendu, le dernier paragraphe 12, qui concerne spécifiquement cette réunion du Conseil.

Je veux préciser un point, c'est que la FAO s'adresse au Secrétaire général, qui sous la seule responsabilité, préparera le rapport du Secrétaire général des Nations Unies à la Commission du développement durable. Il n'y a donc pas de rapport de la FAO à la CSD, il y a un rapport de la FAO au Secrétaire général qui utilisera les éléments que nous lui fournirons pour préparer son rapport à la CSD. Je répète donc, nous devrions saisir le Secrétaire général début décembre et le rapport du Secrétaire général à la CSD devrait être disponible fin janvier – début février. Sur la procédure maintenant qui va être suivie pour l'examen de ces différents textes, je rappelle que la Commission du développement durable, huitième session, se tiendra à New York du 23 avril au 3 mai, je répète du 23 avril au 3 mai, avec un segment de haut niveau, c'est-à-dire de niveau ministériel, les 25 et 26 mai, suivi de deux semaines de négociations du rapport de la Commission dans lesquelles vos États seront, je crois, tous représentés et négocieront le texte final qui sera adopté par la CSD-8. Cette réunion sera préparée par un Groupe de travail intersessions chargé

des questions sectorielles qui se réunira également à New York du 28 février au 3 mars, et qui est composé de tous les États Membres. Ce Groupe de travail intersessions recevra le rapport du Secrétaire général, il recevra également une présentation par le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas des résultats de la Conférence de Maastricht, probablement faite par le Président de la Conférence, M. Hans Aders, et il est bon de souligner que la FAO n'aura aucun rôle spécifique lors de cette réunion puisque, je le répète, le rapport du Secrétaire général et la présentation de la Conférence de Maastricht sera faite par le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas. Il appartiendra évidemment aux États Membres, Membres de ce Groupe de travail spécial, de définir leur position pour préparer au mieux les délibérations de la Commission du développement durable à sa huitième session à New York. J'espère que ces informations seront utiles à la suite des travaux sur les débats qui vous ont réuni hier après-midi et ce matin.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Una sola pregunta para terminar de precisar y aclarar cuál va a ser el procedimiento de este informe. Lo que se va a elevar como informe al Secretario General es el documento que hemos analizado. Si yo no escuché mal este documento va a ser presentado íntegramente. Teniendo en cuenta que las últimas partes dispositivas del documento pedían orientaciones al Consejo, nuestra delegación se pregunta si se va a incluir también un punto sobre los debates que se han sostenido en el Consejo o no. Es decir ¿Cuál es el resultado del mandato del Consejo o del análisis del Consejo sobre este documento específico?

**Henri CARSALADE (Sous-Directeur Général, Département du Développement Durable)**

Je crois l'avoir dit, le document qui sera présenté ne comporte pas le paragraphe 12 qui est spécifique à la procédure du Conseil de la FAO. Et donc, nous n'aurons que la partie informatrice et informative de ce document sans paragraphe 12 et bien entendu à l'Annexe du rapport du Président.

**CHAIRMAN**

That concludes Item 5.

**III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**  
(continued)

**III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION** (suite)

**III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS** (continuación)

**8. FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (Spanish only); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)

**8. Cadre stratégique de la FAO 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (espagnol seulement); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)

**8. Marco Estratégico para la FAO 2000-2015 (Versión 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Corr.1 (sólo español); C 99/12-Sup.1; C 99/12-Sup.2; CL 117/2)

**CHAIRMAN**

Now we move on to Item 8. FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015. You will recall that at its last Session in June, the Council, on the basis of a recommendation of the Programme and Finance Committees, requested that Version 4.0 be as concise as possible with supporting material provided separately. It also stressed the need for Members to have the possibility to study Version 4.0 well ahead of the Conference. I believe that the Secretariat has complied with these requirements. You also have the report of the Joint Meeting on the matters in document CL 117/2. You will note that the Committees felt that question 4.0, as it now stands, "offered excellent prospects for adoption by the Conference".



If the Council concurs with this view, we could forward Version 4.0 to the Conference together with any comments you may wish to make. The floor is now open for discussion.

Before the debate, I invite Ms Killingsworth to make an introductory remark.

**Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Special Adviser, World Food Summit Follow-up)**

It is not necessary to take much of the Council's time at this point to introduce a document with which I believe Members are very familiar, having considered earlier versions of it at Council Sessions in November 1998 and in June of this year.

Just to clarify a few points before you begin your debate, the document before you represents, as you know, the fruit of almost two years' intensive dialogue and consultation within the Secretariat, with and among Members, as well as with external partners. In fact, the four versions have been discussed at no less than twelve intergovernmental meetings so far.

Version 4.0, which, as you Mr. Chairman have pointed out, is for discussion prior to submission to the Conference for approval, incorporates the comments and recommendations made by the Council on the previous draft, Version 3.0. Some changes have been introduced in parts I and III of the document in response to Council's suggestions but most of the changes are in part II, Corporate Strategies. Here the Secretariat has endeavoured to introduce greater focus and coherence, as requested by the Council, through consolidating Strategy Elements, trying to clarify Comparative Advantages of FAO, giving greater specificity on Partnerships and greater detail on Strategies to Address Cross-Organizational Issues. To accomplish this, there was a further round of interdepartmental discussions within the Secretariat in May and June of this year.

C 99/12-Sup. 1 contains one section, what was formerly the Annex on Partnerships, which has been extensively revised compared to the text you had in version 3.0. There is, however, supporting material based on the Secretariat's original analysis made to prepare version 1.0 in 1998. I would like to stress that because this material is presented for historical reasons it has not been revised and it is not, of course, submitted to the Council or the Conference for approval. The material in C 99/12-Sup. 1 is background material, not submitted for approval.

You have on your list of documents an indication of a C 99/12-Sup. 2, which was to contain a revised version of the Annex on Regional Perspectives which had been originally considered last June by the Council in Version 3.0. As the Secretariat has not received comments and amendments from all of the Regional Groups, it has not yet been possible to issue this document.

The Programme and Finance Committees, as you have pointed out, considered Version 4.0 already in their Joint Meeting in September, and their comments are contained in the Report of their meeting in C 117/2. They recognized that further views could be expressed by Members during the current Council Session and looked forward to consensus adoption of the document by the Conference. So the Council's Report on its discussion today will be an important input to discussions in Commission II next week. The Secretariat therefore stands ready to provide any further clarification which may be necessary to facilitate this process.

**D. BOMMER (Chairman of the Programme Committee)**

I think you referred already, and also Mrs Killingsworth, to our report, the Report of the Joint Meeting of the Finance and Programme Committee together I had the honour to chair. I wanted only to add only a few additional points in our report, which need to be kept in mind.

First of all, we have reaffirmed that there is a need for the strategy to have a summary, a version of the Strategic Framework, after its approval by the Conference, in order to facilitate the dissemination of its key messages to a broader audience. More important, our Report will reflect that we recommended, or considered, that Version 4.0 offered an excellent prospect for adoption by the Conference. There were two issues unresolved, however, to which we could not, or the membership of those committees could not agree. These are listed in paragraph 43, referred to the "rights-based approach to food security", where some Members accorded a deletion of this phrase while others favoured its retention.

The second issue was in paragraph 76, a phrase considering the multifunctional character of agriculture, which we just discussed at length yesterday and still this morning. Here the majority of Members supported the deletion of this phrase, while others favoured its retention, or its retention with alternative wording. I think these points should be kept in mind in the following debate now.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Simplemente para solicitar le ceda la palabra a la delegación de Haití para formular la declaración del Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Sra. Suze PERCY (Observador por Haití)**

Quisiera agradecer a la Sra. Killingsworth por su excelente introducción sobre el tema que estamos estudiando que es el Marco Estratégico. Hago uso de la palabra a nombre del Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe, con el propósito de expresar la posición del Grupo Regional que represento sobre la versión final del Marco Estratégico.

En primer lugar deseamos destacar que hemos estudiado el documento en profundidad y subrayamos la importancia que éste tiene para orientar el trabajo de la Organización. Asimismo, reconocemos el esfuerzo que ha hecho la Secretaría para conducir este proceso de mejoramiento de la última versión de este documento que debe ser adoptado por los Estados Miembros en la próxima Conferencia. La Región considera que esta última etapa que corresponde al proceso de adopción del Marco Estratégico, debe ser conducido por los Estados Miembros de la Organización promoviendo de esta manera un intercambio de opiniones franco y directo para alcanzar un alto grado de compromiso y responsabilidad política con las acciones que el Marco Estratégico contiene. Para tal efecto, se estima fundamental que los Estados Miembros en la próxima Conferencia, procedan a promover su adopción a través de un Grupo de Trabajo, y este Grupo de Trabajo favorezca la adopción final por parte de la Conferencia. Con tal motivo, la Región se encuentra preparada para participar activamente en el mecanismo propuesto de modo tal que durante la Conferencia se faciliten los equilibrios políticos, las aspiraciones regionales y los compromisos de todos los Estados Miembros de la Organización. A este respecto, la Región de América Latina y el Caribe, por este intermedio, hace entrega a la Secretaría de un Documento Resumen de sus observaciones al Marco Estratégico que podrá servir como uno de los elementos de análisis del Grupo de Trabajo que la Región propone.

No obstante lo anterior, deseamos anticipar algunos aspectos que en su opinión deben subrayarse en el Marco Estratégico y esos elementos esenciales serán la promoción y aplicación de manera integral de todos y cada uno de los elementos contenidos en los acuerdos del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial de Alimentación. El fomento de programas regionales de apoyo a los procesos de reformas de las instituciones agrarias y a la modernización de los sectores públicos, teniendo en cuenta el proceso de evolución del mercado internacional. Para ello se insta a los Estados Miembros de la Organización a que desarrollen unas mejores condiciones internacionales en lo referente al comercio internacional de productos agrícolas profundizándolo y liberándolo, suprimiendo, al mismo tiempo, las subvenciones a las exportaciones y reduciendo los subsidios a la producción, que distorsionan el comercio internacional, estableciendo condiciones equitativas de acceso a los mercados, eliminando tanto los obstáculos arancelarios como los no arancelarios al comercio y las restricciones sanitarias y fitosanitarias. Otro elemento importante es la necesidad de abstenerse de aplicar medidas unilaterales que no están en consonancia con el derecho internacional y con la Carta de las Naciones Unidas, ya que podrían poner en peligro la seguridad alimentaria. Se debe favorecer la aplicación de un trato diferenciado a los países menos adelantados, en particular aquellos que son importadores netos de alimentos y también a los pequeños Estados insulares, se debe también alcanzar una efectiva y pronta aplicación del Plan de Acción para éstos últimos. Se tiene que aumentar la cooperación técnica y el apoyo de manera eficaz para el desarrollo agrícola y rural, buscando financiamientos para la implementación del Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable. No olvidemos que se debe alcanzar un aumento de la competitividad de las zonas rurales con la consiguiente mejora de las condiciones de vida de

las comunidades rurales, fomentando la diversificación y creando fuentes alternativas de ingresos para los agricultores, sus familias y la comunidad rural.

La Región de América Latina y el Caribe renueva su interés en seguir apoyando el proceso de alcanzar, y cada vez más, la modernización, eficiencia y eficacia en las labores de la Organización, puesto que en esta perspectiva todos los Estados Miembros salen beneficiados. De igual manera estima que la adopción de un Marco Estratégico en el inicio de un nuevo milenio, permitirá renovar los compromisos y responsabilidades individuales y colectivas de sus Estados Miembros, reforzando el mandato que emana de la Carta Fundamental de la Organización, como así mismo, transcurrir un nuevo milenio sin el flagelo del hambre y la malnutrición.

**Paul ROSS (Australia)**

Australia welcomes the opportunity to comment on Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework. As Ms Killingsworth has noted, we are indeed very familiar with the document. It is the product of a very thorough development process, and we appreciate the comprehensive participatory process that had been gone through to reach the version of the document we have before us.

We also appreciate the considerable effort put into the development of the Framework and want to commend the Secretariat and the Membership for this constructive work.

We welcome the endeavours by FAO to establish a new planning and management framework for the Organization, and we see the Strategic Framework document as providing a valuable framework to facilitate FAO's taking a more strategic outcomes-oriented approach to planning and evaluation. We particularly welcome the much-improved sections on Criteria for Priority Setting and the more clear articulation of the Organization's Comparative Advantages in this fourth version.

While Australia considers that the Secretariat should continue to look at ways to further improve these areas, we do not see this as a reason to delay adoption of the Framework for FAO at the upcoming Conference.

We would also like to emphasize that we consider that the document should continue to be seen as an evolutionary document, and we would like to see the document regularly reviewed to take account of future developments of importance to the Organization, to ensure it remains very much a timely and strategically-focused document.

Allow me to turn specifically to the issue identified by the Joint Programme and Finance Committees when they looked at the document in September, specifically with regard to paragraph 76. We cannot accept the inclusion of the multifunctional character of agriculture in this framework document. We accept that there is an undefined reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture in the World Food Summit Plan of Action, as there are also references to many other matters. It is a vast and wide-ranging document. The issues surrounding this concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture are the subject of a very divisive and political debate in other international fora.

These discussions are at a very preliminary stage, and there is no agreement on what the concept may mean. In fact, as we have already discussed, there was no support for furthering the cause of MFCAL at the recent Maastricht Conference. We cannot, therefore, accept that this concept be included in a document intended to frame FAO's work for the next fifteen years. We would not wish to see the excellent work put into the Strategic Framework jeopardized over this issue.

**A.M.M. SHAWKAT ALI (Bangladesh)**

Let me begin by expressing my deep appreciation of the work done by FAO in preparing this document.

We all know that the Strategic Framework document has gone through intensive discussion, debate and consequent revision since 1998. The document of the courts shows that adequate consultations with different stakeholders have taken place. Furthermore the document has been put to the test of scrutiny by the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

The Report of the Joint Meeting appears to have favourably recommended the adoption of the document by the Council. However, in paragraph 12 of the Report in question, the Joint Meeting drew the attention of the Council to certain areas of disagreement or lack of consensus. The first of these relates to the wordings of paragraph 43 of document C 99/12; the second relates to paragraph 76 of the same document. For the sake of a structured and more focused discussion, I think we should concentrate on these areas.

My delegation would like to support the retention of the words, "... a rights-based approach to food security ...", which relates to the first issue already mentioned. We strongly believe, as indeed many of us around here do, that the right to food is a basic human right. It is a basic and inalienable right, as the right to vote is in a democratic polity.

With regard to the second area of this disagreement, in paragraph 76, that is, the multifunctional character of agriculture, I think much has been said, and I would go along with our colleague from Australia: that we need to study it in more depth before agreeing to reach a conclusion.

Let me now come back to the point at issue before the Council as far as the Agenda at hand is concerned. The Strategic Framework for FAO has sought to identify specific areas of interventions during the next one-and-a-half decades. It has outlined the Strategy Components and FAO's Comparative Advantages and the Small Partnerships.

We will agree that the comparative advantage of the Organization should be an important basis for priority-setting. However, we strongly believe that it will be futile to compartmentalize FAO's comparative advantages, either in normative work or in its field activities. In our view, both sets of activities are necessary for the Organization's effective delivery of services to the Member Nations. In fact, they are not mutually-exclusive, but rather the opposite. The normative works of the Organization and the related field programmes, in fact, re-enforce each other. The need, therefore, is to establish the necessary synergies between them.

Much against my will, I wish to sound a pessimistic note. It is that the Strategic Framework document placed before the Council for consideration and decision will remain a Strategic Framework and, excuse me for saying this, probably will gather dust unless it is adequately backed up and supported by the needed resources to implement the programmes approved.

In the course of our debate on the budget yesterday, we have discussed this issue at length, so I will not elaborate on that further, short of saying that the time has now come to seriously address the issue of declining aid for agriculture to developing countries. This has time and again been raised in the past, at Council and Conference meetings. Whatever elements of the Strategic Framework document we agree upon, ultimately these must be implemented with the needed resources.

In the Strategic Framework document that we are now discussing, much has been said on the diminishing role of the state and the increased role of the private sector. May I remind you all that, in the Fiftieth Session of the United Nations a few years back, where about 160 countries participated, this much talked of issue was also debated. The consensus reached in that meeting, "... we should get away from the disabling notion that the public sector can do nothing right, or that the private sector can do nothing wrong ...".

I would like to very strongly emphasize that food security is too serious an issue to be left to the private sector alone. At the end of the day, food security is basically a legitimate responsibility of the state, and it is in the nature of public good. In fact this perception, I find, has led to an ambivalent note in the documents that we are discussing now. For example, bullet 3 of paragraph 39 of the Strategic Framework states, "... improving the efficiency and effectiveness by which the public and private sector respond to multiple and differing needs of disadvantaged rural populations, notably women and youth ...". Please read this with paragraph 26, page 23, of document C 99/12-Sup.1. It concludes, "... The needs of resource-poor farmers in developing countries are unlikely to be addressed adequately by the private sector, with a need for the public sector, including international institutions, to fill the gap ...". This statement, I find, is more

realistic and confirms the consensus emerging out of the debate in the United Nations, to which I have already referred.

Let me also draw your attention to paragraph 44, page 18, of the Strategic Framework document. Bullet 1 of the paragraph speaks of FAO's Strategy of Promoting Incorporation of Nutrition Objectives and Conservations into National and Sectoral Policies and Plans. In fact, this process has already started in many countries, including Bangladesh, since the International Convention of Nutrition was concluded.

Bangladesh, for example, has already drawn up its own National Plan of Action on Nutrition and is implementing a multisectoral project involving multiple ministries and agencies, including the NGOs. What FAO needs to do is to convince the international aid-giving agencies to have nutrition as part of the agricultural development plans and programmes. FAO should strongly advocate a new approach to fighting nutritional deficiency. Nutrition has so far been, as perhaps still is, a medicine- or capsule-based approach. It should shift to an agricultural-based approach and FAO should assist its Member Nations to promote and sustain a nutritional approach which is food based. This Strategic Framework document should highlight this.

Finally, I have a feeling that the Strategic Framework document has not given due attention to the gender dimensions of agriculture. We all perhaps know that FAO, a few years back, conducted a global survey on the role of women in agriculture. That well-documented report has drawn our attention to gender blindness. This issue should form part of the Strategic Framework document. Otherwise I am afraid the document will suffer from gender blindness, to which FAO has earlier drawn global attention.

**Lyll W. SMALL (Barbados)**

I would wish to congratulate FAO on the very significant improvements which have been made to the document since I last saw it at the Council meeting in June this year. In fact, I consider that it needs very little work to be acceptable for consideration by the Conference. I would like to join with the distinguished delegates from Australia and Bangladesh in indicating that I do not think that the reference to MFCAL should remain in the document.

**Hirofumi KUGITA (Japan)**

Japan very much welcomes the excellent work carried out by the Secretariat and the Member Nations in setting up the FAO Strategic Framework Version 4.0. We find version 4.0 considerably improved over the earlier versions both in presentation and in substance. In particular, we appreciate the refinement of Part II Corporate Strategies, the heart of the document. We believe that this document is appropriate to serve as a medium and longer-term strategy for FAO.

I wish to make some comments on two particular points raised in the Secretariat document CL 117/2, Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee, namely the phrases: "...rights-based approach to food security..." in paragraph 43 of Version 4.0, and "...considering the multifunctional character of agriculture..." in paragraph 76 of the same document.

Regarding the first point, I would like to recall that everyone has a fundamental right to be free from hunger as stated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. I believe that the problems of hunger and food insecurity have global dimensions. They are likely to persist and even increase dramatically in some regions if urgent action is not taken. In this regard, I would like to reiterate that food should not be used as an instrument for political or economic pressure as is stated in the Rome Declaration of the World Food Summit. For these reasons, we are in favour of the retention of this phrase as it is. We believe that "rights-based approach to food security" could serve as a good approach for achieving the commitment and objectives of the World Food Summit.

As regard to the second point, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the "multifunctional character of agriculture" is clearly stated in Commitment 3 of the World Food

Summit Plan of Action, as is also indicated in paragraph 18 of the Strategic Framework Version 4.0, which is a new point of reference to the World Food Summit.

FAO has a major role to play in assisting countries to implement the provisions of the World Food Summit Plan of Action which falls within its mandate. Furthermore, we have strong concerns about the argument raised in the Joint Committee since the deletion of the reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture would reopen many other relevant discussions and heavily undermine the value of the World Food Summit Plan of Action which was unanimously agreed upon by the Head of State. For these reasons given the coherence between the Strategic Framework and the World Food Summit Plan of Action, we urge that the phrase should be retained as it is in the final version of the Strategic Framework.

**James W. SCHROEDER (United States of America)**

Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework is logical and concise; it contains the focus and coherence sought by the June Council. The reduction in elements from 82 to 53 enables clear priority-setting.

We are particularly encouraged by the language relating to partnerships where FAO has realized that it can play a useful role in facilitating and assisting without always taking a lead role. There are, of course, areas where we could offer additional changes but in the spirit of compromise we will forego those at this time.

We are satisfied with the Mission, Vision Statements, the Corporate Strategies, FAO's Comparative Advantages and the Revised Criteria for Priority-Setting. The document does a good job of capturing the important role of FAO, promoting market-oriented trade regimes, developing global standards under Codex and the IPPC, noting the growing role of the private sector, highlighting advances in technologies including biotechnology, managing fragile ecosystems in a sustainable manner, and utilizing FAO's wide ranging expertise in forging an interdisciplinary approach to agriculture problems.

FAO's critical role in harmonizing data and information through WAICENT will continue to underpin most all of FAO's activities.

FAO's role in food security is expressed very well in paragraph 101 where it states that, and I quote "...The major thrust of FAO's action will be to work with its partners in promoting national and international action to meet the Summit's goals and to keep the question of food security high on the international agenda".

We agree with the recommendation of the Joint Session of the Programme and Finance Committees on FAO's role in developing international standards. The Draft Implementation Plan looks reasonable but we will need to experience a biannual cycle before we can more fully assess changes which may be appropriate. Having a shorter Programme Evaluation Report and including more quantitative information on WAICENT are ideas we support.

We should take another look at the new Programming Model and the Revised Criteria for Priority-Setting at the 2001 Conference.

Now, unfortunately, we do have several concerns with this fourth version of the Strategic Framework. Those are the two points mentioned by the Chairperson of the Programme Committee. These are concerns, changes which were not in the third version.

First, the reference in paragraph 43 to developing a quote "...rights-based approach to food security..." We cannot support that language. We suggest that it be deleted. It adds nothing to the existing text. Ensuring access to sufficient, safe and nutritionally-adequate food, and better identifying food-insecure people are extremely important and in themselves daunting tasks. Adding a "rights-based" dimension only complicates and confuses the issue.

Our second concern is paragraph 76 where reference has been included and is made to the "...multifunctional character of agriculture...". In our view, this phrase should also be deleted. As is clearly apparent here, pointed out by our colleague from Uruguay yesterday, and our colleague

from Australia today, this phrase is at best controversial; at worst it is confusing, it distracts from the intent of the paragraph which we believe is clearer, and should go forward without this phrase.

So in conclusion we are pleased with the improvements made in Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework. We are certainly willing to work with others to remedy these two concerns which I have mentioned.

**Thomas J. KELLY (United Kingdom)**

I would like to ask that the floor be given to Finland, so Finland can speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

**Ms Ulla-Maija FINSKAS (Observer for Finland)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. Two years ago at the Twenty-ninth Session of the FAO Conference, we agreed on the development of a Strategic Vision for FAO for the years 2000-2015. Now we are close to the end of the process and preparing ourselves to approve the Strategic Framework document which is going to guide our work in the years to come.

Firstly, the participatory approach which was adopted deserves to be commended. Indeed, we all have been able to comment and contribute to the different versions of the document. Due to these contributions, the quality and content of the document has improved considerably during the process.

The Mission of FAO, as stated in Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework, is to help build a food-secure world for present and future generations. FAO's contribution to sustainable development and the reduction of rural poverty in which conservation, improvement and sustainable utilization of natural resources is an important component, complements this Mission. The special nature of FAO lies in its unique position as a universally-recognized Centre of Excellence, collecting, analysing and disseminating data and information; its role as a Secretariat for international negotiations and its advice in agricultural and food policies.

The normative activities should be supported by complementary field activities in an appropriate balance. These are the Organization's strengths on which it must build for the future to achieve its goals.

Two years ago, we had clear expectations for the FAO Strategic Framework. We expected it to describe the challenges ahead of us and to tell us what the Organization plans to achieve during the period covered by the Framework, and how it proposes to get there. This was the starting point for our comments on the previous versions of the document.

Version 4.0, which is under discussion now, is the last of the versions of the Strategic Framework. We welcome the improved readability and structure as compared to the previous document. In particular, we appreciate the clear formulation of the Corporate Strategies and the new treatment of Comparative Advantages under every Strategic Objective.

The EC and its Member States find it essential that sustainable livelihoods represent the conceptual framework for addressing rural poverty and food insecurity. We are pleased that the systematic approach, the socio-economic and gender issues, are included in version 4.0. We welcome the adoption of interdisciplinarity and partnerships as the underlying principles for the development of Corporate Strategies. They, as well as the Strategies for Addressing Cross-organizational Issues, will have potentially far-reaching implications for FAO. We think it is vital that FAO pursues these Strategies with as much interest and rigor as it devotes to its programmatic activities. The tasks set out under this section of the Strategic Framework are of key importance and will, in large part, determine the presence, effectiveness, and impact of FAO's activities over the next fifteen years and beyond.

We note with satisfaction that the multiple functions of agriculture have been recognized in several parts of the document. In addition to its principle functions, as the production of food and fibers, agriculture contributes to achieving a great number of important objectives, such as

preserving the rural environment and landscape and contributing to the viability of rural areas and balanced territorial development. Given the importance of these functions, they have been taken into consideration by an increasing number of countries.

There are, however, some concerns which we would like to discuss. A major problem of version 4.0 is that the Strategic Vision is still not clear, as there are no choices presented and no indication of what FAO will do more and what it will do less. Everything seems to have equal importance in the document. Thus, there is a risk that FAO will disburse its efforts over too broad a field of activities. We think that FAO and its Members are about to miss the good opportunity to direct FAO's work to the most essential activities.

The organizational overstretch can be a serious problem. An issue closely associated to this one is the resource constraints which FAO faces. In fact, this problem is underplayed and should have been brought out better in Version 4.0. We agree with the statement in paragraph 127 "Emphasis needs to be placed on expanding the total resources applied to the principal programmes espoused by the Organization, and not necessarily on the amount of resources managed by FAO".

Concerning FAO's Normative Programmes, our position is that they are the core activities and thus they should be funded by the regular budget. And here I wish to refer to paragraphs 131 and 132.

The EC and its Member States have been expecting, during the preparation of different versions, that the clear statement of the Criteria for Priority-Setting would be made. There is a chapter in this Version 4.0, but it gives the criteria only in broad terms. The Medium-Term Plan which is the next tool in the new planning mechanisms of the Organization, would establish the Criteria for Priority-Setting at the level of actions and outputs which we find important. It is, however, unsatisfactory that the definition of Criteria for Priority-Setting is left to be sorted out only in the Medium-Term Plan.

Concerning the management process, we asked FAO at the Council Session in June 1999 to address issues like overcoming cumbersome administrative procedures, and encouraging decision making initiatives by middle management.

Version 4.0 deals with many elements of Human Resource Management and management systems, but leaves some parts too vague.

As to the new interdisciplinary approach, it is not yet clear how it would be implemented in practice and what it means for the allocation of resources and the organization of staff.

Once again we would like to take up cooperation with other agencies and the participation of FAO in relevant frameworks within the multilateral system. Version 4.0 describes the partnerships in relation to each Strategic Objective. This is important because FAO's effectiveness will depend crucially on its ability to sustain and develop partnerships. Version 4.0, however, does not mention one of the latest initiatives, the Comprehensive Development Framework, which is under implementation already in a dozen countries. We think that the CDF is an interesting concept which should be further elaborated and we would appreciate to hear how FAO envisages its involvement in the CDF process.

The EC and its Member States accord special importance to the implementation of the Strategic Framework and the assessment of its effect. It will be essential to monitor the progress towards achieving the Objectives and towards implementing and using the Strategies. For this purpose, the Secretariat needs to develop a few key, clear and over-the-years unchanging indicators which will enable the measurement of the results. However, the efforts to develop indicators must be proportional to the benefit derived from them. We would very much like to hear how the Secretariat plans to carry out this task, and what the procedure and timeframe would be. Some information on the accuracy of the adopted strategies should be available already before the first planned review of the Strategic Framework in six years time. We would like to suggest that this issue be considered also in the Programme Committee when they are discussing the development of a new evaluation regime.



Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework is still very detailed and heavy to become a strategy document, which could be carried in minds and pockets of every FAO employer, Member and partner. Anticipating this, we asked several times for an Executive Summary. To our disappointment, the document does not have such a Summary. We would like to hear the Secretariat's views on why this Summary has not been prepared.

The EC and its Member States would like to reiterate their support to the concepts of the Comprehensive Planning Mechanism of FAO. The Strategic Framework is the first step in fundamental overhaul of the Organization's systems for planning, budgeting, evaluation, and reporting.

Part III of Version 4.0 provides a clear outline of what is involved and the schedule for putting it into effect. We support the results-based orientation, and we take a very close interest in the further development of the systems.

Finally, in conclusion, I would like to inform that the EC and its Member States would like to inform the Council of its intention to table a Resolution on an Alliance for Food Security in Commission I of the Conference, under the agenda item on the follow-up to the World Food Summit.

**Wilberforce KISAMBA MUGERWA (Uganda)**

My delegation supports the Strategic Framework. In fact, Uganda has adopted it as a model in developing its plan for modernization of agriculture in the country, particularly in respect to agro-research, extension and farmer-market linkage, and also allocation of resources and determining the role which will be progressively played by the private sector, also applying international experiences on Uganda sector.

At this juncture, I beg for indulgence that the floor be given to Tanzania to speak for G-77.

**L.T. ASMANI (Observer for Tanzania, United Republic of)**

Thank you for giving us the floor to speak on behalf of the G-77 and China.

The G-77 hopes that we are now coming to the end of the long way on getting this Strategic Framework as a vision of our Organization. Numerically, we are on the fourth version. The Strategic Framework, as we see it, should respect the mandate of the Organization, taking into account its comparative advantages for the benefit of all Members, but particularly to developing countries to achieve food security. We believe that by having this document, more efforts are going to be put into strengthening the Organization in order to implement the commitments of the World Food Summit and the Plan of Action. Food security and rural development remain the priorities of most developing countries, although sometimes one gets the impression that rural development may not necessarily mean the same thing among the various Members.

We took a considerable time yesterday and this morning on Agenda Item 5. I believe where the Strategic Framework makes reference to that issue. I think the Council has pronounced very clearly what is the position on the multifunctional nature of agriculture. Therefore, its place in the Strategic Framework should take into account what the Council deliberations have been during the two days of discussion. There is a need for financial commitment for the success of the Strategic Framework, and the G-77 attaches great importance to the availability and the predictability of resources to the Organization, so that it can implement what we are trying, and hopefully will achieve, to adopt this morning.

Regional, as well as national priorities are very important, and we believe they need to be respected. Therefore, the G-77 takes this Strategic Framework with a bit understanding, but more important, we believe the Strategic Framework will not become an instrument of restrictive character in any way, and that no group should use the Strategic Framework for undue dominance.

Concerning other issues, there has been a reference to *Codex Alimentarius*, IPPC, private sector and biotechnology. It is important that we do realize the level of development of Members of this

Organization, their ability or their inability to achieve the fruits and the benefits of some of these things. We should not pretend that we can enjoy them equally, and there is a need to reconsider when talking about other initiatives.

Lastly, we have just heard from the previous speaker concerning the Resolution. The G-77 has not had time to discuss that particular Resolution, but we look forward to seeing it and studying it and, hopefully, pronouncing its own position.

**Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)**

En primer lugar, reconocemos el esfuerzo de la Secretaría por mejorar la última versión de este documento, así como también las presentaciones escuchadas en el día de hoy.

Entre todos los temas de la orden del día de este 117º Consejo de la FAO, sin lugar a duda el Marco Estratégico para la FAO constituye la piedra angular para nuestro trabajo. No se puede desligar el hambre de ayer, con la de hoy, ni con la de mañana: es el mismo hambre, el mismo flagelo sin resolver. Esta problemática está recogida y expresada en la declaración del GRULAC, intervención dada a conocer por nuestra Presidenta Regional, la cual compartimos plenamente, siendo además expresión de nuestra posición, pero para no repetir lo expresado por la Representación de Haití, permítame algunos breves comentarios que inciden sobre este amplio tema.

Repito una frase y cito: "El hambre no está encerrada dentro de ninguna frontera, pues se trata de un problema de desigualdades". En este sentido es preocupante el proceso de concentración de la riqueza, en una palabra: las desigualdades subsisten dentro de un injusto orden económico-internacional. Aunque es peligrosa la síntesis, el reto está allí; perfilar un camino para llegar a soluciones, mejorar los mecanismos de distribución de la riqueza, en fin, buscar soluciones a lo que de hecho es nuestra gestión: eliminar el hambre allí donde millones de seres humanos la sufren, descartando el infantilismo que define el hambre como tan solo una fatalidad. Permítanme compartir con ustedes informaciones que recientemente se han publicado por la FAO bajo el título "El Estado de la Inseguridad Alimentaria en el Mundo", el cual subraya que todas las noches 800 millones de personas se van a dormir con hambre en los países en vía de desarrollo. El documento publicado el día 14 de octubre de 1999 incluye cuadros gráficos, lo que demuestra que "la conocida cifra de 800 millones de hambrientos en el mundo en desarrollo", expresa el informe, "supera la población de Europa y América del Norte juntas". Para subrayar, y vuelvo a citar, "todos ellos forman una especie de continente de hombres, mujeres y niños que tal vez nunca puedan evolucionar desde el punto de vista físico e intelectual por falta de comida expresa".

Observemos este dato brindado en el informe de la FAO: "en el futuro de los niños de los países del Tercer Mundo, cerca de 200 millones de pequeños, tienen problemas de crecimiento, además, en esos países el peso de los menores de cinco años está por debajo de lo normal para su edad". En este orden de ideas, y vemos que con estos ejemplos se desconoce, invertir en el ser humano es el mejor medio para salir del subdesarrollo.

Por lo que observamos, nos va a sorprender el nuevo siglo con más preguntas que respuestas. La población mundial alcanzó 6.000 millones de seres humanos y este aumento se concentró en los países en vía de desarrollo. Según estudios realizados, los desequilibrios son enormes. La quinta parte más rica de la población mundial consume 66 veces más recursos que la población pobre. Si echamos una ojeada a una Región prácticamente no priorizada como América Latina y el Caribe, observamos que el 40 por ciento vive en condiciones deplorables, el 35 por ciento en el desempleo y 80 millones por debajo del umbral de la pobreza, agudizándose el hambre y la malnutrición en más de 200 millones de personas. Si a esto agregamos que un año después del desastre natural más devastador del siglo, el Huracán Mitch, que causó estragos en los países centroamericanos, como por ejemplo a nivel infraestructural. Estos países aún esperan la prometida contribución de los donantes, ayuda sin la cual los organismos internacionales no pueden completar su trabajo, otros países de la Región han sufrido los embates de la naturaleza como los del Caribe, Colombia, y más recientemente México. Tenemos que enfrentar estas catástrofes con otras, para mencionar algunas solamente, el intercambio desigual, la globalización,

tanto unos como otros hacen que la Región busque fórmulas para enfrentar estas situaciones, con bases a crear objetivos comunes, poblaciones que en su identidad y orígenes funden una historia, busquen un mismo derrotero en una estrategia en su integración, como quedará demostrada en la próxima semana, en la IX Cumbre Interamericana que reunirá a su más alto nivel a España y Portugal en esta importante reunión, los días 15 y 16 de noviembre en La Habana, Cuba, para lo cual el pueblo cubano se prepara para recibirlos con su habitual hospitalidad.

Entiendo necesario reiterar lo que está recogido en los textos de la Declaración de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: ningún país por sí sólo puede salir de la pobreza sin la cooperación y la colaboración internacional. Dentro de esa orden de ideas nos sorprende un nuevo milenio, al que llegamos con preocupantes asignaturas pendientes: aún aumenta el hambre y la desigualdad y juntos caminan de la misma mano entre otros problemas, como los de la deuda externa. Es inexplicable que en vez de disminuir esa deuda en los países subdesarrollados, ésta aumenta, precisamente para los más pobres: ¿cómo explicar esto? En la cuadratura del círculo, después de reducir la deuda existen países que todavía deberán dedicar más del 50 por ciento de sus presupuestos al reembolso de la misma.

No queremos alargar más este tema. Tanto unos como otros, reitero que están incluidos en la declaración del GRULAC y ésta resume todas las prioridades y observaciones de nuestra Región, de nuestros países de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Mohamed Abd El Hamid KHALIFA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

I would like to begin by thanking the Secretariat for the excellent document that they have prepared for us. We have discussed the Strategic Framework for FAO 2000-2015 in various groups and committees within FAO and, on those occasions, have expressed our opinions on it.

Version 4.0, the one that has been submitted to the Council, does not include a great deal of changes, amendments or improvements to this Strategic Framework, particularly if we compare it to previous versions. It does not seem to fully cover the different opinions that have been expressed regarding possible improvements to the Strategic Framework. Since this is the last opportunity that we have to express our opinions, we would like to say the following.

First of all, we feel that the Strategic Framework should be summarized so that it would make it possible for us to draw greater benefit from the ideas that it contains. Furthermore, we feel that the priority should be carefully considered in the implementation of the FAO Strategic Framework. Thirdly, we feel that the follow-up of the implementation of this Strategic Framework, and the evaluation of it, should be very carefully considered so that we may draw from the lessons learned. The financial earmarking must all be carefully considered in the implementation of the Strategic Framework for the consequences that it may have. Finally, we would agree on this Strategic Framework as long as the implementation can be undertaken at the agreed-upon date.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

Allow me to congratulate the Secretariat for the excellent work in synthesizing a diverse range of views expressed in several fora on earlier versions resulting in this Version 4.0.

This is certainly a much improved document. Useful editing and improvements have been made under various headings, even Strategy titles have been shortened. These are all welcome changes, and we concur with the views of the Joint Meeting and of the Programme and Finance Committees expressed in paragraph 10 of the report in this regard. However, we feel further editing is also possible, for example in paragraphs 2 and 21.

We still have certain general concerns with the document, which we had heard earlier, and feel that reiteration of these is necessary. First, though a good working document, it continues to lack a political flavour inspiring hope and promise, which is essential for a long-term strategy document. Second, the document shies away from any commitment to adequately resourcing the implementation of the Strategy. Finally, the document in itself is unmonitorable, as it does not address issues of results, outcomes and impacts.

We have already endorsed Strategies but have some specific comments on various paragraphs introduced in Version 4.0. So, we would be more comfortable with paragraphs 29, 30, 31 and 33 deleted and paragraph 40 of Version 3.0 restored in place of paragraph 36 in the current version. Paragraph 61 under Corporate Strategy B.2 suggests that FAO would do all this work by itself rather than assisting the Member Nations in carrying out these activities. This impression needs to be dispelled through the introduction of suitable language.

We note that though introduced on demand of Member Nations, the identification of specific Comparative Advantages under each Strategy has resulted in a lot of unavoidable repetition. We would be much more comfortable with a single section on Comparative Advantages and partnerships, noting that these are again covered under paragraphs 156 to 174.

We would prefer that the priority-setting criteria approved by the Hundred and Tenth Session of the Council given in paragraph 151 of Version 3.0 be restored in place of that given in 154 of the current version. With regard to paragraphs 43 and 76, we support the viewpoint that terms that are not adequately defined at this stage or are controversial in any way need not be introduced to the document at this final stage, particularly when their inclusion has not been specifically requested by the previous Council session.

Finally, we can support the demand of the committees made at a joint session for a summary version of the Strategic Framework for a broader audience.

In conclusion, let me thank Mr Wade and Mrs Killingsworth once again for their tremendous contribution in finalizing this important document.

**Bill DOERING (Canada)**

Let me also begin by expressing our appreciation to the staff of the Secretariat who have devoted considerable time to the preparation of the various versions of the Strategic Framework over the past two-and-a-half years. Version 4.0 hopefully represents the final instalment to the Strategic Vision for the Organization. Canada supports its adoption because we believe this version responds to and incorporates suggestions made by the Council in all but two areas, of which I will discuss later.

We feel that it is an excellent document not because it contains the points we want. In fact, in a number of areas the opposite is true and contains references which we would have preferred not be there, but we accept these compromises because we have a chance to raise these concerns and hear the views of other Members. We have all had a chance to make choices and sacrifices, and the end product we believe is better for that process of consultation.

Version 4.0 is also more focused. It reduces the number of Strategic Elements by half and has become more results oriented. The sections on Comparative Advantages, Partnerships and Priority Setting have been strengthened and recognize that FAO is not always the lead agency. The introduction on Members' Global Goals, on the FAO's Mission, Vision and Values is also much improved, in that the text now recognizes the need to examine the structure of the Organization in light of the changes that the Strategic Framework will entail.

Corporate Strategies to address members needs on the one hand, and Cross-Organization issues on the other represent a clear measurable framework upon which to plan for the next fifteen years. The Organization has listened to the Members and has produced a set of goals and strategies that accurately reflect their wishes. If the Organization carries through and enters into and fosters partnerships with UN Organizations, Civil Society and the private sector, this Framework will place the FAO well ahead the rest of the UN System in the area of strategic planning.

In discussing strategies to address cross-organizational issues, we encourage the Organization to continue to share expertise with its partners and continue in ways to form partnerships with universities, other research centers and the private sector and to rent or buy the expertise when it is needed.

However, there are two areas of concern we would like to bring to your attention. It should be noted that reference to a “rights-based approach to food security” was not requested by the Membership, nor has it been discussed by the Committee on Food Security, which, by the way, is the only FAO mechanism to monitor implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, but has a UN-wide role. The comment read by the Committee on Food Security by the Observer representing the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights did not discuss a “rights-based approach”. Reference was made to a human rights approach to adequate food, but that is also equally-undefined and a vague concept. This paragraph loses none of its meaning if this sentence is deleted, and that's what we recommend, that it be deleted.

In the same way the concept of the “multifunctional character of agriculture” introduced in paragraph 76 when it had not been discussed in Version 3.0. The Mandate of the Organization is to promote sustainable agriculture and rural development. We therefore recommend that reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture be replaced with the reference to sustainable agriculture and rural development.

**Yohannes TENSUE (Eritrea)**

May I ask you give the floor to Burkina Faso.

**André Anatole YAMEOGO (Observateur du Burkina Faso)**

Le Groupe africain note l'importance du document relatif au Cadre stratégique qui est un pari engagé contre le temps, ses nombreux ravages et ses incertitudes. Le Groupe est conscient également de la nécessité de disposer de ressources minimum pour l'exécution de ce Cadre stratégique. Autrement dit, il pense qu'il nous faut être conséquents quant au rapport à établir entre le niveau de budget et les activités planifiées, et pas seulement dans le court terme. En général, le Groupe africain est satisfait à quelques détails près, de la Version 4.0 du Cadre stratégique, qui est le résultat de bien des discussions constructives sur plusieurs sessions et réunions antérieures du Conseil et des Comités de la FAO.

Cependant, il convient de rappeler et d'insister sur les points suivants: la nécessité d'avoir en permanence un équilibre entre les activités normatives et les activités opérationnelles, un équilibre juste que nous n'avons jamais cessé de réclamer; préciser le genre de travail normatif, dont l'Organisation a absolument besoin, et qui de ce fait est incontournable; prévoir un mécanisme de révision périodique des stratégies et des tendances, afin de mesurer les progrès de l'application de ce Cadre stratégique. Il s'agit, en somme, de se donner tous les moyens nécessaires pour atteindre l'objectif fixé par le Sommet mondial de l'alimentation de novembre 1996, qui est de réduire de moitié le nombre de personnes sous alimentées dans le monde. En tant qu'Organisation leader et Centre d'excellence reconnu dans le domaine, la FAO a besoin de la solidarité de tous les États Membres pour relever les défis encore nombreux, les cas graves et les récentes catastrophes naturelles. La solidarité dont il est question doit s'exprimer aussi et évidemment en termes financiers. Il y a urgence quand des priorités comme celles liées à la gestion durable des ressources naturelles pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture et la lutte contre la pauvreté rurale nous interpellent. Pour le Groupe africain, et pour les détails concernant le document, les membres africains du Groupe pourraient intervenir.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

Speaking on behalf of the Republic of Korea, I would first like to convey my sincere appreciation to the Secretariat's efforts for preparing the Strategic Framework 2000-2015, the last Version 4.0. I think that all of us can remember how many integral sessions and technical meetings were required for this version to be produced. So, I believe that the problems in the previous versions have been corrected, complemented and improved in Version 4.0, and this version can now serve as the Strategic Framework for FAO's long-term development plan. Therefore, I would like to strongly support that FAO's Strategic Framework 2000-2015 Version 4.0 be approved at the upcoming Thirtieth Session of the Conference as it is.

However, I would like to note with particular concern the issue of removing the phrase in paragraph 76 of the Strategic Framework Version 4.0, saying "considering the multifunctional character agriculture was raised by some Member countries here". First of all, I would like to support the comments on this paragraph from Japan and Finland on behalf of the EU Member States.

With regard to paragraph 76, we first wish to remind you that these points are incorporated into the Commitment 3 of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, and that all the seven commitments of the Plan of Action have been agreed and pledged upon by all Member Nations at the highest level through the long and detailed negotiations in a large number of the meetings, including the Regional Conferences, CFS meetings and Inter-sessional Working Group meetings in 1996. We also wish to make it clear that each commitment is indispensable and an integral part of the World Food Summit Plan of Action. Together with this, we would like to reiterate that Commitment 3 addressed the need for sustainable agriculture and rural development and that it provides for the multifunctional character of agriculture to be considered in pursuing sustainable agriculture and rural development.

Along these same lines, we wish to draw your attention to Chapter 14, Agenda 21 of UNCED, which elaborates on the framework of sustainable agriculture, fisheries, forestry and rural development in relation to food security. We believe that all the distinguished delegates present here recall the twelve programme areas emphasized within the context of sustainable agriculture and rural development. Here we would like to remind you again that Chapter 14 underlines, among others, the need for agriculture policy review, planning and integrative programmes in the light of respective agriculture, particularly with regard to food security and sustainable development.

Now let me turn to paragraph 18 of the Strategic Framework, Version 4.0, which says that "FAO has a major role to play in assisting countries to implement the provisions of all World Food Summit Plans of Action which fall within its Mandate, and in defining FAO's own goals therefore the Plan of Action is fundamental." We consider that this paragraph highlights the importance of the commitment of the Plan of Action in setting FAO's long-term programme orientations. In addition to that, paragraph 19 adequately points out FAO's significant responsibilities for assisting in implementing Agenda 21 of UNCED. In this review, a famous pursuit of sustainable development and conservation of the environment and the natural resources as one of the Corporate Strategies certainly falls within this area of the FAO mandate and competence, and the need for FAO to consider the multifunctional character of agriculture in doing so is undisputed.

Moreover, it should be noted that the consideration of the multifunctional character of agriculture focuses on the far-reaching external effects of agriculture on the environment and natural resources while reviewing its negative ones. In this sense, we consider that removal of the phrase in the questions would certainly overlook or omit one of the major elements to be considered in pursuing sustainable agriculture and rural development, and we further consider that any assertion of the deleting of the phrase is such that Members need to question what were the commitments of the Plan of Action and Chapter 14 of UNCED, Agenda 21, which have already been agreed upon by all the Members.

In conclusion, we are of the view that the phrase in paragraph 76 should be retained without any alternative.

Once again, I would like to support that the Strategic Framework being approved at the upcoming Thirtieth Session of the Conference as it is.

**LIANG QU (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The Chinese delegation thanks FAO's Secretariat and others for improving the Strategic Framework. We appreciate the spirit of full participation and broad consultations displayed in revising this strategic document, which guides the future of FAO.

In comparison with Version 3.0, the fourth version has been improved both as far as structure and contents are concerned. We believe that the most remarkable improvement is in the part of the core of the document, that is, the Corporate Strategy. The Strategic Elements have been greatly consolidated. Therefore, their objectives and priorities are more prominent, and repetition has been avoided in the interest of efficiency. At the same time, the analysis of the Comparative Advantages of FAO has been increased. The Comparative Advantages and the Strategic Elements are both complementary to each other, the basis for Strategic Objectives and their realization. The Chinese delegation would like to express its appreciation for these efforts.

With regard to the Criteria for Priority-Setting, the Chinese delegation would like to reiterate that we support that FAO attempt to eradicate poverty and hunger, ensuring world food security as the first priority development area of the Organization. FAO should also base its work on this and further carry out technical cooperation activities, intensify its implementation of the Special Programme for Food Security.

In the process of formulating specific activities, we hope that full consideration will be given to agricultural education and training, to the development and promotion of agricultural science, to technology, to the development of agricultural resources and environmental protection, as well as to carrying out international cooperation in the field of food and agriculture.

As for the implementation programme for the Strategic Framework, the Chinese delegation would like to emphasize the importance of monitoring and evaluation. Without accurate and objective monitoring and evaluation, there can be no guarantee for the healthy implementation of the Strategic Framework. We have noticed that a new evaluation method is under consideration. We hope that in this process, views will be elicited extensively.

**Marcel Théophile RAVELOARIJONA (Madagascar)**

Ma délégation se joint aux délégations qui ont exprimé leur satisfaction de vous voir présider à nouveau notre Conseil et adressé à nouveau leurs félicitations aux autres Membres du Bureau, qui auront la lourde tâche de mener à bien nos travaux. Je voudrais aussi profiter de l'occasion pour remercier le Secrétariat de la FAO pour la qualité des documents sur lesquels se fondent nos débats. Ma délégation a cependant constaté que le rôle qui incombe à la FAO pour la lutte contre la pauvreté et pour la sécurité alimentaire, risque d'être un vœu pieux si les moyens ne suivent pas les besoins qui sont malheureusement toujours croissants, malgré les efforts accomplis et les résultats obtenus.

Ceci est à notre avis le cas aujourd'hui, dans la mesure où le budget de ces dernières années n'ont pu être augmentés et restent à une Croissance Nominale Zéro. Nous estimons que cette démarche ne pourra que réduire les activités de la FAO, voire retarder la réalisation des programmes, et conduire inéluctablement la FAO à une mission impossible. Pour cela nous souhaitons vivement que le budget du prochain biennium prenne en considération les différentes interventions d'un grand nombre de délégations, appuyées par le Groupe de la région Afrique, qui consistent à envisager le scénario Croissance Réelle pour être en mesure de réduire sensiblement les 800 millions de personnes qui souffrent de la faim, mission assignée à la FAO par le Sommet mondial de l'alimentation.

S'agissant plus particulièrement du Cadre stratégique 2000-2015, dans sa Version 4.0, nous nous associons aux délégations qui ont exprimé le souhait de mettre des ressources suffisantes à la disposition de la FAO pour la mise en application des stratégies, qu'il s'agisse des activités normatives ou d'activités de terrain, intimement liées et complémentaires.

La diffusion du Cadre stratégique, sous forme plus condensée, sera accueillie favorablement par les pays en tant que document de référence pour leur plan d'action, notamment pour les pays en développement.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Como lo señaló nuestra Presidenta Regional, América Latina y el Caribe ha hecho entrega en la Secretaría de una serie de propuestas de modificación que consideramos deben ser incluidas en la versión actual del documento.

Reconocemos la transcendencia de la estrategia que será sometida a la Conferencia cada vez que ésta representará la guía de las actividades de la FAO en los próximos tres lustros. En tal sentido es importante que se alcance un consenso entre todos los Estados Miembros. Más allá de los aspectos específicos sobre los cuales el GRULAC ha planteado propuestas, querríamos resaltar algunas cuestiones de fondo que consideramos no están aún debidamente reflejadas. Primero, pensamos que el mandato de la Organización debe representar el eje del Marco Estratégico; en tal sentido estimamos que se debe otorgar una atención igualmente similar a las tres áreas previstas: informativa, normativa y de campo. En este contexto, deseamos apoyar lo señalado tanto por la Representante de Finlandia, a nombre de la Unión Europea, como por el de Burkina Faso a nombre de Africa, para que haya un equilibrio entre las actividades normativas y de campo.

Advertimos que en la versión actual, las actividades de Cooperación Técnica son el gran ausente. Mientras la Estrategia B está dedicada en su integridad a las labores normativas y la Estrategia E está orientada a las acciones de información, no existe ni siquiera un párrafo completo en todo este documento sobre las actividades de campo de Cooperación Técnica de la FAO. Pensamos que esta importante esfera de la Organización debe estar expresamente incluida en este documento.

La Reunión Conmemorativa de los Cincuenta Años de la FAO celebrada en Quebec en 1995 y la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación refrendaron el mandato, los dos macroeventos más recientes de la Organización, por lo que consideramos que el mandato de la FAO continúa vigente. En este contexto, queremos resaltar también que si las ventajas comparativas de la Organización deben ser un elemento que se debe considerar, éstas no deben sustituir de ninguna manera como criterio fundamental orientativo al propio mandato.

Finalmente, deseamos resaltar la importancia de que en la Estrategia se incluyan las partes relativas a las estrategias regionales.

**Marek GRELA (Poland)**

My delegation welcomes Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework. In our view, it properly reflects the discussions of our previous Council meetings and it tries rather successfully to satisfy the different interests of countries and regions. Let me state in my capacity as the current Chairman of the Sub-regional Group of FAO Members from Central and Eastern European Countries, that our position, the position of the Sub-region, with regard to the Strategic Framework, coincides with the position of the European Community and its Member States presented today by the delegate of Finland, including our support for the concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture. Poland, like some other countries in transition, is particularly interested in this element of the Strategic Framework.

Finally, I would like to address one small point with regard to Strategy D. In Poland's view, a reference should be included in Strategy D to the Global Strategy for the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources to give a better plant-animal balance. The previous Council meeting resolved that FAO should shape and further develop this Strategy for the livestock sector of agro-biodiversity.

**Benamara DRISS (Maroc) (Langue originale arabe)**

Je m'exprime au nom de la délégation du Maroc et tout d'abord, permettez-moi, comme les orateurs précédents, de remercier le Secrétariat des efforts qu'il a déployés pour préparer ce document important, Version 4.0 du Cadre stratégique de la FAO.



La délégation du Maroc appuie ce qui a été dit par le Président du Groupe africain. Nous appuyons aussi tous ceux qui se sont exprimés, qui ont fait référence à l'importance du Cadre stratégique pour la FAO et de la nécessité de fournir à l'Organisation les ressources appropriées afin qu'elle puisse mener à bien ses activités pour faire face aux défis à venir.

En conclusion, j'aimerais avoir un exemplaire de la proposition qui sera faite par la Communauté européenne pour que nous puissions l'étudier au Groupe des 77.

**Kalarickal P. FABIAN (India)**

We want to say thank you to those who rewrote the document. They have a good mind and a good pen, and it is eminently readable. The language has been tightened, and there is a touch of modesty. I am referring to page 9, paragraph 2. "In anticipating what the future will hold, the only real certainty is uncertainty." Well, it is refreshing to be told such a home truth. I said that the language has been tightened further but there is call for further tightening. For example, there is not much advantage in repeating the phrase "comparative advantage". One important factor is the question of numbers. On page 9 there is a figure of 828 million for the period 1994-96. Now later we shall be discussing, I believe, food insecurity, the state of food insecurity in the world, and as the Director-General had also mentioned, there the figure is 790 million for the period 1995-97. Obviously the figures should be corrected when the document will be finalized. In doing that, it will be important to indicate somewhere how many people die because of hunger every year, since the number of those who are suffering from chronic malnutrition can disappear, either because their situation improves or because they just disappear. So it is important to point out somewhere how many of our fellow human beings die, due to hunger, every year.

I want to point your attention to Version 3.0, page 20, paragraph 55, Section F. This is a point of particular importance to developing countries. I read Section F "Sensitizing the whole of FAO's membership to special concerns of developing countries including food security." We shall be happy to see that restored. Now, coming to paragraph 30 of Version 4.0, we are not all that happy with the formulation, and we share the point so ably made by the Representative of Pakistan. After all, what does paragraph 30 say? It speaks of normative work. That is the first sentence. Then it goes on to say, "However, they will also involve operational activities, provided that Members request them, that the requisite human and financial resources are available, and that they are practical extensions of normative work and of direct benefit to Member Nations." For us, this is not satisfactory. We believe that it is possible to have a formulation that will reflect a better balance between normative and operational activities.

The fundamental question is whether the Strategic Framework, apart from giving us a good description of the scenery, provides us with a route map to enable us to reach where we should reach. In this context, allow me to share with you a thought of Mahatma Gandhi who said, "Those who are in charge of public policy, whenever they have any doubt as to what course of action they should undertake, should ask themselves the following question: Is the proposed course of action going to make any difference to the poorest and weakest human being whose face they can recall? Will the course of action restore that person's control over his destiny? Will the course of action improve that person's condition in life?" If we can ask that question, Mahatma Gandhi says that our doubts will dissolve, and not only our doubts but even our own selves.

**João Maurício CABRAL de MELLO (Brazil)**

The Brazilian delegation fully backs the declaration made by the delegation from Haiti, on behalf of the GRULAC I would also like to add some considerations from my part.

In Part I of the document, my delegation would like to point out that it is still disappointed with paragraphs 23 and 24, regarding the Mission of the Organization. We find that they are excessively generic and could be more specific.

Regarding Part II, I would like to make some observations. First of all, I have serious doubts about paragraph 30 because that the Organization seems to be giving full priority to the normative aspect. Therefore, I have to also agree with my colleague from India when he says that.

I would also like to point out that leaving FAO only to concentrate on the informative and normative aspects would, I think, impede achieving food security in the world. I believe that the operative aspect of the Organization is fundamental if we are to have world development and food security in the developing countries. Article I, which defines the mandate of FAO -- I am talking about the Constitution of FAO -- clearly mentions that the Organization is: "to furnish such technical assistance as Governments may request; and to organize in cooperation with the Governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist and to fulfil the obligation arising from their acceptance of the recommendations, of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture and of this Constitution." Therefore, I think that the operative aspect of FAO should be on an equal footing with the normative and informative aspects.

Part III of the Strategic Framework seems to be well elaborated and I do not think there are any serious modifications to be made.

I would also like to point out, that my delegation supports other delegations on the issue regarding the multifunctional character of agriculture. We think that it should be deleted from the document, since there is no consensus regarding the issue, in that this document here should avoid any concept which has not been the object of consensus. Therefore, the Brazilian delegation would ask that the following concepts be deleted, in addition to the multifunctional character of agriculture, the concept of a "rights-based approach to food security" and the concept of an Alliance for Food Security. We think that these issues should be more fully discussed and, therefore, should be deleted from this document.

One thing that strikes me here, as being awkward, going back to this concept of multifunctional character of agriculture, is the fact that the Secretariat put this concept in, given the fact that there is no consensus regarding the issue. Plus if I could add, here in the Strategic Framework we see all over the place the fact that FAO should maintain its neutrality. It strikes me, to see that they were quite willing to insert this concept when many countries, as has been noted, have serious doubts regarding it.

I would also like to thank the Secretariat, Ms Killingsworth and Mr Wade for their work. I know it was very difficult to produce four versions of this document. It was not easy and I would like to express my full thanks for this very hard work that you have done during the biennium.

#### **Ms Mariann KÓVACS (Hungary)**

We would like to join those delegates who commended the Secretariat for their work. We consider Version 4.0 as an improvement to the previous one, incorporating most of the proposals made at the FAO Council in June. We also welcome putting details in the Supplement 1, but we regret the absence of Supplement 2, which should refer to the Strategic Objectives, region by region.

Since nearly everything has been said, and as you already just mentioned now, we should be brief. At this point in time, my delegation would like to associate itself with the statements of Finland, on behalf of the European Union, and Poland, on behalf of the Central Eastern European Countries, with special regard to the retention of the concept of the multifunctional character of agriculture in the Strategic Framework.

#### **P. W. MISIKA (Namibia)**

Namibia commends the Secretariat for a well formulated Strategic Framework document, as presented in Version 4.0.

We also want to support and reiterate the position, as indicated by the Chairperson of the G-77, and the Chairperson of the Africa Group, with regard to this document.

Namibia takes cognisance of the fact that, while the document before us might not be considered perfect for all, it is, nevertheless, our firm belief that Version 4.0 encompasses most, although not all, of the concerns voiced by Members during the Hundred and Sixteenth Council Session held in

June. Indeed, it can confidently be said, that this version reflects an improvement compared to the Version 3.0 that was presented at that time.

We take note that the Mission, Strategic Competence, Comparative Advantages and Partnerships and the Criteria for Priority-setting are better formulated and are, therefore, welcome and indeed applauded. They may not be perfect, but we believe they signify a right step, at the right time and in the right direction.

We understand the concerns of those Members calling for the refinement of the document to cover all concerns of all Members and to have a more clear and concise strategic document, defining what FAO will do and what it will not do. However, believing that the Strategy is for a period of 15 years, we wish to caution that, unless Council wants a theoretical framework, that may not be relevant to the circumstances of Member Nations as they are today. There is a need for tolerance, as regards the current generality of the document. Equally, we appeal for understanding among Members on the need for compromising, rather than insisting on the inclusion of all our individual concerns.

Namibia believes that strategy formulation is not a static process but, rather, a dynamic and evolving one with scope for reviews and improvements. In this regard, we want to believe that the very few inadequacies in Version 4.0 will not negatively influence the acceptance and adoption of the current version by the Council, provided reference to the concept of MFCAL is deleted from the document, as suggested by many delegations, service inclusion thereof was not discussed and neither was it recommended by previous consultations. Namibia submits that the concept of MFCAL should only be used in FAO documents when the definition, scope and implications thereof are clear for all and understood and accepted by all.

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je voudrais revenir sur un sujet déjà abordé par les orateurs précédents qui, selon nous, ne devrait pas être au centre d'une polémique. Je veux parler de l'inclusion dans le Cadre stratégique du caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture. Tout d'abord, permettez-moi de rappeler, comme cela a été dit à maintes reprises, que tant la Déclaration de Rome que le Plan d'action pour la sécurité alimentaire qui y est annexé, ont fait explicitement référence à la multifonctionnalité de l'agriculture. Nul doute alors que cette notion participe du consensus qui a présidé à l'élaboration du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Il serait surprenant que le Conseil ne reprenne pas à son compte, à travers le document sur le Cadre stratégique, des orientations pourtant claires et consensuelles données par les Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement présents lors du Sommet mondial.

Les politiques agricoles concernent bien sûr les secteurs agricoles et agro-alimentaires mais aussi la sécurité alimentaire, le bien-être rural, l'environnement, les valeurs culturelles de la société et bien entendu, les relations commerciales et internationales dans ce domaine.

Le concept de multifonctionnalité constitue un outil analytique et une grille de lecture des politiques agricoles qui permet de placer celle-ci sur la voie de l'objectif de développement durable, que nous avons tous souscrit dans le cadre du processus de Rio.

La Conférence de Maastricht a permis de faire un grand pas pour expliciter et illustrer ce concept. Il convient, selon nous, maintenant, de construire sur le travail déjà réalisé tant au plan conceptuel, comme je viens de le dire, qu'au plan pratique, en s'appuyant sur les nombreuses études de cas recueillies pendant la préparation de la Conférence de Maastricht. Notre opinion est qu'il serait incohérent de dire que la FAO doit encore apporter sa contribution sur ce point et de proposer en même temps d'exclure la référence à la multifonctionnalité de l'agriculture du Cadre stratégique - Cadre stratégique qui est censé fournir les lignes directrices de l'Organisation pour l'avenir, et au moins jusqu'à 2015.

Bien entendu, nous rejoignons en cela l'Union européenne dans son ensemble qui s'est exprimée par la voix de sa Présidence, la Finlande. Nous rejoignons aussi totalement le Japon qui, parmi

d'autres orateurs, s'est exprimé sur ce point ainsi que la Suisse qui s'est exprimée en premier ce matin, lorsque nous terminions l'examen du point 5 sur la multifonctionnalité.

Pour toutes ces raisons, la délégation française estime pouvoir insister sur le maintien en l'état du paragraphe 76 du Cadre stratégique.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)**

Je souscris mot par mot à ce qu'a dit la délégation finlandaise au nom de l'Union européenne des États Membres, et je souscris par entier à ce qu'a dit le délégué de la France. Je voudrais en particulier me référer aux paragraphes 76 et 164 du Cadre stratégique.

J'ai suivi avec le plus grand intérêt la discussion d'hier sur la multifonctionnalité de l'agriculture, il y a eu des opinions différentes et naturellement, j'ai beaucoup appris des positions différentes de la nôtre. Mais, je ne peux pas accepter le concept; peut-être la question n'a-t-elle pas encore assez mûrie, mais elle aurait pu être éclaircie, discutée davantage. On aurait pu mieux clarifier ce que les différentes délégations pensent en terme de multifonctionnalité. Mais, étant donné que tous les Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement ont souscrit à la Déclaration de Rome où il est fait référence au caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture, si on revient à des textes, à des accords pris au plus haut niveau de nos Gouvernements, je me demande si cela vaut la peine de parvenir à des textes et à des documents conjoints si on les remet en cause à chaque fois.

Il n'y a pas seulement l'engagement 3 auquel plusieurs délégations se sont référées, mais il y a le texte initial souscrit par les Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement. Je vois mal comment dans une perspective de quinze ans, un problème qui touche un des points vitaux de l'agriculture, de la sécurité alimentaire, puisse être mis à l'écart. Nous avons discuté du rapport de Maastricht hier, mais c'est un rapport qui est au Comité du développement durable à New York, et qui aura donc une suite. Or, la FAO est chef de file dans le respect des Chapitres 10 et 14 du Sommet de Rio, de l'Agenda 21, elle est naturellement impliquée dans cet exercice. Elle l'est d'autant plus par son expertise, à traiter un problème qui doit peut-être encore être clarifié, c'est un problème qui fait part de l'acquis, du vocabulaire que les États ont approuvé au plus haut niveau. Je vois mal comment on pourrait priver le Cadre stratégique dans les quinze prochaines années d'un des éléments si important. Il devra encore être clarifié, nous avons encore quinze ans pour le clarifier. Nous avons aussi la Conférence à moyen terme, nous avons d'autres occasions pour perfectionner cette idée. Mais on ne peut pas la faire tomber comme dans l'intervention du délégué du Brésil qui voudrait même enlever la référence au paragraphe 114 qui se réfère à l'Alliance. Nous sommes en train d'en discuter, mais c'est sûrement quelque chose qui, dans les quinze prochaines années, va revenir, va prendre une forme plus précise que dans nos discussions actuelles.

Je voudrais me limiter, en ce qui concerne ce paragraphe 76, au point que je viens de dire, car pour le reste, tout a été dit et tout est perfectible. Je crois que Madame Killingsworth et Monsieur Tony Wade vont reprendre les textes pour les perfectionner ultérieurement, mais comme dit un proverbe italien "Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien". Je crois qu'on est déjà parvenu à un bien assez substantiel, essayons de le sauvegarder autant que possible.

Si vous me permettez deux mots sur le paragraphe 164,

(Continues in English)

Paragraph 164 refers to the Organization's contacts with Governments combined with the presence of Permanent Representatives in Rome. I think that just considering, I will come back in another item of our Agenda on the role of Permanent Representatives in Rome. The phrasing of this paragraph implies that the contacts with Governments are of prime importance, and followed by contacts with the Permanent Representatives in Rome. We are the Governments, and I think that we are the first channel of contact with the Organization.

So, I would like to revert the order of this paragraph, which is a minor issue, but does have some major implications. Apart from that, Mr Chairman, I thank you for giving me the floor.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

En realidad muchas de las cosas que tenía la delegación de Chile para comentar, han sido muy bien explicadas por otros oradores, por lo tanto y en aras del tiempo, sólo pienso referirme a algunos aspectos suscitados.

En primer lugar apoyar, por cierto, la declaración del GRULAC que representa las preocupaciones del Grupo Regional de América Latina y el Caribe.

En segundo lugar, acoger la propuesta que ese mismo documento contiene y que son mejoramientos que se proponen, pues estamos convencidos que el Marco Estratégico debe reflejar un equilibrio (y nótese bien, digo equilibrio) entre todas las aspiraciones e intereses de los Grupos Regionales. Ciertamente este es un foro multilateral que debe contener todas esas aspiraciones, pero en forma equilibrada. Son 40 observaciones al texto que hemos propuesto, que deberían ser elaboradas y estudiadas por un Grupo de Trabajo. Porque usted ha mencionado claramente que tenemos muy poco tiempo para continuar a profundizar nuestro trabajo sobre esta materia. Es claro que no tenemos un acuerdo y que hay varios aspectos que se han reflejado en nuestras discusiones, sobre los cuales no hay consenso. Uno de ellos es, por ejemplo, el tema de la multifuncionalidad de la agricultura que no solamente está el tema en el párrafo 76, sino que también en los párrafos 69 y 78. También se han mencionado otros elementos que son substantivos para algunos países en desarrollo y que Chile comparte, por ejemplo cómo se considera el tema de los enfoques de la evolución del derecho de alimentación. Es un tema importante, no es cosa de borrar la frase y aprobar un documento. Estamos al frente de un documento que va a reflejar los intereses, los propósitos de esta Organización durante los próximos quince años - Quince años que sin duda van a ser muy importantes para la humanidad. Tenemos numerosos desafíos por delante, puede ser que uno de ellos sea el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura. Puede ser que debamos, también, preocuparnos de los subsidios agrícolas que entregan numerosos países y que hoy día alcanzan a una cifra cercana a los 320 000 mil millones de pesos anuales, comparados con 800 millones de personas que sufren hambre y malnutrición.

Por lo tanto, yo creo que aquí es el momento de hacer una Alianza como ha sido mencionada en el documento para el desarrollo, que puede tener distintos aspectos, pero esa Alianza sin duda alguna pasa por algunos principios. Primero, el compromiso político de un presupuesto mínimo para esta Organización. No podemos entregarle a esta Organización un Marco Estratégico y al mismo tiempo una inseguridad sobre los recursos con los cuales esta Organización puede contar. ¿Qué mensaje le estamos dando a la sociedad civil que queremos movilizarlas, que queremos que se junte a nosotros para compartir este desafío que tenemos de eliminar el hambre y la malnutrición? No podemos darles un mensaje que sólo nos preocupan los papeles. No le podemos dar un mensaje que solamente los lindos párrafos equilibrados sirven. Tenemos que darle un mensaje que estamos genuinamente comprometidos.

He escuchado una frase que quisiera subrayar, a propósito de alguien que argumentaba en favor del carácter multifuncional de la agricultura. Decía lo siguiente: "que pasaría si nosotros desconociéramos el acuerdo que han asumido los Jefes de Estados cuando han hablado del carácter multifuncional de la agricultura". Reconozco que ese tema está puesto en el Plan de Acción, así como muchos otros. También reconozco el que está en la Agenda 21, en el Capítulo 14, pero al igual que yo subrayo ese compromiso que tiene mi país con esos dos documentos, también subrayo el sinnúmero de otros compromisos que tenemos todos individual y colectivamente con esta Organización y que no solamente están reflejados en la Agenda 21 o en el Plan de Acción Mundial de la Cumbre o en el Plan del Uso de los Recursos Fitogenéticos (el Plan de Acción del ACSI), que es un tema fundamental, y ¿dónde está?

Nosotros estamos enfrentados a desafíos que quizás no nos dimos cuenta, pero la evidencia de las catástrofes climáticas que está viviendo el planeta son una gota que nos debe hacer reflexionar. Por ello y para terminar mi intervención, hago un llamado a dos cosas fundamentales: una que el Comité de Recacción de este Consejo no se transforme en un proceso de negociación entre cuatro

países, sino que por el contrario invito a que este Consejo decida que en virtud de las distintas opiniones que aquí se han expresado cree ese Grupo de Trabajo durante la Conferencia que vaya a facilitar la opción de un documento final que a todos nos refleje y contemple todas nuestras aspiraciones. Creo que eso sería el mejor favor que le podríamos hacer a esta Organización a la entrada de este nuevo milenio.

**Ms Ratana THANOMSAKYUTH (Thailand)**

First of all, please allow me on behalf of the Thai delegation to express our appreciation as well as to compliment the Secretariat for the excellent document on the Strategy Framework placed before us. It has certainly much improved from the former versions. Moreover, it gives clearer focus and direction of the Organization's tasks over the next fifteen years. My delegation would like to support the previous speakers particularly Tanzania, as the Chair of the G-77, and would like to voice briefly our comments, as follows.

First, since the Strategy Framework has quite a long timeframe, the translation of the Strategy into action should be flexible and updated periodically to respond effectively and efficiently to the changes of the internal and external environments as well as the Members' needs as indicated in paragraphs 27 and 142.

Second, to achieve the Organization's goal, priority-setting and transparency, coupled with perfect balance between the normative and field activities as well as between the regions is certainly needed.

Third, the implementation and assessment of the Strategy should be carried out carefully and should use the appropriate indicators.

Before closing, I would like to inform the meeting that my delegation strongly supports the adoption of the Strategy Framework and thus wishes to have the celebration of the Seventieth anniversary of FAO in the year 2015 with a positive and optimistic outcome from this Strategy Framework.

**Sra. Hilda Graciela GABARDINI (Argentina)**

En aras de la falta de tiempo, Argentina solamente quiere apoyar por completo lo que ha dicho el delegado de Chile. De hecho él ha cubierto perfectamente, y aún más, los puntos que yo pensaba evocar. Sólo me queda, en vez de entrar en algunas menciones de ciertos párrafos con los cuales mi delegación tiene problemas, exhortarlo a que tenga presente la propuesta del Grupo Latinoamericano expresada esta mañana por la representante de Haití y reforzada por lo dicho por los Representantes de Brasil y Chile y constituya un grupo de trabajo para tratar exhaustivamente estos temas.

**Ms Maria Celia FERNANDEZ (Observer for Philippines)**

First, the Philippines supports the proposed Strategic Framework. However, we have two comments. One, we would like the Organization to apprise Member Nations as to how the Strategic Framework relates to the Strategic Plan for the Forestry Sector. And second, we request that an annual evaluation be conducted to assess the performance of all entities and to allow flexibility in reprogramming the same, considering that the Framework encompasses fifteen years.

**Francis MONTANARO MIFSUD (Observer for Malta)**

My delegation would like to compliment the Secretariat on the fourth version of the Strategic Framework, which we welcome and fully support. In this connection we would like to associate ourselves with the position outlined by the Finnish delegation on behalf of the European Community, the position which we share. In particular, we would not agree to the exclusion of the reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture. This is a concept that is very consistent with the character of our own agriculture, and I would also venture to suggest with the economies of many developing countries.

Consideration of the multifunctional character of agriculture is an integral part of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, which as has already been noted by several speakers, was adopted at the highest level without any reservations with regard to the particular commitments in question.

I would also like to observe that we consider that this is an area where FAO has a particular competence and where we have received assistance, advice from FAO, which we are receiving at the moment. This is a concept which is very pertinent, and without this concept I am not so sure that FAO would have any expertise to furnish us with that would be relevant to our own agriculture.

**Andreas ROUSHIAS (Observer for Cyprus)**

Considering the time constraint, I will be very brief. On this very keynote issue of Strategic Framework 2000-2015, my delegation would like to say that our views are aligned with the positions that are reflected in the statement delivered by Finland on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. We would like to emphasize in particular that the inclusion of issues of the multifunctionality of agriculture in the Strategic Framework document is of utmost importance.

**Dag BRISEID (Observer for Norway)**

Norway appreciates the participatory and open process in developing the Strategic Framework. We have participated actively throughout and made substantial input to the various Committees in which different versions of the Strategic Framework have been discussed. Norway, however, regrets that the document presented is less focused and does not contain as clear priorities as we had hoped for when this process started two years ago. Having said this, at this stage Norway believes we should focus on the challenges ahead of us, in particular on how to secure an active use of this document in the overall planning processes. This is especially important in relation to the Medium-Term Plan and the envisaged process of priority-setting. The time has now come for the Conference to adopt the Strategic Framework, and we shall contribute to reaching a consensus.

Norway fully supports a "rights-based approach to food security" as referred to in paragraph 43. The World Food Summit clearly called for an increased focus on the right to food as prescribed by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In this respect, the right to food as a human right, and the role of Governments in this respect, has been further clarified and operationalized by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its general comment released in May this year. Therefore, we are glad to see that the increased awareness of the importance of a "rights-based approach" is reflected in the Strategic Framework. We would, however, have liked this approach to figure even more prominently in the Framework, as was the case in former versions.

Let me also add a comment on paragraph 59, where reference is made to Government' continued "progressive disengagement from productive functions. . . " This reference should be deleted as it is at best not clear, and at worst, contradictory to the very important efforts that many Governments make to ensure an efficient level of domestic food production. While in certain cases, Government disengagement is necessary to increase efficiency and avoid unnecessary draining of scarce public funds, in other cases the intervention of Governments to facilitate the increased productivity and production is crucial to the legitimate pursuit of sustainable development and food security objectives.

Finally, regarding paragraph 76, let me take this opportunity to join those countries that have stressed the importance of continued recognition of the multifunctional character of agriculture.

As discussed under the previous agenda item, Agenda 21, as well as the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit, clearly acknowledge the concept of multifunctionality, and we fully support France, Italy and the Republic of Korea in saying that it is worrying that language agreed at the highest level at the World Food Summit is now being questioned by some delegations. Based on the discussions we have had today and yesterday, it seems that some delegations are not

convinced about the usefulness of the concept of multifunctionality and question whether it adds anything valuable in addition to the SARD approach. In our view, the concept of multifunctionality is complementary to SARD and very useful for a number of reasons. The concept of multifunctionality explicitly recognizes the important multidimensional roles that agriculture plays and has always played in most countries – developing as well as developed – for instance, in relation to food security, the viability of rural areas, agriculture landscapes, agrobiodiversity, and cultural heritage and identity. As we said yesterday, the concept of multifunctionality helps us understand better this multidimensional reality and facilitates the design of appropriate policy instruments to safeguard these various functions of the sector. In our view, the concept of multifunctionality is relevant to both developing and developed countries. Naturally, countries may give different priority ranking to the specific functions maintained by the agricultural sector because of differences among countries, both in the way agriculture operates due to natural, historic, economic and cultural reasons and because of variations in national demand for the different functions in question. However, for agricultural policies to be successful, they have to take into account the various multiple functions that agriculture fulfils and society demands in each country.

As a follow-up to Agenda 21 and the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit, it is fully in accordance with FAO's normative mandate to undertake further work in this area within the context of food security and sustainable agriculture and based on sound and rigorous analysis. We therefore fully support that multifunctionality be reflected in the Strategic Framework, and we would have liked the Framework to focus even more on this important matter.

**Gudmundur HELGASON (Observer for Iceland)**

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the statement just made by Norway and earlier by the delegation of Finland on behalf of the European Community. We would like to add our voice to the many delegations that have spoken in favour of the retention of the concept of multifunctionality of agriculture in the Strategic Framework. We are frankly surprised by some of the statements that have been made this morning with respect to the deletion of this concept from the document, as it is not the subject of consensus. We need look no further than the conclusions of the World Food Summit, which we do not believe to be open to question. At any rate, the multifunctional role of agriculture goes so far to the core of what FAO is and does that we would find it inconceivable for the Organization to abandon work on this very important issue to developed and developing countries alike.

By way of closing, my delegation wishes to extend its appreciation to the Secretariat for its excellent work in the elaboration of this document. While we share the reservations that have *inter alia* been expressed by the delegations of Finland and Norway, we are prepared to contribute constructively towards its prompt adoption.

**Krassimir KOSTOV (Observer for Bulgaria)**

It is exactly ten years ago today that the people of Bulgaria brought down a regime that used to speak in declarations, both at home and abroad. It did not work, and that is why it was brought down. In the ten years of our transition on the road to democracy and market economy, we have learned to appreciate the value of dialogue, openness and ability to compromise to reach even the most difficult decisions. It is with this spirit that Bulgaria is looking forward to participating in the concluding debate of the Conference and the adoption by consensus of the Strategic Framework for FAO, to guide our efforts, as individual countries and as a community, to tackle the problems that require the development of modern agriculture.

For Bulgaria, Version 4.0 of the document presented to us by the Secretariat – and here I would like to commend the work of the team that prepared the document – represents a most clear, comprehensive and complete basis for reaching a consensus for a final document. It correctly reflects the full range of ideas and instruments available, and is an indication that FAO is well equipped to guide the global efforts to eradicate hunger by building modern, functioning and efficient agriculture if the Member Nations wish so.



In the ten years of restructuring and reforming our agriculture, we have been able to make good use of the expertise of FAO and the Member Nations of the different models, concepts and practices that exist. That is why, in our view, it is of fundamental importance to see this richness reflected and preserved in the final document, including the reference to the multifunctional character of agriculture and land. In fact, we would like to see this concept further elaborated and presented in the Strategic Framework and in the work of FAO.

**Rolf GERBER (Observer for Switzerland)**

I have listened to this discussion with interest but also with an increasing sentiment of frustration, especially when I listened to the delegate of Brazil, who seemed to believe that there is no consensus on the concept of multifunctionality. As expressed by the Republic of Korea, France, Italy, Norway, Iceland and a number of other delegations, I find it deeply worrying that delegates do not acknowledge the Rome Declaration and the Plan of Action endorsed by Heads of State and Government at the World Food Summit in 1996. If somebody feels that the concept of multifunctionality should be further discussed, fine. Let us have further FAO work on this and have further discussion, but this work must, of course, build on what Heads of State and Government have already agreed. The deletion of the reference to multifunctionality is therefore totally unacceptable to Switzerland.

*The meeting rose at 13 00 hours.*

*La séance est levée à 13 h 00.*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 13.00 horas.*



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Seventeenth Session Cent dix-septième session 117º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 9-11 November 1999 Rome, 9-11 novembre 1999 Roma, 9-11 de noviembre de 1999</b>
<b>FOURTH PLENARY MEETING QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE CUARTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>10 November 1999</b>

**The Fourth Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.45 hours**

**Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding**

**La quatrième séance plénière est ouverte à 14h45  
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Président indépendant du Conseil**

**Se abre la cuarta sesión plenaria a las 14.45 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo**

### III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)

### III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)

### III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)

**8. FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1; CL 117/2 paras 9 to 19) (continued)

**8. Cadre stratégique de la FAO 2000-2015 (Version 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1; CL 117/2 par. 9 à 19) (suite)

**8. Marco Estratégico para la FAO 2000-2015 (Versión 4.0)** (C 99/12; C 99/12-Sup.1; CL 117/2 párrs. 9 a 19) (continuación)

#### CHAIRMAN

We should reconvene our meeting this afternoon. We are still on Item 8, the FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015.

I wish to bring your attention that Ms Suze Percy, Observer for Haiti, will submit a written statement on this item for insertion in the Verbatim Records.

#### Sra. Suze PERCY (Observador por Haiti)

LAS ENMIENDAS QUE SE PROPONEN ESTAN REGISTRADAS EN LETRA ITALICA Y SUBRAYADAS. LAS FRASES QUE SE SUGIERE ELIMINAR ESTAN IDENTIFICADAS EN [PARENTESIS CUADRADOS].

#### I. MARCO ESTRATÉGICO GLOBAL

Hacia el 2015

1. En el año 2015 la FAO celebrará su 70º aniversario. ¿Qué estará haciendo entonces? ¿Qué hay que hacer desde ahora hasta entonces? Ante el cambio de siglo y de milenio, los Miembros de la FAO han decidido abordar estas cuestiones mediante la elaboración de un Marco Estratégico, (actualizado periódicamente), que sirva de orientación a la labor de la Organización durante los 15 próximos años.

5.

[La región con el mayor número absoluto de personas desnutridas (512 millones) es Asia, mientras que la región que tiene la mayor proporción de la población desnutrida (39 por ciento) es África. A menos que se realicen grandes esfuerzos para mejorar el suministro de alimentos y superar las desigualdades, en el año 2015 la incidencia de la malnutrición en algunos países podría mantenerse aún hasta en un 30 por ciento de la población.]

El hambre y la pobreza han aumentado en partes de América Latina y el Caribe en la época del reajuste estructural de los años ochenta. La FAO (1995a) estima que el número de personas que sufren desnutrición crónica ha pasado de 46 millones en torno a 1980 a más de 60 millones a principios de los años noventa; lo que representa el 14 por ciento de la población. Antes que ocurrieran las grandes emergencias alimentarias, derivadas de los recientes desastres naturales, se preveían grandes mejoras que permitirían abatir las tasas de malnutrición de esta región durante los siguientes decenios, teniendo especialmente en cuenta las mejores infraestructuras institucionales y de mercado; sin embargo, en la actualidad este panorama se ha visto intensamente afectado.).

Como se puede observar, diversas partes del mundo se caracterizan por el crecimiento de la pobreza, la deuda externa, las desfavorables relaciones de intercambio, el descenso en la producción nacional per capita, las altas tasas de fecundidad, las calamidades naturales y el

problema creciente de situaciones de emergencia que conducen al desplazamiento masivo de personas, el uso de los alimentos como instrumento de presión política y económica; factores todos ellos que han contribuido a acelerar el empeoramiento de la situación de la seguridad alimentaria

7.

(Por otra parte, se debe tener presente que unos cuatro quintos del aumento previsto de la producción agrícola de alimentos en los países en desarrollo provendrá de la intensificación de la producción agrícola: dos tercios en forma de rendimiento más altos y el resto como resultado del aumento en la intensidad de los cultivos (más cultivos múltiples, barbechos más breves), especialmente en los países con unas condiciones agroecológicas favorables y pocas o nulas posibilidades de aumentar la superficie cultivada. La consecución de los aumentos en los rendimientos dependerá de que se conceda gran prioridad a las inversiones en la agricultura primaria, en la investigación y extensión agrícolas, facilitando el acceso a una amplia variedad de tecnologías modernas<sup>1</sup>

8. EL GRULAC NO COMPARTE LOS PÁRRAFOS DE APOYO EN EL DOCUMENTO SUPLEMENTARIO<sup>2</sup> REFERIDO A SIGUIENTES LETRAS: VI., VII, VIII, XI.

13. En la Declaración de Quebec, aprobada por la Reunión Ministerial convocada en la ciudad de Quebec, Canadá, y luego suscrita oficialmente por la Conferencia de la FAO, los Miembros recordaron cada uno de los elementos específicos del Preámbulo y reafirmaron su apoyo político a la Organización para llevar a cabo "su misión de contribuir a la construcción de un mundo en el que todas las personas puedan vivir con dignidad y con la garantía de una seguridad alimentaria" (y al mismo tiempo renovaron el compromiso de fomentar el bienestar general intensificando la acción individual y colectiva hacia la consecución de los objetivos de la organización.)

#### **La Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación - un nuevo punto de referencia**

16. En el mismo período de sesiones de 1995 en el que aprobó la Declaración de Quebec, la Conferencia de la FAO decidió convocar la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. La Cumbre, que tuvo lugar un año más tarde, fue la primera reunión mundial al más alto nivel político que se centró exclusivamente en la seguridad alimentaria, y al aprobar la Declaración de Roma sobre la Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial y el Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación renovó el compromiso de la comunidad internacional [de garantizar] ("alcanzar la seguridad alimentaria para las generaciones presentes y futuras") [alimentos para todos.] La Declaración enuncia la meta última y el objetivo inmediato: "Prometemos consagrar nuestra voluntad política y nuestra dedicación común y nacional a conseguir la seguridad alimentaria para todos y a realizar un esfuerzo constante para erradicar el hambre de todos los países, con el objetivo inmediato de reducir el número de personas desnutridas a la mitad de su nivel actual no más tarde del año 2015."

17. Un elemento común a todas las declaraciones y planes de acción aprobados por las conferencias mundiales es el relativo a la responsabilidad nacional y a la solidaridad internacional. Las metas establecidas sólo pueden alcanzarlas los Estados, pero se hace un llamamiento (a los gobiernos a cooperar activamente entre sí y con las organizaciones del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, las instituciones financieras, las organizaciones intergubernamentales y no gubernamentales y los sectores público y privado en programas encaminados a alcanzar la seguridad alimentaria para todos) [las instituciones multilaterales para que, cada una con arreglo a su mandato y dentro de su esfera de competencia, les presten asistencia y apoyo en ese empeño.]

<sup>1</sup> Párrafo 11 ( Información suplementaria C99/12-Sup.1)

<sup>2</sup> Se estima necesario modificar el documento C99/12.Sup.1. que contiene información suplementaria en lo relativo a los antecedentes complementarios de este párrafo.

18. Por consiguiente, la FAO debe cumplir la importante función de prestar asistencia a los países para aplicar las disposiciones del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación que corresponden a la esfera de su mandato, y a través de su Comité de Seguridad alimentaria Mundial (CSA) de [supervisar] (vigilar) por la aplicación nacional, subregional, regional e internacional del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre mundial sobre la Alimentación”. [los progresos realizados en la consecución de los objetivos de la Cumbre]. El Plan de Acción es, pues, fundamental (para orientar las acciones de la FAO en el ámbito de la seguridad alimentaria) [definir los objetivos de la FAO]. <sup>3</sup>

## Recuadro 2. Valores

Se sugiere o desplazarlo a los anexos, puesto que en nada contribuye al ME. Más bien se trataría de cuestiones ligadas a la gestión de la organización.

### Misión

23. En cumplimiento de los fines para los que se estableció la Organización (Preámbulo de la Constitución de la FAO) y respetando plenamente su mandato (Artículo 1 de la Constitución), la misión de la FAO es (asistir a los países en la construcción de) [contribuir a construir para las generaciones presentes y futuras] un mundo en el que [impere la seguridad alimentaria] (“todas las personas tengan en todo momento acceso físico y económico a suficientes alimentos inocuos y nutritivos para satisfacer sus necesidades alimenticias y sus preferencias en cuanto a los alimentos a fin de llevar una vida activa y sana”)

24. Durante los próximos 15 años (la FAO junto a la acción individual y colectiva de sus Estados Miembros) ayudará a sus Miembros a<sup>4</sup>:

(Contribuir a la erradicación de) [reducir] la inseguridad alimentaria y la pobreza rural;

(Promover, elaborar y reforzar) [garantizar un] marco(s) reglamentarios y de políticas [normativo y reglamentario favorable] para la alimentación y la agricultura, la pesca y la silvicultura [actividad forestal];

Conseguir aumentos [garantizar incrementos] sostenibles del suministro y la disponibilidad de alimentos (y otros productos de los sectores agrícolas, ganadero, pesquero y forestal);

(Apoyar la conservación, la mejora y la utilización sostenible de los) [conservar y fortalecer la base] de recursos naturales (para la alimentación y la agricultura);

(Mejorar la adopción de decisiones mediante el suministro de información y evaluaciones, y fomentar la gestión de conocimientos para la alimentación y la agricultura) [y generar conocimientos sobre la alimentación y la agricultura, la pesca y la actividad forestal.]

### Visión

25. La visión de lo que constituye el éxito de la Organización radica en *(promover el trabajo colectivo e individual de sus Estados Miembros en procura de una evolución positiva, a nivel nacional e internacional, del bienestar general de los habitantes del planeta. El Preámbulo constituye el deseo e interés fundamental expresadas por los Miembros, en participar en la materialización de los fines definidos para la Organización. Asimismo, forman parte del éxito de la organización ejecutar eficientemente las demás tareas y responsabilidades que colectivamente*

<sup>3</sup> Comentario: como se relaciona esta afirmación con lo que aparece en el párrafo 36 y 67 del C99/12 –Sup.1 en el que se afirma que “Muchas de las medidas específicas solicitadas por el Plan de Acción de la Cumbre quedan fuera del mandato y la competencia de la organización, y la definición de objetivos, cuya consecución satisfactoria depende casi totalmente de otros, habría significado que el impacto de las propias acciones de la FAO podría haber quedado demasiado diluido para poder medirla”

<sup>4</sup> En realidad representan las estrategias A,B,C,D, y E definidas en el Marco estratégico para atender las necesidades y desafíos de los Estados Miembros y la comunidad internacional.

los Estados Miembros han definido para la Organización en diversos Acuerdos y Conferencias internacionales,) [responder siempre a los ideales y necesidades de los Miembros y en ser reconocida por su función de dirección y por su cooperación para ayudar a construir un mundo en el que impere la seguridad alimentaria<sup>5</sup>]

## II. ESTRATEGIAS PARA TODA LA ORGANIZACIÓN

29. Ambos conjuntos de estrategias exigen un examen de los medios de acción de que dispone la Organización. Estos medios pueden agruparse en general en actividades (*'informativas'*)<sup>6</sup>, "normativas", "operacionales" y (*principalmente la asistencia técnica*). [incluida la cooperación técnica]. Sin embargo, con frecuencia no existe una delimitación rígida entre ellas, dadas las sinergias inherentes a un programa multidisciplinario que se ejecuta a través de una estructura descentralizada.

30. (El marco Estratégico será el punto de partida para la formulación del Programa Ordinario de la organización y la base futura para la definición)

[Puesto que el Programa Ordinario de la FAO es la base y el punto de partida para la formulación del Marco Estratégico, las estrategias para atender las necesidades de los Miembros tienen su raíz en las actividades normativas]. [No obstante, entrañarán también actividades operacionales] de las actividades, informativas, normativas y operacionales para atender las necesidades de los Estados miembros, previstos en la constitución de la FAO, y otorgando la misma importancia a cada una de ellas. siempre que los miembros las soliciten, que se disponga de los recursos humanos y financieros necesarios [y que constituyan en la práctica prolongaciones de la labor normativa] y benefician directamente a los Estados Miembros<sup>7</sup>.

31. El Programa Ordinario seguirá realizando [ciertas aportaciones] aportes decisivos a las actividades operacionales, en particular mediante el [Programa Especial para la Seguridad Alimentaria (PESA)] el Programa de Cooperación Técnica (PCT) y (el Programa Especial para la Seguridad Alimentaria (PESA). Las actividades de cooperación técnica básica, deberán ser financiadas a través del presupuesto ordinario de la Organización e incrementadas a través de fondos extrapresupuestarios). [Sin embargo, la mayor parte de los fondos habrán de proceder, como hasta ahora, de fuentes extrapresupuestarias. En las estrategias para afrontar cuestiones intersectoriales se examinan las medidas destinadas a mejorar la eficacia de las actividades de cooperación técnica de la Organización y a movilizar recursos para ellas.]

## ESTRATEGIAS PARA ATENDER LAS NECESIDADES DE LOS MIEMBROS

32.

- la asociación, tanto entre dependencias de la FAO -en la Sede y en las oficinas descentralizadas- como con los gobiernos, otras organizaciones (del sistema de las Naciones Unidas y ajenas a él) y la sociedad civil (*y en especial con la población objetivo*).

33. La finalidad de estas estrategias para toda la Organización es orientar y dirigir con más precisión la labor de la Organización al servicio de sus miembros, centrándose en las esferas (de su competencia) [en las que tiene ventajas comparativas]. La definición de los objetivos estratégicos se basa en el supuesto de que su consecución dependerá tanto de la acción de los Estados Miembros como de la acción de la FAO. [Aunque] El Marco Estratégico [no tiene

<sup>5</sup> .En este contexto es importante recordar como define la seguridad alimentaria la CMA: Existe seguridad alimentaria cuando todas las personas tengan en todo momento acceso físico y económico a suficientes alimentos inocuos y nutritivos para satisfacer sus necesidades alimenticias y sus preferencias en cuanto a los alimentos a fin de llevar una vida activa y sana

<sup>6</sup> Esta en armonía con la estrategia E que se refiere al suministro de información.

<sup>7</sup> Considerar el párrafo 35 del C99/12 inf.1. que explica precisamente lo contrario de lo que en este párrafo se está haciendo.

efectos] debe orientar el uso eficiente y eficaz de los recursos, la cuantía y el tipo de (estos) [los recursos disponibles] determinarán en gran medida (su) [el] éxito.]

A. Contribuir a la erradicación de la inseguridad alimentaria y de la pobreza rural

35. Si se quiere alcanzar la meta mundial establecida por la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, habrán de realizarse esfuerzos especiales por y en favor de (las regiones en desarrollo) [los países] donde mayores son los problemas. En general se trata de (poblaciones muy pobres) [países caracterizados por una pobreza muy extendida], principalmente en las zonas rurales, (con) [un] bajo crecimiento de la producción de alimentos per cápita, una disponibilidad baja y variable de alimentos per cápita y un acceso desigual a los alimentos disponibles. (También se deberían realizar esfuerzos en los) [El grupo comprende también a los] países que son vulnerables a las catástrofes naturales y a las crisis humanitarias, las cuales son causas importantes de la inseguridad alimentaria, o que padecen sus efectos.

36. Esta estrategia para toda la Organización aborda los factores fundamentales que contribuyen a ciertas tendencias preocupantes en las condiciones externas: persistencia de la pobreza, ampliación de la disparidad entre ricos y pobres, desigualdad en el acceso a los beneficios del progreso económico y tecnológico y riesgo continuo de emergencias complejas y relacionadas con catástrofes. Los medios de acción normativos comprenderán la determinación y difusión de instrumentos de apoyo a la formulación de políticas y la adopción de decisiones, directrices e información sobre prácticas idóneas, y creación de capacidad para los sectores público y privado. En su labor de cooperación técnica con los Estados Miembros, la FAO se centrará en actividades [que sean a la vez urgentes y adecuadas] (propias de) [teniendo en cuenta] su mandato [y sus ventajas comparativas]. [Por ejemplo, cabe prever que el apoyo a la coordinación de la ayuda y la planificación de la rehabilitación en el sector agrícola adquirirá creciente importancia en la respuesta a situaciones de urgencia.]

A.1 Medios de subsistencia sostenibles en las zonas rurales y acceso más equitativo a los recursos

39. Entre los componentes de la estrategia se incluyen los siguientes:

- mejora de las oportunidades que tiene a su disposición la población rural pobre para reforzar, diversificar y mantener sus medios de subsistencia aprovechando las posibles sinergias entre agricultura, pesca, silvicultura y ganadería, inclusive mediante actividades anteriores y posteriores a la producción que generen ingresos [(por ejemplo a través del PESA)];

(i)incluir también la cooperación técnica).

A.2 Acceso de los grupos vulnerables y desfavorecidos a alimentos suficientes, inocuos y nutricionalmente adecuados

42. Aunque teóricamente la erradicación de la pobreza debería traducirse en seguridad alimentaria para todos, hay razones imperiosas para centrarse de manera directa e inmediata en la lucha contra la desnutrición y la malnutrición. Una ingestión insuficiente de alimentos que persiste en el tiempo plantea una grave amenaza para la salud, impide un crecimiento y un desarrollo normal en los niños, (y en las madres gestantes y lactantes), reduce la capacidad mental y disminuye la productividad de los adultos aptos para el trabajo, contribuyendo con ello de manera significativa a las condiciones que impiden a las personas salir de la pobreza. Para alcanzar las metas de la CMA será necesario que los países adopten medidas especiales, dirigidas a conseguir y mantener mejoras nutricionales para los grupos vulnerables, entre ellos la población pobre, los niños menores de cinco años, las madres gestantes y lactantes y las poblaciones indígenas, [la población pobre y socialmente desfavorecida]. Si no se hace esto, amplios sectores de la población estarán toda su vida insuficientemente alimentados y no serán capaces de contribuir al proceso de desarrollo ni de beneficiarse plenamente de él.

44. Entre los componentes de la estrategia se incluyen los siguientes:

- fomento de la incorporación de objetivos y consideraciones nutricionales en las políticas y planes nacionales y sectoriales;



- asistencia para establecer sistemas nacionales de información y cartografía sobre la inseguridad alimentaria y la vulnerabilidad que faciliten la formulación y aplicación de programas bien orientados para aliviar la inseguridad alimentaria [crónica y transitoria] (*especialmente de las niñas, niños y mujeres, así como también de ancianos o discapacitados, pues frecuentemente se ven abandonados y por ende se encuentran en situación de inseguridad alimentaria*).

realización de actividades conceptuales y metodológicas relacionadas con políticas y programas para establecer una red de seguridad social, con el fin de asegurarse de que propician la satisfacción de las necesidades nutricionales mínimas de los grupos vulnerables y desfavorecidos;

- fomento de la acción directa para mejorar la seguridad alimentaria y la nutrición de los hogares, inclusive mediante enfoques comunitarios y basados en los alimentos, para impulsar la participación de la población (*particularmente de las mujeres*) y el consumo de alimentos tradicionales o insuficientemente utilizados que añaden valor nutricional al régimen alimenticio (*así como la formulación de políticas y programas para promover la distribución equitativa de los alimentos en el hogar*); y

- apoyo a programas para mejorar la calidad de los suministros alimentarios disponibles y aumentar al máximo los beneficios nutricionales derivados de ellos, mediante una manipulación adecuada (desde el punto de vista de la higiene y la inocuidad) y la conservación y preparación en los hogares y las comunidades y en el sector comercial no estructurado (alimentos callejeros).

46. El Grupo de Trabajo Interinstitucional de sistemas de información y cartografía sobre la inseguridad alimentaria y la vulnerabilidad (SICIAV) reúne a las organizaciones de las Naciones Unidas, organismos bilaterales y ONG internacionales más preocupados por los diversos aspectos de las cuestiones que abarca el SICIAV. El Subcomité de Nutrición del CAC, en el que participa la FAO, constituye el marco natural para el establecimiento de una serie constructiva de relaciones de colaboración, en particular para promover el seguimiento de la Conferencia Internacional sobre Nutrición (CIN). Existen acuerdos de colaboración con el FIDA sobre erradicación de la pobreza rural y con el PMA sobre programas de asistencia alimentaria que complementan los esfuerzos de desarrollo a más largo plazo. Dentro de esta estrategia existe la posibilidad de seguir intensificando la cooperación y colaboración entre las organizaciones con sede en Roma que se ocupan de la alimentación. Teniendo en cuenta que la desnutrición es también con frecuencia (*causa y*) el resultado de enfermedades, son fundamentales las asociaciones con la OMS y el UNICEF. Se realizarán esfuerzos para alentar a otros organismos de las Naciones Unidas, así como instituciones financieras internacionales (IFI), entidades académicas y de investigación, asociaciones parlamentarias, ONG y elementos comprometidos del sector privado a que se sumen a programas dirigidos a grupos específicos. (*En este contexto se debe fortalecer la asociación con la mujer en su calidad de agente generador de desarrollo, productora de bienes y servicios y consolidación familiar*).

49. Entre los componentes de la estrategia se incluyen los siguientes:

- fortalecimiento de la preparación para catástrofes y de la capacidad para atenuar los efectos de las emergencias que afectan a la seguridad alimentaria y a la capacidad productiva de la población rural;

- pronóstico y alerta de condiciones desfavorables en los sectores alimentario y agrícola y de emergencias alimentarias inminentes, incluida la vigilancia de plagas y enfermedades de los animales y las plantas;

- evaluación de las necesidades y formulación y aplicación de programas de socorro y rehabilitación agrícolas, así como formulación de políticas y marcos de inversión que favorezcan la transición del socorro de emergencia a la reconstrucción y el desarrollo en los sectores alimentario y agrícola (*en los que prevalezca la eficacia y el reparto equitativo de los costos y beneficios tomando en cuenta el papel de la mujer, que en muchas ocasiones se encuentran en desventaja por las circunstancias que la rodean y las labores que realiza frente al hombre*); y

• fortalecimiento de la capacidad y de los mecanismos locales para hacer frente a la situación orientando la elección de prácticas y tecnologías agrícolas y de servicios de apoyo a la agricultura de manera que se reduzca la vulnerabilidad y se aumente la capacidad de recuperación.

50. [La ventaja comparativa de la FAO en materia de asistencia humanitaria deriva directamente de los conocimientos técnicos y prácticos y de la experiencia que ha acumulado en su calidad de organismo técnico. La Organización ha demostrado su capacidad técnica para vigilar los recursos naturales y facilitar, junto con otros organismos, la labor internacional de pronóstico, prevención y atenuación de calamidades naturales.] Dentro del sistema de las Naciones Unidas desempeña un liderazgo reconocido en relación con la alerta de situaciones de escasez de alimentos mediante el Sistema Mundial de Información y Alerta (SMIA), así como la prevención de emergencias de plagas y enfermedades transfronterizas de los animales y las plantas (EMPRES), incluida la lucha contra la langosta y otras plagas migratorias. Posee los conocimientos técnicos necesarios para evaluar las necesidades de socorro y proporcionar asistencia con miras a la pronta recuperación de la capacidad de producción alimentaria y agrícola, de vital importancia para los países afectados donde el sector agrícola es predominante. (Por consiguiente puede brindar apoyo a instituciones y programas nacionales; participar en el análisis de situaciones para preparar respuestas oportunas a las necesidades de los países y formular medidas de emergencias conjuntamente con ellos.) [tomar la iniciativa en los preparativos con respecto a determinadas opciones de recuperación y desarrollo del sector rural y la determinación de proyectos prioritarios de inversión. Al centrarse simultáneamente en la seguridad alimentaria de los hogares y el bienestar nutricional de la población afectada, la FAO está en condiciones de aplicar un criterio global a la recuperación y la rehabilitación.]

B.1 Instrumentos internacionales relacionados con la alimentación, la agricultura, la pesca y la silvicultura<sup>8</sup>, y con la producción, utilización sin riesgo e intercambio equitativo de productos agrícolas, pesqueros y forestales

54. Es necesario seguir desarrollando el actual marco normativo y reglamentario internacional para la alimentación, la agricultura, la pesca y la silvicultura, dado que es una condición previa importante para conseguir la seguridad alimentaria para todos. Este marco facilitará la conservación, la ordenación racional y la utilización sostenible de los recursos naturales, contribuirá a [garantizar] un[os] (creciente) suministro[s] de alimentos [suficientes e] inocuos, [y] (facilitando el ) [promoverá políticas de] comercio alimentario y agrícola [y de comercio en general] que contribuya[n] a la seguridad alimentaria mediante un sistema de comercio mundial justo y orientado al mercado.

59. Se prevé que los gobiernos seguirán retirándose de las funciones productivas en favor del suministro de bienes y servicios públicos y el establecimiento de un marco propicio al crecimiento económico sostenible y la mitigación de la pobreza. La competencia por los recursos naturales, unida a la privatización y globalización en aumento, planteará exigencias cada vez mayores a las funciones reglamentarias del Estado. Existe pues una necesidad creciente de marcos reglamentarios y de políticas nacionales que respondan a las necesidades internas y sean compatibles con el marco reglamentario y de políticas internacional.

63. (Si bien los marcos reglamentarios y de políticas nacionales son de potestad de los gobiernos la FAO puede asistirlos en su elaboración y aplicación) [Los asociados naturales de la Organización en lo que concierne a marcos reglamentarios y de políticas nacionales son los gobiernos]. La FAO mantiene también un diálogo con la sociedad civil y el sector privado sobre estas cuestiones, y continuará haciéndolo. Se seguirá impulsando la cooperación con la Unión Interparlamentaria. Se mantendrán asociaciones con organizaciones técnicas y comerciales sobre el contenido técnico de la asistencia proporcionada. El ámbito de esta asistencia comprende desde los acuerdos en los que las organizaciones proporcionan apoyo técnico a las actividades de asistencia de la FAO, por ejemplo en el caso de la colaboración con la OMS sobre inocuidad de los alimentos y otros aspectos sanitarios o con el PNUMA sobre asuntos ambientales, hasta

<sup>8</sup> Solicitar aclaración sobre el contenido del concepto a la Secretaría.

esferas en las que la FAO desempeña una función de apoyo a actividades realizadas por otras organizaciones, como por ejemplo la OMC en relación con el Acuerdo sobre la Aplicación de Medidas Sanitarias y Fitosanitarias. La FAO [tratará también de] (*procurará*) movilizar fondos de donantes para sufragar actividades de los gobiernos en estos ámbitos.

65. Los objetivos fundamentales de esta estrategia para toda la Organización son los siguientes: mejorar el entorno normativo y el marco institucional y abordar las limitaciones a la gestión de sistemas, teniendo en cuenta los cambios en la función del Estado y la importancia de la iniciativa privada; y apoyar la transferencia y aplicación de tecnologías apropiadas que tengan como finalidad la intensificación sostenible de los sistemas de producción. Para ofrecer a los países opciones apropiadas en materia de políticas y aumentar su capacidad para elegir entre ellas y aplicarlas, la FAO elaborará, (*en conjunto con los Estados miembros*) y difundirá instrumentos normativos [(directrices, compendios de "prácticas idóneas", etc.)], proporcionará asesoramiento y asistencia técnicos y sobre políticas y promoverá la creación de capacidad. Actuará como sintetizador y difusor de información sobre tecnologías, criterios e instrumentos de apoyo a la adopción de decisiones, así como de promotor de soluciones [especialmente satisfactorias].

66. (*Muchas veces*) las imperfecciones del mercado, las deficiencias de las instituciones de apoyo o un entorno de políticas desfavorable limitan a menudo la eficiencia de los sistemas de producción, elaboración y comercialización para generar y ofrecer a los consumidores un suministro cuantitativo y cualitativamente apropiado de productos agrícolas, pesqueros y forestales. Estos factores obstaculizan la movilización de recursos para la agricultura y el desarrollo rural -desalentando en particular la inversión en bienes y servicios productivos- e impiden la adopción de tecnologías y prácticas apropiadas. [También hacen que sea más difícil para los sistemas adaptarse a las nuevas circunstancias, como por ejemplo la necesidad de abastecer a una población urbana en aumento.]

#### Componentes de la estrategia

69. Gracias a su competencia en la agricultura, la silvicultura y la pesca (políticas, recursos, producción, elaboración y comercialización), la FAO es una fuente importante de asesoramiento independiente sobre políticas en estos sectores. Desempeña una función rectora en diversas iniciativas internacionales relacionadas con la ordenación forestal y pesquera sostenible. Ha elaborado y experimentado métodos de apoyo participativos y sensibles a la paridad entre hombres y mujeres para formular políticas agrícolas equitativas y mejorar los sistemas de extensión. En lo que concierne a los sistemas de apoyo a la producción y la posproducción, realiza una labor normativa reconocida, a menudo en asociación con organismos donantes, y se encuentra por tanto en una excelente posición para asesorar sobre políticas y medidas institucionales en este ámbito. Hay constancia de sus logros en la movilización de recursos para la inversión agrícola y rural y posee una amplia experiencia en lo que respecta a la ayuda para preparar planes y proyectos de inversión (por ejemplo para el fomento y utilización de tierras y agua) con miras a una asignación óptima de los recursos. [También ocupa una posición idónea para asesorar sobre posibles compensaciones y sinergias entre las funciones productivas y de otra índole de la agricultura y el aprovechamiento de la tierra]. Dentro del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, es el coordinador sectorial del Capítulo 14 (Fomento de la agricultura y del desarrollo rural sostenibles) del Programa 21.

73. Entre los componentes de la estrategia se incluyen los siguientes:

- fomento de la producción y elaboración sostenibles de productos agrícolas, pecuarios, pesqueros y forestales [madereros y no madereros], prestando especial atención a la reducción de las diferencias entre los resultados de las investigaciones y la productividad efectiva [, en particular mediante iniciativas fundamentales en el contexto del PESA y mecanismos de seguimiento conexos].

76. El bienestar de las generaciones presentes y futuras se ve amenazado, especialmente en los países en desarrollo, por la degradación de la tierra, la escasez de agua y su contaminación y salinización, la destrucción de bosques, la explotación excesiva de los recursos marinos del

mundo, el aumento de las emisiones de gases de invernadero y la pérdida de recursos genéticos y de diversidad biológica. Los ecosistemas frágiles, en particular, corren especial peligro. El desafío consiste en establecer un equilibrio apropiado entre la conservación y la utilización sostenible de los recursos naturales. [Esto implica la adopción de políticas y medidas que contribuyan a una ordenación eficiente y socialmente deseable de la tierra, el agua y los recursos pesqueros y forestales y que, teniendo en cuenta el carácter multifuncional de la agricultura, aumenten sus efectos positivos y reduzcan sus efectos negativos sobre el medio ambiente y los recursos naturales].

77. La FAO seguirá ayudando, *(en el ámbito de su competencia,)* a la comunidad mundial a afrontar cuestiones relativas a la ordenación y conservación de los recursos naturales mediante la aplicación del Programa 21 de la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo. Esta estrategia para toda la Organización, orientada a prestar asistencia en la aplicación práctica de las medidas necesarias, requerirá una evaluación de los recursos naturales y asesoramiento normativo y técnico a todos los niveles y en todas las disciplinas, así como un intercambio de información y conocimientos. Se elaborarán y utilizarán diversos instrumentos de apoyo a las políticas para mejorar en la mayor medida posible la adopción de decisiones, la programación y la formulación de proyectos. Estos instrumentos incluirán prácticas idóneas, [directrices y normas], asesoramiento sobre enfoques participativos y sensibles a la paridad entre hombres y mujeres, así como criterios e indicadores para la ordenación de los recursos naturales, inclusive en relación con los costos y beneficios económicos, sociales y ambientales de la restauración de entornos degradados.

#### D.1 Ordenación integrada de la tierra, el agua y los recursos pesqueros, forestales y genéticos

78. Con frecuencia, los programas y políticas que tienen por objeto conservar y fomentar los recursos naturales fracasan o tienen sólo un éxito parcial debido a las necesidades de desarrollo *(y de seguridad alimentaria)* que compiten por unos recursos escasos. [A medida que se intensifica la competencia por los recursos, se hace cada vez más necesario tener en cuenta las sinergias positivas entre las diversas funciones de la agricultura, así como los usos múltiples de los recursos, incluida la conservación en beneficio de las generaciones futuras.] La ordenación integrada de los recursos naturales tiene por objeto alcanzar objetivos tanto de conservación como de desarrollo, en el contexto del cambio demográfico en curso (crecimiento y urbanización, en particular).

81. Los conocimientos especializados de la FAO y su amplio ámbito disciplinario *(facilitan la comprensión)* [garantizan la incorporación] de aspectos económicos, sociales, jurídicos e institucionales en [los planteamientos de] la ordenación de recursos naturales, prestando la debida atención al desarrollo rural, la paridad entre hombres y mujeres, la población y cuestiones conexas. Su alcance mundial le permite apoyar debates e intercambios a nivel normativo y operacional sobre cuestiones transfronterizas [y asuntos que interesan a muchos países]; de ese modo puede impulsar la cooperación entre las diversas partes interesadas para abordar problemas incipientes. Entre los ejemplos pueden citarse el Plan de Acción Mundial de Leipzig para la conservación y la utilización sostenible de los recursos fitogenéticos para la alimentación y la agricultura, el Servicio Mundial de Manejo Integrado de Plagas, la Iniciativa sobre Fertilidad de Suelos y la Alianza Mundial en favor del Agua. [Además, la cooperación de la FAO con ministerios de planificación, agricultura, silvicultura, pesca, agua y medio ambiente, y la experiencia con respecto a la elaboración y fomento de enfoques participativos para la ordenación comunitaria de recursos naturales contribuyen a reforzar los necesarios vínculos intersectoriales que son fundamentales para el éxito en la aplicación de enfoques integrados de ordenación de los recursos naturales]. Dentro del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, la FAO actúa como coordinador sectorial para la aplicación del Capítulo 10 del Programa 21 (Enfoque integrado de la planificación y la ordenación de los recursos de tierras) y del Capítulo 11 (Lucha contra la deforestación) y es un asociado importante en lo que respecta a otros capítulos pertinentes.

#### D.2 Conservación, rehabilitación y desarrollo de los entornos expuestos a mayores riesgos

84. La vigilancia adecuada de los ecosistemas frágiles y la determinación de las tendencias y amenazas con que se enfrentan estos sistemas son problemas importantes que es necesario abordar. Especialmente en los países en desarrollo, hay también una necesidad acuciante de evaluar y tener en cuenta los costos económicos, sociales y ambientales de la ordenación [y fomento de esos ecosistemas].

#### Ventajas comparativas y asociaciones

86. La FAO está en una posición favorable para abordar las preocupaciones relacionadas con la conservación y rehabilitación desde una perspectiva multidisciplinaria y para ayudar a las instituciones y organizaciones de los sectores público y privado y de la sociedad civil en los Estados Miembros a adoptar soluciones prácticas para los ecosistemas frágiles. Como resultado de su capacidad institucional y de sus conocimientos técnicos en relación con la vigilancia de los recursos naturales, la FAO puede garantizar también la compatibilidad de los datos sobre recursos naturales con otros datos alimentarios y agrícolas conexos. La FAO puede valerse también, al asesorar sobre medidas prácticas para afrontar entornos expuestos a riesgos, de su función institucional como depositario de diversos convenios internacionales, [como por ejemplo el Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable, así como del hecho de que es el coordinador sectorial o uno de los principales asociados en la aplicación de los capítulos del Programa 21 relacionados con los ecosistemas frágiles (por ejemplo deforestación, montañas y tierras áridas).] Dentro del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, desempeña una función rectora en lo que concierne a los criterios e indicadores para la ordenación forestal sostenible.

90. Los usuarios de información de la FAO (sus miembros, la comunidad internacional y el público en general) seguirán necesitando una información pertinente y oportuna en apoyo de la adopción de decisiones y la formulación de políticas. Por consiguiente es fundamental mantener y mejorar el alcance, la cantidad, la utilidad, la oportunidad y la accesibilidad de la información recogida y difundida "siendo para ello necesario presentar datos desagregados por sexo, lo que contribuirá a visualizar el desarrollo de manera integral y a observar el avance que se tenga en la seguridad alimentaria y en el programa de la comunidad internacional, conforme a los hombres y las mujeres." La revolución de las comunicaciones crea un entorno externo cada vez más consciente de la calidad, que exige mayor atención para mejorar los productos informativos y/o prevenir su deterioro.

92. Entre los componentes de la estrategia se incluyen los siguientes:

- desarrollo continuo de WAICENT como principal servicio internacional de información que constituye el marco para la armonización y difusión de datos relacionados con el ámbito de competencia de la FAO. (Tomando en consideración las recomendaciones de la plataforma de acción de beijing para realizar estudios y establecer mecanismos que permitan cuantificar la contribución y el valor económico del trabajo no remunerado de las mujeres, especialmente en las tareas domésticas, su participación en la agricultura y la alimentación y en la crianza de los hijos, e incorporar ese aporte a las cuentas nacionales).

99. La labor analítica de la FAO depende de las aportaciones de una gran variedad de fuentes. Por consiguiente, las asociaciones externas son fundamentales para llevar a cabo evaluaciones y análisis fiables y globales. La FAO seguirá fortaleciendo los vínculos y constituyendo alianzas con asociados nacionales e internacionales, entre ellos IFI, otras organizaciones de las Naciones Unidas, el GCIAI y sistemas nacionales de investigación, instituciones académicas y de investigación y otros centros de excelencia, organismos de desarrollo, (comisiones e instituciones regionales y subregionales) y organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Estas asociaciones incluirán exámenes colegiados, evaluaciones y análisis conjuntos, elaboración y aplicación de instrumentos y métodos comunes, inclusive la construcción de modelos y el análisis de hipótesis, y el establecimiento de redes para obtener los mejores datos e información posibles con el fin de validar resultados y conclusiones.

106. Un período de restricción<sup>9</sup> de las corrientes de AOD y de disminución de los recursos para las organizaciones multilaterales ha ido acompañado de un crecimiento del número de instituciones que trabajan en sectores relacionados con el mandato de la FAO. Por consiguiente, la Organización se enfrenta con el desafío de mantener y desarrollar ulteriormente su función como fuente preeminente y autorizada de información, asesoramiento y asistencia en sus esferas de competencia.

108. Sin embargo, *(mientras no se dé cumplimiento a los compromisos y responsabilidades internacionales asumidas por los Estados Miembros, enteren las cuotas impagas y se aumenten los aportes extrapresupuestarios)* es esencial determinar ciertas esferas en las que la FAO espera poder mantener su liderazgo técnico y garantizar las medidas necesarias para seguir aumentando su capacidad de excelencia en ellas. [Entre los criterios propuestos para elegir dichas esferas cabe señalar los siguientes: que tengan repercusiones transfronterizas y el potencial para lograr acuerdos que apoyen acciones internacionales, que exista una clara y creciente demanda de trabajo al respecto y que la FAO disponga de una ventaja comparativa para ocuparse de ellas, debido a su carácter y capacidad particulares]. Las medidas para reforzar la labor en estas esferas incluirían también el establecimiento de otras asociaciones, pero se prestaría especial atención a conservar y realzar la posición de la Organización como fuente reconocida de información y asesoramiento autorizados a los Miembros, la comunidad internacional y el público en general.

114. La FAO es, ante todo, *(una agencia intergubernamental especializada)* [un] miembro de la familia de organizaciones de las Naciones Unidas, y es necesario ampliar y fortalecer las asociaciones que derivan de esta condición y que constituyen una importante ventaja comparativa, teniendo plenamente en cuenta el proceso de reforma en curso en las Naciones Unidas. También es necesario prestar especial atención al ulterior fortalecimiento de los vínculos, y de las posibilidades de sinergia, entre las organizaciones con sede en Roma, a saber la FAO, el PMA, el FIDA y el IIRF. Esta cooperación reforzada podría dar lugar a disposiciones, adoptadas de mutuo acuerdo, *(a fin de optimizar la coordinación e incrementar sustantivamente la sinergia con dichas organizaciones)* [sobre una alianza en favor del desarrollo agrícola].

118. En lo que concierne a la sociedad civil y las organizaciones no gubernamentales, la FAO, *(según proceda)*, habrá de:

119. En lo que concierne al sector privado, la FAO habrá de:

a. entablar un diálogo [para eliminar cualesquiera concepciones erróneas que pueda haber con respecto a una institución como la FAO, y llegar también a una clara comprensión de los intereses] *(con el sector privado)* agroindustrial[es] que *(facilite acciones conjuntas en la lucha contra el hambre y la malnutrición)* y *(que sea)* [son] compatible[s] con los objetivos de la FAO; b. establecer dentro de la FAO una política y práctica para toda la Organización con respecto a los asociados del sector privado, a fin de reforzar la cooperación sin poner en peligro la independencia *(financiera y política)* de la FAO; c. estudiar con *(los gobiernos, la forma como)* el sector privado [la forma en que] puede[n] (orientar) [encauzarse] las inversiones en nueva(s) tecnología(s) para que (estas) (brinden) [reporten] mayores beneficios a los países en desarrollo; d. lograr el apoyo del sector privado para programas de la FAO, incluidos tanto los fondos obtenidos de patrocinadores como los ingresos derivados de los servicios que presta la FAO al sector privado, así como coaliciones y proyectos bilaterales con el sector privado; e. *(promover)* [desempeñar el papel de "intermediario imparcial" para aumentar] las inversiones del sector privado en la agricultura; y f. esforzarse en aumentar la capacidad del sector privado en los países en desarrollo, especialmente para que presten servicios eficaces de suministro de insumos, comercialización, elaboración y financiación.

<sup>9</sup> Sólo cuatro de los Estados miembros que pertenecen al Comité de Asistencia para el Desarrollo de la OECD dan cumplimiento a la recomendación realizada en 1970 por las Naciones Unidas de efectuar un aporte equivalente al 0,7% del PGB como un adecuado nivel para la ayuda oficial para el desarrollo. Estos Estados son , Dinamarca, Noruega, Países Bajos y Suecia. (Shaping the 21 st century: The Contribution of Development Co-operation, pag. 16. OECD.)

126. La capacidad de la FAO para desempeñar su misión está condicionada por la reducción de los recursos disponibles, tanto de fondos esenciales para el Programa Ordinario como de contribuciones extrapresupuestarias para la cooperación técnica. *(Si bien )* No es realista prever un aumento de la cuantía de la asistencia oficial para el desarrollo (AOD) de carácter multilateral en los próximos años, teniendo en cuenta las actuales tendencias en los países donantes, *(se deben efectuar esfuerzos adicionales que permita disponer de los recursos necesarios para dar cumplimiento al mandato de la FAO)* . Además, las necesidades crecientes de asistencia para emergencias y las necesidades previstas en relación con actividades de reconstrucción y rehabilitación se cubrirán con toda probabilidad a expensas de los recursos disponibles para el desarrollo a largo plazo. [Los recursos limitados que probablemente se pondrán a disposición de la FAO para el desarrollo agrícola habrán de utilizarse de acuerdo con unas prioridades cuidadosamente establecidas.] La finalidad será aumentar la sinergia entre las actividades normativas y operacionales y potenciar la doble función del programa de campo consistente, por una parte, en traducir en acciones prácticas los conceptos y resultados obtenidos a través de actividades normativas y, por otra parte, enriquecer la labor normativa mediante el suministro de información basada en la experiencia práctica.

127. Es necesario hacer hincapié en el incremento de los recursos totales destinados a los principales programas que ha adoptado la Organización y no necesariamente en la cuantía de los recursos que administra la FAO. A este respecto, un aspecto fundamental será la movilización de recursos internos y externos, públicos y privados, para el sector agrícola y rural, con inclusión de la silvicultura y la pesca. La FAO puede contribuir a la consecución de este objetivo fundamental prestando asistencia a los gobiernos en la formulación de estrategias nacionales de desarrollo que creen un entorno de políticas favorable a la participación e inversión del sector privado. Análogamente, puede ayudar a los Miembros a preparar programas y proyectos de inversión, con miras a mejorar en la mayor medida posible la asignación de recursos, para responder mejor a las metas prioritarias, [prestando la debida atención a la capacidad nacional de absorción]. La FAO debe asociar en este empeño a todas las partes interesadas a nivel nacional e internacional, de manera que se asegure la propiedad, el compromiso y un seguimiento apropiado mediante la financiación de actividades de gran prioridad por las instituciones financieras internacionales (IFI) y los principales donantes multilaterales.

#### Estrategia

128. La estrategia propuesta tiene por objeto aumentar el efecto multiplicador de los recursos en apoyo de las funciones *(previstas en el mandato de la)* [asignadas a la] FAO mediante una gestión eficiente y eficaz de los programas; la orientación efectiva de su labor hacia las esferas *(que sus Estados miembros definan consensualmente como)* prioritarias; y la consolidación, diversificación y ampliación de las fuentes de financiación. La FAO aprovechará sus oficinas descentralizadas para asegurar un enlace apropiado con las estructuras descentralizadas de adopción de decisiones de muchos donantes.

142. Aunque el Marco Estratégico tiene un horizonte cronológico de 10 a 15 años, se reconoce que podría ser necesario actualizarlo periódicamente, ya sea debido a acontecimientos importantes en la esfera internacional (por ejemplo, conferencias internacionales de primer orden, etc.) o a cambios en el entorno interno y externo. A este respecto, se considera que el horizonte cronológico de las estrategias para abordar cuestiones intersectoriales de toda la Organización es por lo general más breve que el de las estrategias para atender las necesidades de los Miembros. Por consiguiente, sin que estas indicaciones hayan de interpretarse con excesiva rigidez, *(es)* [podría ser] oportuno realizar una revisión cada seis años [aproximadamente] *(o cuando la revisión del Marco Estratégico sea incluido en la agenda de la Conferencia)* [, aunque este plazo habría de revisarse cuando se acercara la fecha.]

170. La FAO seguirá utilizando sus conocimientos técnicos multidisciplinario para promover la inversión en la alimentación y la agricultura mediante las provechosas relaciones tripartitas que mantiene con el Banco Mundial y otras instituciones financieras internacionales (IFI), así como con los propios gobiernos interesados. En la esfera del asesoramiento en materia de políticas, la

Organización debe tratar de articular su asesoramiento en el plano sectorial con la asistencia macroeconómica global que prestan esas instituciones. También aprovechará la disponibilidad de éstas para establecer una base más amplia de cooperación con el fin de apoyar programas nacionales concretos, por ejemplo sobre estadísticas agrícolas o acuicultura, como lo evidencian los nuevos memorandos de acuerdo firmados (*al mas alto nivel político*) con esas instituciones [al nivel de política más alto].

172. Varias otras organizaciones intergubernamentales (OIG), en particular de carácter regional, están interesadas en cuestiones agrícolas y puede darse el caso de que participen activamente en programas de cooperación relacionados con la alimentación y la agricultura (*en tales casos se debería tener especial cuidado de mantener el carácter neutral de la organización*).

Reconociendo plenamente las ventajas comparativas que pueden tener esas organizaciones en contextos regionales específicos, la FAO deberá seguir estudiando formas de cooperación para sacar el máximo provecho de los aspectos complementarios, en consonancia con su mandato.

#### Sociedad civil

173. La FAO deberá seguir adaptándose a los importantes cambios que están experimentando las funciones y responsabilidades respectivas del estado, el mercado y la sociedad civil. [La FAO no puede equipararse en capacidad de difusión capilar a las organizaciones de la sociedad civil, en particular las organizaciones de agricultores y consumidores y el gran número de ONG que participan activamente en la alimentación y la agricultura, hasta llegar al nivel de las propias comunidades agrícolas]. [Sin embargo,] (*En coordinación con los Estados miembros*) puede desempeñar una valiosa función catalizadora impulsando iniciativas a nivel nacional, apoyando coaliciones y fomentando el intercambio de experiencias. Por consiguiente, habrá de ampliar las asociaciones constructivas con actores no estatales, valiéndose de su amplia experiencia y su memoria institucional en actividades prácticas conjuntas, por ejemplo con organizaciones de productores rurales<sup>10</sup>.

#### CHAIRMAN

We have had a very intensive debate, and I thank you for your contributions to the debate, and I would like now to ask Ms Killingsworth and Mr Wade to answer questions raised by the delegates and make any comments.

#### Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Special Adviser on World Food Summit Follow-Up)

May I start by expressing our thanks, and these are thanks I think on behalf of all colleagues who have been working on this document for so many months, for the very many positive expressions of appreciation which we heard on the floor this morning for Version 4.0, and also for the process which has been followed to arrive at Version 4.0. We were particularly gratified at the recognition, I think general, by the Council, of the importance of the process itself at arriving at a document which could be submitted to Conference for approval, and by the dialogue and interaction which that has entailed over what, at the end of this meeting, will have been thirteen intergovernmental meetings.

There was also a great deal of appreciation for the commitment by Member Nations to the process and to what it represents for the future of the Organization. Finally, we heard some recognition of the efforts which the Secretariat has deployed to facilitate consensus among you.

I think that there was also a general view, coming out in a number of interventions this morning, that everyone would perhaps have liked to see some things in the document which they haven't seen or would like not to see some things in the document which are still there, but that generally the document represents a compromise among the many different views and perspectives which have been expressed by Member Nations during this process. The hope was expressed that the

---

<sup>10</sup> Statement inserted in the verbatim records on request.  
 Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.  
 Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.



document could be approved on the understanding that it will of course need to be reviewed at an appropriate time on the basis of experience.

Nevertheless, there are some specific issues which are still outstanding. First of all, we could mention the famous paragraphs 43 and 76, where the Secretariat's effort to present language which would be suitable for all concerned was patently unsuccessful. Here it is up to Member Nations to decide what they want to do on the sentences in question in those two paragraphs: delete, leave in or find alternative language.

A number of other suggestions were made, some in the nature of factual corrections. I believe India this morning referred to the fact that since in fact the Strategic Framework, Version 4.0, went to press, new data have been issued by the Organization on the number of hungry, which have been published in the *State of Food Insecurity in the World*. That obviously is not a problem. If you desire it, and it would seem logical for us to update that material, we can certainly do so in the final version of the Strategic Framework.

A few other corrigenda were mentioned. The delegate of Pakistan referred to paragraph 61, where the loss of a few words in processing has given the impression that the Organization might be doing things on its own. We could obviously introduce corrections to dispel that impression as well. And there may be still outstanding some problems in the various translated versions.

At the same, however, a number of in some cases fairly complex amendments were proposed this morning from the floor, which the Council does not have available to it at this point in all languages. The first is the document which has been submitted by the Latin America and Caribbean group. I haven't counted the amendments, but I will take the word of the delegate of Chile that there are some forty amendments in various paragraphs of the document, and some of them are quite extensive textual revisions or additions. Some other delegations made more or less precise suggestions for specific textual changes.

It's clear at this point in your deliberations that it would be difficult for the Council to deal with these proposals. The Conference would also have some difficulty dealing with them unless they were available in all the official languages of the Organization.

So, the Secretariat could suggest, could offer, to consolidate the various proposals for specific amendments to document C 99/12, as proposed on the floor this morning. We would refer to the document submitted by GRULAC and to the verbatims of the discussion to consolidate these amendments into a LIM document which we would have translated and made available to the Conference. This would facilitate the work of Commission II, which will begin its work on Monday of next week, and will consider among the items on its programme the Strategic Framework.

I would like to stop here and pass the floor to Mr Wade for some other points.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation)**

The first point I would like to address is what I feel is something of a misunderstanding about the structure of this document, and in particular, the way the Strategic Framework addresses technical assistance. It really is important to clarify this not because there shouldn't be amendments to the document, that's not my point. What is important is that, frankly, it would have been a rather serious failure on the part of the Secretariat if it had not taken technical assistance - that is, the third function of FAO - fully into account when it developed the Strategic Framework.

I would like to go back a step and take you back to Article 1 of the Constitution, which was referred to, in particular, by Mexico. In fact, it does have as you know the three functions of FAO being that we will organize, collect, disseminate information, is the first one. *Promote* is the key word in the second one: promote national and international action in a whole series of technical areas. And then, finally, it should also be the function of the Organization to furnish technical assistance. Now, these are the three functions, but the document is not structured to reflect the functions of the Organization. It is instead, and has been since Version 1.0, I might add, structured in the form of a series of interdisciplinary Corporate Strategies. So there are the five Corporate

Strategies and beneath them the twelve Strategic Objectives, all of which are interdisciplinary areas of action. They are not in the same dimension as functions; in fact, all three functions apply to all the five Strategies. Each of the three functions is applied in the development of the Strategy Components.

Let me demonstrate this because I think it's important. If you take A, which is the Strategy on Food Insecurity, you will see that there is an important information component under A.1 refer, for example, to paragraph 46 and FIVIMS, which is a critical part of A. You will see that in paragraphs 39 and 44 there is "... promotion to incorporate nutritional objectives in national plans and to assist countries in that regard ..." So, here you see the promotion element, the second function of FAO.

Finally, if you see in paragraph 44, for example, and I'm really giving these as examples, the last bullet deals with supporting programmes to approve the quality of and maximize the nutritional benefits derived from available food supplies, etc. It can only be handled in an effective way through technical assistance with countries at a national level. So, it implies technical assistance. A.3, continuing on A for a moment, A.3 is Emergencies. The primary action in emergencies is at the field level in the form of action, which can only be called technical assistance.

The distinguished delegate of Mexico referred to B as being normative, and I think he aligns B with the second function, which promotes national and international action. B is Regulatory and Policy Frameworks, so you can see the connection, which in a sense there is. But B also consists of the information function. For example, we publish and produce and make available and disseminate all of the food standards under *Codex*. This is a function of B, which comes into B and not into E. We promote action; that's a major part of this particular Strategy, but you will see technical assistance there as well. In paragraph 56, in the last bullet, you will see that we have reference to improving Members' capacities etc. to participate actively in negotiations relevant to international fora dealing with natural resources, etc. There we provide training, and assist Member Nations carry out this role, and again, I would argue that this falls into the classification of technical assistance. The same might be said for the last bullet on paragraph 61, still within B. Here you will see that we are proposing that the strategy components include "Developing national capacities to respond to and benefit from changes in international trade environments". So, here again we are talking about technical assistance.

I don't want to take too much time, but I will briefly go through the other three, because I think it's important to see the structural dimensions of what we have produced. Under C, if we look at paragraph 65, towards the end of the paragraph, we specifically refer in the last sentence to the fact that FAO "... will act as a synthesizer and disseminator of information on technology approaches and decision-making support tools ..." Here you see the information role coming in strongly.

Under C, as you would expect, if you also look at paragraph 68, for example in the first, second and third bullets, "we are promoting certain forms of action, certain responses to situations, and certain techniques and methodologies", all falling under the second function. But then you will also see under paragraph 68, in the fourth bullet, "helping to strengthen agricultural and rural development in support institutions" etc. etc. Again, this is technical assistance. You see the same picture in D and even in E, which most people see it as being normative. You see technical assistance coming into the fourth bullet of paragraph 92, "building capacity", and in the third paragraph of 97, "facilitating participation of countries in assessments and outlook studies".

So, what we have is a dimension consisting of the five Corporate Strategies, with a second dimension as FAO's three functions being applied across all five Corporate Strategies.

My purpose again is to explain that we have not ignored technical assistance. It is of the essence of this document that FAO be involved in both normative and field activities. We cannot do our job without being involved in both. The only issue between Members ever has been the balance between the two, not that whether we should be involved in both. The document attempts to

reflect the balance. If it hasn't done it correctly, then the text may need some amendment. But certainly please understand that technical assistance has not been ignored or forgotten.

The only other issue I would like to address is the Executive Summary. This was raised by the European Union, and also by Egypt and maybe by some others. First of all, we absolutely agree that there should be a Summary of this document. We think it's very important as a means of communicating the contents of this document. We don't expect all of our stakeholders and all of those we relate with to read quite such a substantial and solid, I may say - although, people have been very kind about its readability, it's still quite a solid document, and if we want to communicate what is in it we do need a decent Summary. We did not however want to present it at the same time as you are considering the document itself. We believed it would have brought confusion and there would have been an issue of what you were actually going to approve. But the essence of the Strategic Framework is in a lot of that detail. It is in Part 2 of the description of the five Corporate Strategies, the twelve Strategic Objectives and their Strategic Components. So it is important that this becomes the document which is approved and then the Secretariat, on the basis of what you approve and on its own responsibility, can produce a Summary. If there is every any doubt of what it means, the authoritative source is always the document that the Conference approves. So, we think that this is the best way of going about that particular task, and as soon as you approve the document, we will work very quickly on producing and publishing a Summary.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

There is a suggestion by the Secretariat, and I think that we should work on that, namely, that the Secretariat will consolidate all of the suggested amendments into a single document that will be translated and then submitted for consideration by the Conference. This will allow all Members to see precisely what the proposals are and also to have them available in their respective languages. I think that this is a very good suggestion, and I again hope that we can welcome it.

In addition, one Region has suggested that a Working Group be established. Although, others have not really reacted to that suggestion, in my view, it is not possible for Members to make a judgement about the need for such a Group without seeing the consolidated amendments proposed.

In addition, it is not logistically possible for the Council to manage a Working Group in the time remaining available, and certainly I cannot see how we, the Council, can establish a Working Group for Conference. Surely, Conference must do that. So, there are alternatives. I can propose that our Report simply note the request for a Working Group and will leave it to Conference to decide. But better still, I would like to ask the Heads of Regional Groups to consult as early as possible to determine whether they agree on the need for such a Group, and if so, try and agree on its composition. This would allow Commission II, which commences its meetings next Monday, to consider the matter first thing and if necessary establish the Working Group, so that it can review all the suggested amendments before Commission II takes up the Strategic Framework on Wednesday afternoon.

Would this approach have Council's agreement?

#### **Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Permítame sólo expresar nuestra complacencia sobre cómo usted ha resuelto guiar nuestros trabajos y precisamente esa ha sido nuestra intención. Puede ser que no hayamos expresado claramente lo que era nuestra idea.

En primer lugar, queremos agradecer los esfuerzos que hará la Secretaría por obtener un documento consolidado que refleje adecuadamente cada una de las opiniones expresadas, asimismo las que el Grupo Regional de América Latina ha hecho presente a través de su Presidente. En segundo lugar, estamos seguros que la Secretaría llevará a cabo esta labor lo antes posible. En tercer lugar, apreciamos su sugerencia de celebrar una consulta para evaluar la posibilidad de la creación de ese Grupo de Trabajo durante la Conferencia y es precisamente esa nuestra idea.

En definitiva, se trata de disminuir el trabajo o los esfuerzos que posteriormente tendrá que realizar la Comisión I sobre este tema, por tanto todo lo que se pueda avanzar en hacer un documento consolidado y aprobado va a beneficiar el desarrollo de la Conferencia.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Comparto lo que ha dicho el distinguido Representante de Chile. Quisiera saber simplemente una cuestión de procedimiento con la Versión 4.0 que hemos tratado. Mi pregunta es: ¿la Versión 4.0, en qué situación va a quedar en el marco de este Consejo? Teniendo en cuenta que como bien ha dicho la Secretaría, va a recoger las observaciones, los comentarios y las propuestas de enmienda, pero ¿cuál va a ser la situación de esta Versión 4.0? Estaríamos recomendando la Versión 4.0 del documento sujeta a las observaciones, modificaciones y enmiendas que el Consejo pasa a la Conferencia y, en síntesis, ¿no estaríamos dando total aprobación a la Versión 4.0 o cuál va a ser el procedimiento a seguir? porque teniendo en cuenta que han habido varias observaciones, y algunas que se van a presentar, algunas de más sustancia o entidad que otras, sería importante que todos los Miembros tuviéramos perfectamente claro cuál va a ser la situación del documento que ha analizado el Consejo.

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je vais vous demander de m'excuser mais votre marteau est tombé alors que la traduction en français n'était pas terminée. Donc, notre réaction n'a pu être assez vive pour vous donner notre sentiment sur vos conclusions. Je souhaiterais, M. le Président, que vous puissiez donner la parole à la Présidence de l' Union européenne, c'est-à-dire à la Finlande.

**Ms Ulla-Maija FINSKAS (Observer for Finland)**

Just very briefly, the European Community and its Member States is not in favour of establishing a Working Group, that would only reopen a discussion and would not be helpful or fruitful to any of us. We would also like to point out that there is no consensus about modifying the text, nor is there a consensus to delete anything.

**CHAIRMAN**

Any other intervention? To answer the Argentinian delegation, I look upon this as a package. We will forward the document, the fourth Version of the Framework and with that also the consolidated amendments, and I will still invite the Groups to consult whether or not it is possible to have a Working Group that will help Commission II start discussing the Strategic Framework.

We have heard that one Group has already made its opinion known, but there are other Groups, and I would like to have other Groups consult with each other on this matter. I think, the delegate of Argentina, this is one package. We will forward the fourth Version, but with it also the consolidated amendments, and if the Regional Groups agree that the Working Group is established, that would be very good.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

Can you clarify whether this proposal would be for an open-ended Working Group or a closed Working Group, comprised of one Member from each of the seven Regional Groups?

**CHAIRMAN**

This is for the Regional Groups to decide. I think this says something that is a step to assist Commission II in their deliberation of the Strategic Framework. It is up to Regional Groups, of course.

**Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)**

I just wanted one clarification. I am slightly confused. Are we going to take the constitution of the Working Group as a question separately with the Regional Groups? I think it is better to have the amendments first, and the Regional Groups discuss them because there could be opinions on whether certain amendments are necessary or not. There could be synergy in the amendments themselves. I think the constitution of the Working Group should not be discussed as a separate

issue. It should be linked to the amendments. We have to look at the amendments, Regional Groups, and then only if it is necessary to go for a Working Group.

I think we all have problems of delegations, the inadequacy of delegations to represent so many fora in the Conference, and to have another Working Group and to have effective representation in that is going to be a problem. So, I would still think that it would be better to have the amendments first.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I agree with you that we should have the consolidated amendments first.

#### **Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Simplemente el razonamiento que propone la India es absolutamente lógico, si nosotros tenemos en cuenta que este Marco Estratégico deberá ser adoptado por la Conferencia. Obviamente el esfuerzo que tendrá que hacer la Secretaría será mayúsculo para tratar de obtener las enmiendas en tan poco plazo, confiamos en que así sea. Pero, sin duda alguna, teniendo como objetivo último trabajar en forma constructiva para aprobar ese documento, el tema de las enmiendas era central porque seguramente, aún cuando el esfuerzo de la Secretaría, repito, sea mayúsculo, y trate de recoger en una forma equilibrada todas las enmiendas que se proponen al texto, estas enmiendas tienen que ser vistas tanto por los grupos regionales como por cada uno de los Miembros, es decir, para poder dar consenso final al documento, cada uno de los Estados trabajando de forma individual o en los grupos regionales o luego trabajando entre los grupos regionales, tendrán que brindar su consenso en modo tal que las enmiendas sean absolutamente consensuadas por todos, sino es probable que sólo tengamos, algún tipo de inconveniente con nuestras capitales, porque también tendremos que enviarlo para que ellos opinen, pero tendremos algún tipo de inconveniente, y el fin perseguido, que es un documento que sea universalmente consensuado, quizás no tenga ningún efecto.

La idea del Grupo de Trabajo que haya formado el GRULAC, justamente apuntaba a esto: ante las discrepancias en algunos puntos centrales sobre algunos de los elementos que están incluidos en el texto, era lógico que concluyéramos de que tal vez la formación de un Grupo de Contacto, que se ha hecho otras veces en la FAO y siempre con éxito, afortunadamente siempre con éxito, podría ofrecernos un marco de trabajo mucho más rápido como para poder alcanzar una conclusión final.

#### **RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

I agree with the proposal from India in principle but I need clarification. This morning, many Member Nations proposed a new idea of the different comments on the Strategic Committee so all of the comments, if necessary, will be included in the amendment chapter or does it mean even if one country or two countries propose some idea, it will be amended, or not? So, I would like clarification. Will all of the comments be amended, or not?

Second, maybe in some cases it may be difficult to make amendments, especially if there are two Groups that have very different ideas. In that case, I would like to propose that the Secretariat could produce some options. This is option one and this is option two, and then we can discuss them. I think that would be reasonable.

#### **Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Special Adviser on World Food Summit Follow-up)**

May I just quickly clarify that, first of all, what we were proposing was to consolidate in one document the textual amendments proposed this morning, obviously identifying them by the name of the delegation or delegations that proposed them. So, they would not commit any delegations other than those delegations that proposed the amendments, but they would at least be clearly on paper for you in all five official languages.

Second, where there are two proposals dealing with the same paragraph, for instance, and they may be even in conflict, as the delegate of the Republic of Korea suggested, both of them will be

put before you, and the Conference, all delegations, will have a chance to weigh the various proposals.

The Strategic Framework is a Conference document, as you know, and therefore it will go in exactly the same form as it is before you. The Conference will have, therefore, the document, plus the Report of the Council on this item, plus the Verbatim Records of the Council, which contain all of the various comments made by delegations. Finally, the LIM document will contain the specific textual amendments proposed, identified by their source. I hope that clarifies the status of the documentation.

**Thomas J. KELLY (United Kingdom)**

A request to the floor is made for Finland to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

**Ms Ulla-Maija FINSKAS (Observer for Finland)**

I think we are now about getting close to a very dangerous situation. We might be losing the baby with the bath water.

The European Community and its Member States did not present any amendments because we had the understanding that amendments would not be taken into consideration. Therefore we have not proposed any amendments. Now if the Secretariat is about to write a paper on amendments presented this morning, then I am afraid we also have quite a lot of amendments. So, this procedure is not acceptable.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

I completely agree with the statement made by the delegate of Finland on behalf of the European Community. I am concerned about the implications of this proposal for the efficiency of our governance operations. We are not talking here, as I understand the proposal coming from GRULAC, about some small changes. We are talking about possibly forty or more when it is reopened because other countries will surely have other major changes that they also might want to propose if the whole thing is reopened. I note that this comes after discussion, very participatory at Council's insistence, that has lasted nearly two years, and coupled with the very real logistical constraints of many delegations in dealing with the now three-ring circus as opposed to four-ring circus that the Conference is, with the Plenary and Commission I and Commission II. I simply do not think that it is a practical solution, nor do I think it bodes well for our ability to be a self-governing organization.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

I agree with the explanation from Ms Killingsworth. Now I have some difficulty. When we have the amendments, as you explained right now, the delegation of the Republic of Korea wishes to propose to the floor the Strategic Framework as it is now, as has just been noted by the delegate from Finland on behalf of the Member States of European Community.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Lamentablemente no me encontraba presente cuando la Secretaría dio respuesta a los planteamientos que hiciera en mi intervención sobre el tema. Lo que nosotros planteamos es que la cuestión de la cooperación técnica no estaba integrada como un segmento, como una parte integrante e importante del Marco Estratégico, por lo menos en la versión actual. Reconocemos desde luego que hay algunos aspectos, no sé si será un poco exagerado decir, no articulados, como sucede con la parte informativa y la parte normativa. Este es un comentario que queríamos hacer.

Pero en relación con el debate, creo que todos reconocemos la importancia de este documento. Cuando la Conferencia anterior decidió emprender este ejercicio, algunas delegaciones plantearon que no se crearan nuevas estructuras debido a las restricciones presupuestarias. Este fue el principal argumento que se manejó. Nos hubiera gustado desde ese momento que el ejercicio hubiese quedado en manos de los Estados Miembros. Este es un documento con gran

trascendencia y de gran importancia, similar al del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre, porque va a guiar las actividades de la Organización en los próximos tres lustros.

En este sentido, nosotros consideramos que es necesario algún tipo de mecanismo abierto, participativo, en el que, reconociendo el importante trabajo que ha hecho la Secretaría en esta fase, los países integrantes de esta Organización tengan un diálogo directo sobre las propuestas que están planteando. Hemos escuchado las preocupaciones de algunas delegaciones en lo que respecta a restricciones de personal por las diferentes pistas, los diferentes grupos, pero quisiera recordar que esta es la primera Conferencia en la que no va a sesionar la Comisión III, o sea que, en sentido estricto, si se forma este grupo estaríamos con el mismo número de pistas, con el mismo número de grupos con los que la Conferencia ha trabajado en ocasiones anteriores.

**Masato ITO (Japan)**

I will be very brief. Japan joins with the previous speakers, namely, the United States and Finland. I doubt it is practical at this stage to set up a Working Group to discuss the Strategic Framework paragraph by paragraph.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Quisiéramos clarificar y a su vez pedir una clarificación. La clarificación que la Delegación de Chile quiere hacer es que la propuesta sólo se refiere a hacer un ejercicio sobre aquellas cuestiones que son evidentes en las cuales existen diferencias. No se trata de hacer una revisión de todo el texto, párrafo por párrafo, es bastante complejo y entendemos la limitación incluso de tiempo que existe. En ese sentido nos parece muy útil la sugerencia que hacía la Secretaría con respecto a poder hacer un documento consolidado en el cual todos los delegados pudieran tener conocimiento de cuáles son las propuestas. En segundo lugar la clarificación que quisiera pedir es referente a lo que se ha dicho sobre la etapa en que nos encontramos. Yo entiendo que la Versión 4.0 es un documento perceptible, estamos en ese camino, quien tiene el derecho a aprobar el documento es la Conferencia, por lo tanto no prejuzguemos lo que puede hacer la Conferencia, donde habrá un número de delegaciones que con toda seguridad van a poder aprobar este documento, cosa que ha ocurrido siempre en este foro. No me queda claro y este es parte de mi pregunta, si no se soluciona o si no se promueve algún mecanismo, ¿cómo se van a considerar los párrafos donde hay fricciones?, ¿lo va a hacer el Comité de Redacción, el Comité de Redacción del Consejo o el Comité de Redacción de la Conferencia? lo cual obviamente limitará las opiniones que tienen las distintas delegaciones sobre algunos párrafos que son a nuestro modo de ver, esenciales. Me gustaría que nos dieran una respuesta sobre este punto.

**CHAIRMAN**

The Council Drafting Committee will report only what has been discussed in the Council. So, I think we are nearing a consensus, I believe.

I propose that we send Version 4.0, as it is, to the Conference, plus a detailed Report on the debate also to the Conference for their consideration. Is that acceptable? We are not going to have a consolidated amendment. I do not think we can establish a Working Group, so what we can do is, we send Version 4.0 as it is to the Conference, plus the Report of the debate here in the Council.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

I am sorry to ask for the floor again, but I strongly support your proposals.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

We too would support your proposal that we not try and pre-judge the Conference decisions, and that it will be up to the very able Chairman of Commission II to determine how he will play this particular problem. I agree that it would be useful for the deliberations of the Conference to have a document prepared that not only reflects the amendments, which have been so thoughtfully written down for us by GRULAC, but I believe that Ms Killingsworth also mentioned that they

would go through the Verbatim Records and also record all of the proposed amendments that were made during the debate. On that understanding, I can agree with your suggestion.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Apoyamos la propuesta final que se ha mencionado, siempre y cuando este informe adjunte por lo menos las observaciones que ha hecho el GRULAC. Este es un esfuerzo para mejorar el documento, puede ser un buen *input* para el propio trabajo de la Comisión que deberá examinar esa materia.

Coincido ciertamente en que no se trata de prejuizar los trabajos que va a hacer la Conferencia, pero creo es importante que el informe de este Consejo refleje la importancia de esta discusión.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Coincidimos con la delegación de Chile, en que los documentos que debería recibir la Conferencia, y sin prejuizar obviamente su trabajo porque sería imposible, pero sí es importante que este Marco Estratégico, deben tener el consenso de todos los Miembros, sino en el futuro encontraremos algún tipo de complicación en el desarrollo a la implementación, porque son los Estados Miembros quienes nos lo tendremos que implementar.

Mi delegación estaría satisfecha a estas alturas si todos los documentos, toda la información disponible con que contamos hasta aquí, es decir, documento presentado como Versión 4.0, más informe de los debates, más las propuestas que se han hecho recogidas en las actas del *Verbatim* pasen a la Conferencia de modo tal que los Jefes de Delegación, los Ministros tengan toda la información disponible. La delegación argentina estaría satisfecha si pasamos a la Conferencia la más amplia información con la que contamos hasta el momento, es decir, el documento presentado como Versión 4.0, los debates que resumirá el Comité de Redacción y que serán objeto de discusión el día de mañana, las propuestas que se han señalado en el debate y agradeceríamos la comprensión de todos los Estados aquí presentes para que aquellas sugerencias de modificaciones que hace el GRULAC en el documento que aquí tenemos sean tomadas también como información, porque seguramente también podrán enriquecer el debate de la Conferencia. Con esos elementos seguramente trabajaremos de una forma absolutamente constructiva como hemos hecho siempre y luego será la Conferencia que decidirá, con esos elementos en la mano, si se requiere un Grupo de Trabajo o no.

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Avant de vous demander de passer la parole à la Finlande, qui parlera au nom de l'Union européenne, j'aimerais au titre de la délégation française, avoir à nouveau une précision, mais j'avais compris que la Conférence serait rendue destinataire de la Version 4.0 du Cadre stratégique et bien entendu du rapport de ce Conseil qui reprendra, comme il est d'usage, de manière équilibrée et aussi impartiale que possible - mais ceci, entre les mains du Comité de rédaction et entre vos mains, reprendra exactement ce qui c'est passé lors des débats qui ont eu lieu dans cette enceinte, - j'entends maintenant, peut-être j'ai mal compris, qu'il y aurait aussi une transmission d'amendement.

Alors, je pense que si le débat est reporté à la Conférence et que, nous en convenons tous, il appartiendra, bien entendu de manière souveraine, à toutes les délégations de porter leurs amendements à titre national ou à titre régional - mais je dis que c'est souverain et ça leur appartient - il n'appartient pas au Conseil de décider de porter les amendements de tel groupe ou de tel État. Donc, j'aimerais avoir une précision sur cette question M. le Président.

**CHAIRMAN**

Yes, I think we should follow the rules and therefore I would like to have comments from the Secretariat, the Secretary-General, please.



**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

My comments are not on this. I would just like to clarify, because there have been references to the Verbatim Records being made available to the Conference. The Verbatim Records can be made available in the same form as they are available to Council Members immediately after the Council, in other words, in the original language of delivery.

We are not, unfortunately, in a position to translate all the Verbatim Records and to make them a Council document, even for limited distribution. So, they would have to be in the provisional form, in other words before they are checked by the delegations, and in the language in which the delegate had spoken, or has been translated into: English, French and Spanish. We do not have Arabic and we do not have Chinese in the Verbatim Records. I just wanted to make that technical clarification.

As regards the proposal of the Chairman, that is the document as it is, go to the Conference with a detailed Report from the Council. The Chairman has asked me to explain that, but no other amendments will be sent by Council to Conference.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Perdóneme, señor Presidente, pero estoy muy confundido. El esfuerzo que hemos estado haciendo todas estas horas y los recursos que hemos gastado de esta Organización en este esfuerzo son precisamente para examinar el Marco Estratégico de la Versión 4.0 y preparar a la Conferencia en la manera de estudiar y analizar este documento, es decir, si el documento va a ser remitido tal como está sólo con un informe del Comité de Redacción en el cual se diga que se discutió este informe, ¿cuál ha sido el propósito de discutir esta Versión 4.0 si no va a poder incorporar las enmiendas que han hecho los delegados aquí presentes?

**CHAIRMAN**

The Council can put forward only what can be done by the Council, according to the rules and regulations. I think what I am suggesting, what I am proposing, is that we send Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework as it is, plus the Report of the debate in the Council. If that is what the Council can do, then it is what we can do. We cannot go beyond what the Council can do. So, that is why I said we should refer to what the regulations say about the reporting of the Council. I think we should not go beyond it.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

En este contexto, permítame hacer una sugerencia puesto que nos ayudará en nuestras labores en el Comité de Redacción hoy en la noche, y en consecuencia será bueno para analizar el alcance de sus palabras. Estamos absolutamente de acuerdo con lo que usted ha mencionado, entendemos que existirá un informe sobre análisis del Marco Estratégico y este informe por lo tanto podrá referirse y tomar nota de todas las enmiendas y las sugerencias que se han hecho, incluso de los procedimientos que hemos sugerido. Si es así nos parece que se puede actuar perfectamente en la dirección que usted señala. Quisiera antes de terminar mis palabras, señor Presidente, que no es capricho de la delegación de Chile, ni del Grupo Regional de América Latina subrayar la importancia de este documento. Nos parece que vale la pena, gastar una hora, dos, quizás cinco en alcanzar un documento que va a orientar los trabajos de esta Organización durante los próximos quince años, por eso no actuemos con la celeridad, que el día de mañana nos puede costar en lo que estamos sembrando hoy. Por ello, creo que es muy importante como decía un gran diplomático chileno, "es importante tomar las decisiones difíciles y darse el tiempo para tomarlas". No apresuremos las cosas más allá de lo necesario. Por tanto su propuesta me parece adecuada, que el informe que va a tener de elaborar el Comité de Redacción considere todos los comentarios que aquí se han hecho y por cierto se refiera también a las enmiendas.

**CHAIRMAN**

I think we do not have any misunderstanding here. We have a Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee knows very well what it should do, and what should be in the Report, and I think we will have a draft of the Report of the Drafting Committee tomorrow.

Any other suggestions?

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Primero queremos señalar que estamos de acuerdo con su planteamiento, pero creo que hay una confusión sobre un aspecto procesal y un aspecto organizativo. Procesalmente se está actuando correctamente en el sentido de que el Consejo mande la Versión 4.0 y el informe a la Conferencia pero en términos operativos y organizativos este Consejo cumple una función preparatoria de la Conferencia. Aquí ha habido un debate muy importante sobre aspectos de sustancia respecto al Marco Estratégico. Nos preguntamos ¿cómo se transmitirá a la Conferencia lo que ha recibido la Secretaría en términos de propuestas y modificaciones?, ¿será un documento, un compendio por así decirlo de todas estas propuestas?, ¿qué tratamiento recibirán las propuestas verbales que se han expuesto aquí y las propuestas escritas porque lamentablemente en todos los informes se pierde mucho de la sustancia se tiene que llegar a versiones sintéticas?, ¿cómo se manejaría eso para pasarlo a la Conferencia en términos operativos no procesales?

**CHAIRMAN**

The suggestion that there be a consolidated amendment by the Secretariat is no longer there. That suggestion has not been agreed upon by the Membership. The proposal now is to have the fourth version as it is, forwarded to the Conference plus the Report by the Drafting Committee, which we will see tomorrow and decide upon tomorrow. I trust that the Drafting Committee will do its utmost to draft a good Report on what has been discussed during this Council. Of course it cannot go beyond that.

Again, the consolidated amendment, as suggested before, is no longer considered here. It is only the fourth version plus the Report of the Drafting Committee that we will see tomorrow and which we will hopefully adopt and also tomorrow endorse.

I think we should close this discussion and move on to Item 9.

**9. Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee (Rome, September 1999) (CL 117/2)**

**9. Rapport de la réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier (Rome, septembre 1999) (CL 117/2)**

**9. Informe de la Reunión Conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas (Roma, septiembre de 1999) (CL 117/2)**

*Dietrich Lincke Vice-Chairman of the Council, took the Chair.*

*Dietrich Lincke, Vice-Président du Conseil, assume la présidence.*

*Ocupa la presidencia Dietrich Lincke, Vicepresidente del Consejo.*

**CHAIRMAN**

I should like to give the floor to Dr Bommer as Chairman of the Joint Meeting last session, but before doing so, I am sure the Council joins me in expressing our appreciation of the excellent work carried out by him as Chairman of the Programme Committee and several sessions of the Joint Meeting. In particular, I have appreciated his unfailing support of the Council work and his constructive and positive contribution.

On behalf of the Council, I should like to extend to Dr Bommer our best wishes for his future activities and personal life.

**D. BOMMER (Chairman of the Programme Committee)**

Let me first reflect on this very nice work you did. I certainly did not expect at this juncture to be saying, if I could have been of any service to the Council. I think the good work really depends on the Members of the Programme and Finance Committees who have been so constructive and so positive in their contributions. The last issue you just concluded was a sign of how the two Committees have further moved together in developing the Agenda. This item on the Strategic Framework was only discussed in the Joint Meeting, not separately. I think this reflects, the very constructive work we had with the Finance Committee, and certainly I am very happy to see the Chairman of the Finance Committee sitting to my right.

Now, for the Joint Meeting Report. Actually the two major items, Programme of Work and Budget and Strategic Framework have already been extensively discussed here in the Council. There was also the question of the Regional Dimension to Budgeting and Implementation Reporting, which clarifies the scope and basis for the regional breakdown of budgetary estimates routinely provided as part of the Programme of Work and Budget documentation. This, you might recall in our discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget, has been addressed. The Committee, recognized that accounting for such expenditures on a regional basis was not a practical proposition.

The second and last point of the deliberation in the Joint Meeting was to further review as you, the Council, requested, the reform of the General Debate and Conference. This, you will understand, we certainly have postponed to one of the meetings in the next year, and will probably be reported in November 2000 to the Council because there was no time now.

This is all I have to say regarding this Report. This really concludes the Report on the Joint Meeting, and you might see if there are any questions, or if the Council will just approve it.

**CHAIRMAN**

I should like to know whether there are any questions or comments on the Report, or whether we can proceed to a decision on it.

I see that nobody wishes to have the floor. I propose that the Report is accepted. Any objections?

*The Report was approved.*

*Le rapport est adopté.*

*El informe es aprobado.*

**10. Report of the 82<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Programme Committee (Rome, September 1999)**  
(CL 117/3)

**10. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-deuxième session du Comité du Programme**  
(Rome, septembre 1999) (CL 117/3)

**10. Informe del 82º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa**  
(Roma, septiembre de 1999) (CL 117/3)

**CHAIRMAN**

I would like to give the floor to the Chairman of the Committee, Dr Bommer.

**D. BOMMER (Chairman of the Programme Committee)**

You have already discussed a major part of Item 10 on the Programme of Work and Budget. We have, however, left a number of important items in the Programme Committee's deliberation, such as the Progress Report on Gender Mainstreaming. This Report had been prepared at the request of the Programme Committee by the Secretariat. While appreciating the submission of this Report, the Committee noted that progress in gender mainstreaming had been uneven amongst the Divisions and that most progress reported in this document seemed to have occurred through the use of extrabudgetary resources. The Committee called for vigorous action throughout the

Organization to improve the existing mechanisms to incorporate gender mainstreaming into the work of FAO.

The Committee welcomed in this connection the inclusion of a number of recommendations in the Progress Report to bring about desirable improvements. It stressed, however, that the adoption of verifiable indicators was indispensable to demonstrate effective progress. The Committee's successes at future Programme Implementation Reports and Programme Evaluation Reports provide adequate coverage of gender mainstreaming under each programme reviewed. This was the first.

The second: The Committee also considered the Programme Evaluation Report. We had also here requested the Secretariat, in the light of the new programming model, the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan which is being developed, and the following subsequent presentation of the final new programming model, to bring forward views of the movements and changes in the evaluation activities of the Organization.

The Committee considers the document as concise and analytical. It is, by the way, available on the Internet, if somebody wishes to consult it more in detail, providing generally sound proposals for a revised regime of evaluation. It also supported the reintroduction of an external evaluation system as an integral part of programme management. It really belongs there; it has been in the Organization in the past, and now it will be reintroduced. In this context, the Committee highlighted the importance first for the satisfactory implementation of the Strategic Framework 2000-2001 and of the new programming model, second, of impact assessment wherever feasible. I also requested the availability of adequate resources for evaluation.

In terms of resources, the Committee recommended that the cost of programme evaluation be built into the Regular Programme Budget at the project design stage and that programmes be evaluated at various stages of implementation, not only at the end of a given project.

I wish to draw one particular issue to the attention of the Council, which actually needs Council approval, and that is the matter of reporting to the Governing Bodies on evaluation results. Here are some changes proposed:

First, that the Programme Committee will receive individual Evaluation Reports, spread over the two sessions in the first year of the biennium. This will include management's responses to findings and recommendations and whether the Reports were prepared primarily by the external peer reviewers.

A synthesis of all these evaluation reports, reviewed by the Committee, will then be prepared, and this will become the new revised Programme Evaluation Report which will be submitted to the Conference through the Council. So there is a change here in an abbreviated form, in a condensed form, including the reactions of management, and the reactions of external peer reviewers. The Programme Committee the Technical Committees of the Council will receive all these evaluation reports for their comments.

It is proposed that the main reporting to the Programme Committee be made in parallel with these programme reviews, which we do normally in a six-year cycle, that is, at the first two sessions in the first year of the biennium. Reporting to Council and Conference will then take place in the second year of the biennium in the form of the Programme Evaluation Report as described. The Council may wish to express its views on this proposal and if it considers them appropriate, endorse them.

The Committee expressed its preference for subjects to be covered in the next issue of the Programme Evaluation Report, to be presented in the year 2000 and which will be of a transitional nature, as the whole model Medium-Term Plan is still in the making. The Council needs to endorse these selections also as contained in paragraph 54 of the Programme Committee's Report.

In this context, the Committee indicated also its interest in the evaluation of the Special Programme for Food Security, SPFS, as soon as possible. It was informed that the Secretariat proposed to initiate such an evaluation following the cropping season in 2001.

Finally, the Committee noted the Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit, the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit Report for 1999 and the United Nations Office for Project Services, UNOPS, the broad engagement with United Nations Systems Organizations.

This concludes my introductory segment.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you for the introduction to the Report of the Programme Committee. I should like to know now if anybody wants to ask for the floor on this Report. As this is not the case, I propose that the Report is adopted as it stands in document CL 117/3.

*The Report was adopted.*

*Le rapport est adopté.*

*El informe es aprobado.*

**11. Report of the 93<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Finance Committee (Rome, September 1999) (CL 117/4)**

**11. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-treizième session du Comité financier**

**(Rome, septembre 1999) (CL 117/4)**

**11. Informe del 93<sup>o</sup> período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, septiembre de 1999)**

**(cl 117/4)**

**11.1 Financial Position of the Organization (CL 117/LIM/1)**

**11.1 Situation financière de l'organisation (CL 117/LIM/1)**

**11.1 Situación financiera de la Organización (CL 117/LIM/1)**

**11.2 Scale of Contributions 2000-2001**

**11.2 Barème des contributions 2000-2001**

**11.2 Escala de cuotas para 2000-2001**

**11.3 Other Matters Arising Out of the Report**

**11.3 Autres questions découlant du rapport**

**11.3 Otros asuntos planteados en el Informe**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I should like to draw your attention to matters requiring attention by the Council which are listed in the table at the front of the Report, while CL 117/LIM/1 gives the updated status of contributions to FAO on the 5 November 1999.

I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr Julian A. Thomas of South Africa.

**Julian A. THOMAS (Chairman of the Finance Committee)**

Let us hope this mood continues, that we get through this Report quickly.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Report of the Ninety-third Session of the Finance Committee held in Rome from the 13 to 17 September 1999 and reflected in the document that you have before you CL 117/4 and also, as the Chair has pointed out, CL 117/LIM/1, which provided a financial update and which I shall refer to in due course.

The Agenda of the meeting carried a range of budgetary, financial and administrative matters concerning FAO. In addition to its review of the Financial Position of the Organization, the Committee also considered questions such as the Discount Rate of the Incentive Scheme, the Amendment of Financial Regulations 6.9 and 7.1, the Status Report on the year 2000 Issue, a Charter for the Office of the Inspector General, and the World Food Programme's biannual budget for 2000-2001. As those of you who have read the Report will see that I have been selective here, I have just given you a range of the type of issues that were dealt with, but not an exhaustive one.

So, in this presentation, I will highlight points of general interest to Members; all matters requiring attention by Council. I will confine myself to FAO matters and will exclude comment on budgetary matters already dealt with under Item 7 of our Agenda, in other words the Programme of Work and Budget.

Allow me to start with Item 11.1, Financial Position of the Organization, which is updated in document CL 117/LIM/1.

In September, the Committee noted that 57,63 percent of current assessments had been received. Moreover, 59 Member Nations had paid their current assessments in full, while a further 22 Members had made partial payment, and 94 had made no payment as yet toward their 1999 assessment.

At that time the Committee noted that the rate of receipt of contributions compared favourably with the same date of the previous year. The Committee, nevertheless, expressed concern over the number of Member Nations with arrears and renewed its appeal for all Member Nations with contributions outstanding to pay their assessed contributions and arrears in full, as soon as possible.

If the same comparison is made with the data for the 5 November, which is in the LIM document, the result is less favourable, as the rate of receipt is the lowest it has been since 1995. I understand that the Secretariat has a more recent update on this matter which may show some improvement. Mr Mehboob may wish to provide us with this information when we discuss this item.

I would like now to move to Item 2, or 11.2, on our Agenda, the second one I will deal with, and including this one there will be four more items.

The second item then that I did deal with is the Scale of Contributions for 2000-2001. This item is presented to Council for information, as in June some Members of Council expressed concern over the possible effects of a reduction in the ceiling rate from the current 25 percent to 22 percent. At that meeting, the Secretariat was asked to produce a document showing a revised Scale, taking such a change into account, should it materialize. This document was reviewed by the Finance Committee and it has been included, and it is included, as Appendix 1 to the Report of the Finance Committee Meeting that you have in front of you. It is purely information about this possible impact of a reduction from 25 to 22 percent in the ceiling.

Allow me to pass to the next item then, which I have identified as Support Costs that are included under Other Matters Arising out of the Report, in other words, under Item 11.3. The Committee considered the Progress Report on the overall question of support costs and welcomed the review initiated in the Secretariat paper as well as the significant progress made in reducing the cost of supporting field programmes. The Committee acknowledged the conceptual framework proposed as a helpful basis for further development of the proposals, and took note of the consistency of the approach taken and data presented with previous cost studies involving UNDP and other United Nations Specialized Agencies. The Committee recognized both the complexity and importance of the subject and agreed to set aside additional time to deliberate on this item at its first session in 2000, that is, next year. So much for support costs.

The next items then that I would like to briefly summarize in, report on, is the Amendment of Financial Regulations 6.9 and 7.1 to provide for the establishment of a revolving fund for FAO products and related services, other than information products. The Committee noted that the matter had been initially raised by the Programme Committee and that the proposal submitted by the Secretariat to amend the Financial Regulations, to provide for the establishment of such a new revolving fund in response to the Programme Committee's invitation.

The Committee approved the proposed amendments for onward transmission to Council via the CCLM for its endorsement. That is, endorsement by the Council and then to the Conference for eventual adoption. In so doing, the Committee noted that the development of FAO innovated products should continue to be related to the institutional objectives of the Organization, and that

the Organization should not duplicate the role of private commercial sector, and that the exploitation of such products should be in line with the aims, the mandate of the Organization.

This item will be discussed in detail under Item 12, which is the discussion of the Report of the CCLM.

The last item then that I have on my list to report to you here is the question of the Year 2000 Issue, the Status Report of the Year 2000 Issue. I am just highlighting this. It is an important issue; it has been an important issue for FAO, for all of us I am sure as Member Nations, but it was an item that we thought that we would like to bring to your attention.

The Committee considered the status of the various year 2000 activities and complimented the Organization for the progress made and for a report which provided a good description of the effort and costs involved. The Committee recognized the concern expressed by the year 2000 Project Coordinator regarding the state of new issues which were still being identified by Microsoft and other software vendors. It took note of the fact that while it was still possible to correct all the issues so far identified, if this trend continued, there might come a point at which new future items would have to be prioritized and only the most severe and urgent ones corrected.

At that meeting of the Finance Committee, because of the emergence of a few new issues, we asked the Secretariat to prepare for an additional report to this Council meeting in case any more serious issues should come on the table. I have discussed this matter with Mr Pace from the Secretariat. He assures me that there is nothing new, but if the Council should require it, he could give you a short update on the report that I have just summarized.

Allow me, in conclusion, and on the behalf of the Members of the Committee, to extend our appreciation to the Secretariat for its assistance in our deliberations and our gratitude to Member Nations for providing us this opportunity to further the important work of this Organization. I assure you it is really a privilege to be on that Committee, to have access to top echelons in this Organization and to deal with issues of importance and of interest to the Organization. I also wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues on the Committee for their support and cooperation over the past two years. Mr Chairman, just adding to what you said just now, I would also like to witness here to the extremely good, constructive, friendly relationship that has existed between Finance Committee and Programme Committee and especially, I think, with the Chair, Mr Bommer here, who played an extremely useful role in facilitating the interaction and synergy between these two Committees, which I think as he pointed out himself is of great importance to the functioning and to the Organization. And Mr Bommer, on behalf of the Committee, we could again also fare you well in your future activities and life.

In conclusion then, I would be pleased to provide any further explanations you or Member Nations may have regarding the Report, if this should be required before the Report would be hopefully approved.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Mr Thomas, I thank you very much for your Report on the Ninety-Third Session of the Finance Committee and for the introduction to Item 11 and the three sub-items. I also want to stress your wish that the Council should remain in the same constructive mood as far as this Report is concerned and help to do our business speedily, as we have a long agenda ahead of us.

In addition to the introduction by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, I should now like to ask the Assistant Director-General of administrative and financial matters to provide us with an update of the figures and Report as indicated by Mr Thomas.

#### **Khalid MEHBOOB (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department)**

We have indeed received contributions from a number of countries which I can give information on. We have received an amount of US\$ 3 143 627 from China; we have received US\$ 65 000 from Guinea; we have received US\$ 21 519 220 from Japan; we have received US\$ 6 000 from

Malawi; US\$ 23 359 from the Gambia; US\$ 4 787 250 from Australia; US\$ 319 000 from Croatia; US\$ 594 from Senegal; US\$ 31 915 from Zimbabwe; and US\$ 161 710 from Nigeria.

This brings the percentage of current assessments received to about 76 percent. This information would also change some of the figures in document CL 117/LIM/1. On page 2, paragraph 6, the percentage I have just quoted of 76.35 percent would be the percentage received for the current assessments. On page 3, paragraph 9, the number of countries who have paid in full would go up to 69 and those who have paid in part would become 25, under the current assessments. In the arrears section, under paragraph 11, arrears paid in full move up to 29 and the total countries in arrears at today's date would be 77.

### **Kazuo TANAKA (Japan)**

We do not intend to stop the speedy flow of the Council's deliberations but we would like to touch upon two issues: that is, the Scale of the Contributions and the question of arrears.

The Japanese delegation would like to express its appreciation to the Finance Committee Chairman and its Members for the serious consideration in the Committee and to the Secretariat for the preparation of the Report, in particular the theoretical Scale of Contributions with a ceiling rate reduced to 22 percent from the present 25 percent. This reduced ceiling rate is still being discussed in the UN Committee on Contributions, which has not reached any conclusion yet. However, this new Scale of Contributions gives us a clearer picture on the financial obligations each Member has to bear if the proposed lowering of the ceiling rate is adopted.

First, it is not difficult to see that once the new Scale of Contributions with a 22 percent ceiling rate is adopted, out of 175 Members, 86 countries, including OECD Member Nations, and a number of developing countries will be affected and required to pay larger contributions, while only one nation pays less. Second, in the case of Japan, the Scale of Contributions will be increased to 21.510 percent, and this means in cash terms an increase of about US\$ 2.7 million under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario, which amounts in total to US\$ 131.8 million. Third, our delegation wishes to point out the fact that Japan and some other larger contributors have been absorbing a substantial part of the total relief provided to developing countries below the threshold by the low *per caput* income adjustment, in addition to the amount of relief given to the largest contributor due to the adjustment made, even under the existing ceiling rate, of 25 percent. In the final analysis, it is our view that we cannot accept the lowering of the ceiling rate and that the Council should recommend to the Conference for its adoption the Draft Resolution contained in paragraph 115, document CL 116/RAP of the last Council, indicating that the FAO Scale of Contributions for 2000-2001 should be derived directly from the United Nations Scale of Assessments in force during 1999.

Before concluding my comments on the Scale of Contributions, we should remind ourselves that the Scale of Assessments is a tool of great importance in optimizing fairness and equity among Member Nations when they assume their collective responsibility of funding the Organization and in placing the Organization on a sound and stable financial basis. A fair and equitable sharing of financial responsibility is a key to the successful running of an international organization like FAO.

Now let me turn to the question of arrears. Yesterday, the Secretariat presented a Draft Resolution for adoption by the Conference on the authorization to utilize resources arising from the payment of arrears. At the moment, we have three points on which we would like to have clarification from the Secretariat on the Resolution, to better understand the intention of the proposal before formulating our opinions.

First, why does the Secretariat need to take a one-time and exceptional measure at this juncture? Second, the Draft Resolution lists ten budget items which are supposed to be covered under the proposed authorization of use of cash surpluses. Is there any order of priority in the listed budget items? Third, in case the Major Contributor fails to pay its arrears, what will then happen to those budget items listed, in particular the budget item of redeployment and separation costs related to the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget 2000-2001?



With the above note, we have no intention or objection to the adoption of the Report by the Council.

**Thomas J. KELLY (United Kingdom)**

I request that the floor be given to Finland, please, to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

**Ms Aulikki KAUPILA (Observer for Finland)**

On behalf of the European Community and its Member States, the Finnish Presidency would like to make some comments on the issues raised in the Report of the Ninety-third Session of the Finance Committee.

First, we would like to thank the Secretariat for making the background documents of the Finance and Programme Committees available on the Internet. The information on issues that we need to analyse for the Conference makes the work easier for Members. In general, we can endorse the conclusions that the Committee has agreed upon. Among the findings of the Committee, there are two issues which raise special concerns among the EC and its Member States. Our first concern is related to programme and budgetary transfers in the biennium. We join the regrets of the Committee about the need to effect considerable transfers of funds from the core substantive work of the Organization to administrative activities. Such transfers undermine the efforts of Governing Bodies to define priority areas. We once again urge the Secretariat to seek more savings in the administrative activities.

Our second concern is related to the Financial Position of the Organization. We noted with great concern from the Report that, at that time less than 60 percent of the current assessments had been received. Still more worrying is that as many as 77 Members have made no payment at all towards their 1999 assessment. In addition, 41 Members were risking their Voting Rights because of arrears corresponding to their dues of at least two years. The amount of arrears is significant for the Organization and causes additional costs and delays in programme execution. We would urge all Members to fulfil their obligations in full, on time and without conditions. In this connection, we call for a more strict application of the provisions of Article 3.4 of the Constitution on the suspension of Voting Rights. As twelve Member Nations have arrears exceeding US\$ 1 million, we advise the Secretariat to intensify bilateral consultations with FAO's largest debtors. We also recommend that the Finance Committee continuously follow the situation and consider the possibilities of complementing the present Incentive Scheme by a disincentive message.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

A couple of points: first of all, in Mr Mehboob's rundown of the contributions recently received, our payment was not listed. We made a payment of US\$ 25.7 million on about 27 October and that was acknowledged by FAO, and so I know it was received. I have a copy of that acknowledgement.

With respect to the Scale of Assessments and Japan's recent recommendation regarding a consensus recommendation by Council that the Conference adopt for two years the Scale in effect at the UN in New York on the day the budget is adopted, the United States would not join such a consensus of Council. Let me please explain why, if I might. As we explained to the Hundred and Sixteenth Council in June, it is our intention to present a Resolution to the Resolutions Committee and hopefully to the Conference at the Thirtieth Session regarding the Scale of Contributions for the 2000-2001 biennium. I would like to reiterate, if I might, the objectives of such a Resolution. The purpose of the Resolution would be to take into account in the FAO Scale any changes in the UN Scale as might be agreed by the appropriate Bodies in New York, which have jurisdiction to set the UN Scale. Such a US Resolution would seek to apply changes in the UN Scale that might be agreed in 2000 to the second year of the FAO biennium. This is necessary in our view because in FAO the Conference only meets every two years, and the Conference has the authority to set the Scale in effect in FAO whereas in other UN Bodies there is a Governing Body of a Supreme Council that meets every year. FAO is different in that respect, and that is why we feel that such a

Resolution is necessary. Now Members of the Council might recall that such a Resolution as we intend to present to the Resolutions Committee and hopefully to the Thirtieth Conference was adopted by the Twenty-Ninth Conference in 1997. That Resolution can be found on pages 45 and 46 of C/97/REP, and was adopted on 14 November 1997.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

Very briefly, I wish to echo the comments of the representative of Finland, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, the comments concerning arrears and the need for all Members to pay their assessed contributions in full, on time and without conditions. We also endorse the comments suggesting that the Organization take special measures to attempt to collect arrears from those large number of Members who owe in excess of US\$ 1 million.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

De manera muy breve, y en línea con las delegaciones que me han precedido, queremos también expresar nuestra preocupación por lo contenido en el párrafo 13 y 14 del Informe, en relación a la transferencia que se está haciendo del Capítulo 2, Programas Substantivos de esta Organización, a la parte administrativa. Consideramos que, al contrario, las actividades de la Organización deben ser reforzadas, deben disponer de mayores recursos y no se deben substraer recursos de estos capítulos para las cuestiones administrativas. Por otro lado, queremos hacer un exhorto para que todos los países de la Organización cumplan con sus compromisos financieros.

**Bandar AL-SHALHOOB (Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of) (Original language Arabic)**

I shall be very brief, too. Mr Mehboob has reported to us about the latest contributions received by the Organization. Could you add the name of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to that list, because we have also paid part of our arrears.

**CHAIRMAN**

If nobody else wants to take the floor, I should now like to ask the Assistant Director-General, Mr Mehboob, to answer the questions put to him.

**Khalid MEHBOOB (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department)**

I will deal with the question of contributions and then with your permission, if I could ask Mr Wade to deal with the questions relating to budgetary matters.

The United States payment of US\$ 25, 700 indeed was received, and the reason I haven't repeated it was because it's in the LIM document. It's shown as being received in the annex attached to CL 117/LIM/1. So that information is already put before you. I was giving the figures received since the production of this document, so that's the reason I didn't mention the United States. And the same holds true in the case of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's payment is also listed in the LIM document. The figures I was quoting were since the production of this document.

With your permission, if I could ask Mr Wade to deal with the questions regarding the budgetary matters.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation)**

The key questions came from the distinguished delegate of Japan concerning the Draft Resolution which was presented yesterday under the budget item, and he had three questions with regard to them. First of all, why does action need to be taken now? Spending authority comes from Financial Regulation 4.1, which says that "the appropriations voted by the Conference for the ensuing financial period shall constitute an authorization to the Director-General to incur obligations and make payments for the purposes for which the appropriations were voted, and up to the amount so voted". So, the authority to spend Regular Programme resources as opposed to extrabudgetary resources comes from Financial Regulation 4.1. The authority to spend extrabudgetary resources, in passing, comes from Financial Regulation 6.7. Therefore, the Conference will be voting on Friday week to authorize a certain amount of expenditure, one of

three figures, you will recall from our discussion earlier this week. The Director-General cannot spend more than that even if the Organization receives it, unless he is given additional spending authorization. So, if, for example, US\$ 93 million was received from the Major Contributor during 2000-2001, the authority to spend that money above and beyond the current accumulated deficit, which is already authorized, does not exist. We have estimated around about US\$ 40 million could be surplus, although it could be a little bit more, but I don't think so. That US\$ 40 million would then become a cash surplus which would be returned to Member Nations under the provisions of Financial Regulations 6.1(b), which says that "any cash surplus in the General Fund at the close of any financial period shall be allocated among Member Nations in accordance with the Scale of Contributions applicable to that period", etc. So, therefore, the US\$ 40 million surplus, all other things being equal, would be distributed in proportion to the Scale of Contributions for the biennium 2000-2001. Of course that Scale could change from the current level, but if it was at the current level that would mean that the Major Contributor would receive back US\$ 10 million, a quarter of the US\$ 40 million surplus of the amount paid to the Organization.

So, the question, "Why now?": if we don't do it now we won't be able to do it at all, because this approval can only come from the Conference, and to give the approval in November 2001 would be too late to authorize these expenditures.

The second question concerns the order of priority for the ten items. In general, can I say that they are not listed in order of priority, and in fact if a lesser amount were received, the most important items from within each item would be chosen. So, the grouping of items is not a function of priority, it's a function of the nature of expenditure. Having said that, in terms of timing, the institution will urgently need to spend resources on redeployment and separation costs from the beginning of the next biennium. The sooner that money is spent, the sooner the savings are generated on the posts which have been abolished. If we don't spend that money, we will instead have to fund the salaries of the staff concerned.

The last question, which is "What happens if the Major Contributor fails to pay any arrears in 2000-2001?" Then one part of the Resolution that remains operative, which would be the last paragraph, which authorizes the Director-General to incur such redeployment and separation expenditures referred to in sub-paragraph 1 - so that's for US\$ 9 million - as may be necessary to complete restructuring pending eventual receipt of arrears. So, the major part of the Resolution would not be effective because it's dependent upon receipt but it would be effective for the first item, which is the redeployment and separation costs.

We do take note very seriously of the comments made concerning the transfers from Chapters 2 to the other Chapters, and the concern expressed about transfers away from technical programmes to non-technical programmes. Obviously the Secretariat shares that concern. Certainly the priority for spending is in the technical programmes in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. I would say that we had exceptional circumstances with a remarkable drop in the level of support cost income versus the level expected, in fact, US\$ 3.9 million shortfall in Chapter 3, and then in addition we have had to incur considerably more on the Oracle Project than we were able to fund in the regular budget. You may recall that we had some hope of extrabudgetary funds for Oracle. I'm afraid they were not forthcoming, and so we had to fund an extra US\$ 2.6 million from Chapter 5. Those are the major reasons for the transfers. That being said, however, the Secretariat very much recognizes and shares the concern of Members as regards to these transfers.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I thank the Secretariat, Assistant Director-General, Mr Mehboob, and Director Mr Wade for the additional explanations. All statements and clarifications made in the Council will of course be duly recorded, and keeping this in mind I should ask for adoption of the Report of the Finance Committee as mentioned in the three under items 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3. As no objection is raised, the item, the report of the Finance Committee is adopted.

*The Report was adopted.*

*Le rapport est adopté.*

*El informe es aprobado.*

*The meeting was suspended from 16.55 to 17.10 hours.*

*La séance est suspendue de 16 h 55 à 17 h 10.*

*Se suspende la sesión de las 16.55 horas a las 17.10 horas.*

**II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)**

**II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO (suite)**

**II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)**

**4. Outcome of the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent (Rome, July 1999) (C 99/14)**

**4. Conclusions de la Conférence de plénipotentiaires sur la Convention de Rotterdam sur la procédure de consentement préalable en connaissance de cause (Rome, juillet 1999) (C 99/14)**

**4. Resultado de la Conferencia de Plenipotenciarios sobre el Convenio de Rotterdam sobre el consentimiento informado previo (Roma, julio de 1999) (C 99/14)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I should go on Item 4, Outcome of the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent, in short PIC, which is contained in document C 99/14.

As you know, the Rotterdam Convention was adopted by a diplomatic conference in September 1998. The adoption was a result of long process which started with the adoption by the FAO Conference of the Principle of Prior Informed Consent in relation to banned and severely-restricted pesticides.

I am sure all Council Members note with satisfaction the successful conclusion of the negotiations for the Rotterdam Convention and its adoption last year, and view favourably this sort of joint venture between FAO and UNEP on such an important issue, which also constitutes an excellent example on how UN Organizations should complement each other.

The Council will also note the joint implementation of the Interim Measures and the preparation for the First Conference of parties by UNEP and FAO through the joint operation of the Interim Secretariat. Of course keeping in mind the long Agenda we have ahead of us, I should know like to ask whether anybody wishes to take the floor on this issue?

#### **Hirofumi KUGITA (Japan)**

Japan highly appreciates the outcome of the Sixth Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee held in July this year, which agreed on interim PIC reasons as well as the Interim Chemical Review Committee. These are necessary to ensure a proper implementation of the interim Prior Informed Consent procedure.

My delegation strongly supports the primary role of FAO jointly with UNEP in the administration of the PIC procedure, both in the interim and permanently.

I am pleased to inform you that the Japanese Government signed the Rotterdam Convention at the end of August this year, and that it is now taking steps for the ratification of the Convention.

With regard to the Interim Chemical Review Committee, Japan intends to contribute to it by sending an expert as well as providing plentiful scientific knowledge, which it has. I would also like to urge FAO to ensure that its accumulated expertise concerning the use of agricultural commodities and risk management would be effectively utilized in implementing the Convention.

My delegation would like to seek a point of clarification to the funding implication for the Interim Secretariat and Convention Secretariat as indicated in Annex 1. Our understanding is that Annex 1 indicates just the work and budget in the interim period only. It seems to me that Annex

I does make any difference to the cost of the Convention Secretariat. I would like to know whether our understanding is correct or not. Having said this, for further discussion on the funding implication for the activities for 1999 and 2000 at the Conference next week, I would suggest that FAO prepare the revised budget estimate for 1999 and 2000, taking into account the amount of additional pledges and contributions made by several countries as well as priority-setting to the activities in Annex 1, in order that more efficient funding mobilization can be ensured.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Con relación al documento que tenemos para nuestro análisis, la delegación argentina quisiera hacer la siguiente declaración: concordamos en el procedimiento sugerido con respecto a que el Consejo en su informe tome nota de la conclusión exitosa de las negociaciones del convenio, así como su adopción y aplicación durante el período interino.

Sin perjuicio de ello, la delegación argentina considera que, para nuestro país, las consideraciones realizadas oportunamente en Roma, a través de una declaración leída con motivo de la VIª Sesión del Comité de Negociación que adoptó los mecanismos para el período interino, siguen vigentes; a saber: Argentina reafirma como fundamental para la futura transparencia del proceso de implementación de este Convenio el carácter provisional de dichos mecanismos, tal como se establece en el párrafo 25 en adelante del documento UNEP/FAO/PIC Inciso 6/7 en particular en cuanto al número de miembros del Comité Provisional de Examen de Productos Químicos, así como al sistema elegido para su constitución, es decir, regiones de la FAO. Asimismo sigue alentando a las partes para que el nivel de contribuciones haga posible que el Comité Provisional utilice las lenguas oficiales de Naciones Unidas a fin de garantizar la participación de los países en desarrollo.

Con respecto al segundo punto, la delegación argentina entiende que la función de la Secretaría Provisional del Convenio, la tarea desarrollada conjuntamente por el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente y FAO, merecería no sólo que el Consejo tome nota de aquélla sino también un reconocimiento de la excelencia de sus resultados.

En cuanto a las orientaciones sobre la financiación de las actividades de la Secretaría Provisional, la delegación argentina estima que se deberá considerar sobre todo la utilización de los recursos propios de los organismos que integran la Secretaría Conjunta LUMA y FAO.

Por acto separado nosotros haremos entrega a la Secretaría de un recordatorio de lo que fue la declaración interpretativa de la República Argentina en ocasión del VIº Comité Intergubernamental de Negociaciones de la Convención de Rotterdam.

**Mme Wilma DU MARTEAU (Communauté européenne)**

Je parle au nom de la Communauté européenne et de ses Etats Membres. Mon intervention se concentrera sur les trois questions spécifiques mentionnées dans les conclusions du document C 99/14 au paragraphe 24. En ce qui concerne la Convention et sa mise en œuvre, comme l'a déjà exprimé la Communauté européenne et ses États Membres pendant la Conférence diplomatique qui s'est tenue l'année dernière à Rotterdam, nous considérons que la Convention de Rotterdam, telle qu'adoptée et si elle est correctement mise en œuvre, contribuera avec succès à l'amélioration de la gestion des produits chimiques dans les pays en développement et dans les pays avec une économie de transition. Les éléments clefs pour le succès de la Convention sont maintenant entrés en vigueur et sa mise en œuvre efficace.

En ce qui concerne la ratification, je peux vous informer que la Communauté européenne a initié le processus interne de ratification qui inclut une modification formelle de la législation existante et, à ce stade, il est prévu de finaliser ce processus en 2001.

En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre efficace de la Convention, la Communauté européenne est également satisfaite des résultats de la Sixième session du Comité des négociations intergouvernemental qui s'est vu attribuer la responsabilité de la mise en œuvre du régime provisoire établi par la Conférence diplomatique. Le Comité de négociations a réussi à prendre les

décisions nécessaires, notamment en ce qui concerne l'établissement des régions "PIC" provisoires et du Comité d'évaluation des produits chimiques provisoire.

Une mise en œuvre efficace signifie également l'amélioration de la gestion des produits chimiques dans les pays moins avancés, dans le lancement des projets de "capacity-building". La Communauté européenne soutient différents projets sur la gestion des produits chimiques dans les pays en développement et pendant la Sixième session du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental, la Communauté a formellement distribué un document de concept sur le "capacity-building" qui a été très bien reçu, notamment par le Groupe africain. En ce qui concerne le deuxième point, donc des conclusions du document, le Secrétariat provisoire de la Communauté européenne est satisfait du travail produit par le Secrétariat provisoire de la Convention. Bien que les ressources disponibles soient très limitées, tant à la FAO qu'au PNUD, la priorité jusqu'à présent a été donnée à l'organisation des réunions du Comité des négociations intergouvernemental et du Comité d'évaluation des produits chimiques provisoire. Bien que plusieurs pays (y compris certains États Membres de la Communauté européenne) et la Commission européenne, aient contribué financièrement à la Convention à titre volontaire, la Communauté européenne craint que le manque de ressources régulières puisse créer des difficultés, comme cela a été justement souligné par le Secrétariat dans son analyse et par le COAG lors de la quinzième session.

Enfin, en ce qui concerne les directives sur les financements et les activités, nous sommes d'accord avec les activités prioritaires identifiées lors de la sixième session du Comité de négociations en juillet dernier, à savoir la mise en œuvre des procédures de la Convention, ce qui inclut les réunions du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental et du Comité d'évaluation des produits chimiques provisoire et l'organisation d'ateliers de mise en œuvre et de ratification.

Notant et partageant les préoccupations du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental sur la situation financière, nous suggérons que la FAO augmente sa contribution régulière au Secrétariat provisoire de la Convention de Rotterdam pour garantir sa mise en œuvre efficace. Cela impliquera nécessairement des économies correspondantes dans d'autres secteurs. En faisant cette proposition, nous soulignons que la Convention de Rotterdam est un bon exemple d'activité normative qui a des implications directes sur les activités opérationnelles.

**Bill DOERING (Canada)**

As the delegates from Argentina and the European Community have previously mentioned, we would also like to note the excellent cooperation that already exists between FAO and UNEP in the operation of the PIC Secretariat.

In order to build on the strength of those two Organizations in the operation of the Convention Secretariat and ensure FAO's ability to meet its increased obligations, it is going to require more than just extrabudgetary resources. If FAO were unable to fulfil its increased obligations under the Convention the unique perspective and expertise that it brings to the operation of the Convention, would be lost. A financially-secure, bipartite Secretariat, we feel, will minimize the cost of overall implementation of the Convention as there will be little, if any, learning curve required and it will build on the technical assistance and capacity-building expertise already resident in the two Organizations.

For FAO to ensure its continued participation in the Joint PIC Secretariat on an equal footing, with UNEP, we feel it appropriate for FAO to consider reallocating the necessary funds from within the Regular Programme budget to fund their ongoing obligations for the PIC Convention.

**Moussa Bocar LY (Sénégal)**

Les pays africains ont participé activement au processus qui a abouti de façon heureuse à l'adoption de la Convention de Rotterdam. Ce faisant, les pays africains n'ont cessé de dire qu'ils avaient besoin d'une assistance technique et financière pour appliquer la Convention, même au cours de la période transitoire. Nous nous félicitons donc, que pour la période transitoire, la Sixième session du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental ait pu dégager un calendrier de

séminaires, ateliers et autres activités de formation pour mieux comprendre la Convention et pour l'appliquer le moment venu. En tout état de cause, les pays africains, dont le mien, ont déjà engagé le processus de ratification de cette importante convention.

De même, lors de la Sixième Session, les pays africains avaient insisté sur la nécessité d'examiner de façon approfondie les questions liées au règlement des différends, au trafic illicite et à la notion de responsabilité - préoccupation dégagée, du reste, par la session du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental. C'est le cas de remercier l'Union européenne pour son projet de renforcement des capacités, essentiellement utiles aux pays africains, comme rappelé lors de la Sixième session du Comité de négociations intergouvernemental.

Enfin, nous pensons que la FAO doit jouer tout son rôle et remplir ses responsabilités financières à l'égard de la Convention.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)**

Following what the Commission of the European Community has just said, I want just to add a personal note. I had the chance to attend several technical meetings organized by the Secretariat, and I would like to commend FAO Secretariat for its high expertise. I think it is a real Centre of Excellence for FAO. I recall, for example, the meeting on pesticides in Africa and it really was a very fruitful, interesting and stimulating exercise. I also recall the excellent collaboration with UNEP in Geneva. I think that it is important that such crucial activities remain within FAO competence with the necessary budgetary implications, as the Representative of the European Community has just said.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia would just like to make a number of brief comments. Australia commends the work of FAO in both the negotiations leading towards the conclusion of the Rotterdam Treaty, as well as the ongoing Secretariat work that is undertaken with respect to the voluntary and interim PIC procedure. We see the Prior Informed Consent procedure as being a high priority programme which improves the ability of countries to better manage the risks associated with certain chemicals, including pesticides. We would, therefore, support PIC being given a higher priority within the work programme of FAO, and would see that the necessary funding for the Interim Secretariat should be met from within existing budget through reallocation of resources and funds.

**João Maurício CABRAL de MELLO (Brazil)**

First of all, Brazil, as one of the first signatories of the Convention in Rotterdam, would like to give its thanks for the work done by FAO and UNEP during the negotiations and for what has been going on since. I would also like to say that Brazil, as one of the greatest exporters and importers of chemicals, has a high interest in the issue. Brazil also notes with concern the issue of funding for the PIC programme.

**CHAIRMAN**

Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen for your contributions to the debate. I should like to ask the Assistant Director-General for Agriculture to reply to the questions raised during the debate.

**A. SAWADOGO (Sous-Directeur général, Département de l'agriculture)**

Permettez-moi tout d'abord de remercier l'ensemble des délégués pour les félicitations qu'ils ont adressées au Secrétariat. Nous partagerons ces félicitations avec nos amis du PNUE parce que la coopération entre nous a été vraiment remarquable.

Le budget qui est présenté dans cette Annexe date du mois de juillet. Nous nous efforcerons de produire un papier avec le budget tel qu'il se présente actuellement. Deuxième point, ce budget concerne le Secrétariat intérimaire et non pas le Secrétariat de la Convention.

Je me permets de faire un commentaire supplémentaire: il semblerait que le problème du financement par le Programme régulier du Secrétariat concernera le biennium 2002-2003, puisque

la période prévue pour rassembler les cinquante ratifications nécessaires est estimée à au moins deux ans.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you very much Mr Sawadogo.

Of course all the remarks and statements made will be duly recorded. May I surmise that the Council has taken note of the document on Item 4 C99/14. I see no objections.

#### **6. Regional Representation at the CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) (CL 117/INF/10)**

#### **6. Représentation régionale au GCRAI (Groupe consultatif pour la recherche agricole internationale) (CL 117/INF/10)**

#### **6. La representación regional en el Grupo Consultivo sobre Investigación Agrícola Internacional (GCIAI) (CL 117/INF/10)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

As you are aware CGIAR initiated a comprehensive review of the system in 1997. The Group has formulated a proposal that the current system of regional representation should be phased out in consultation with FAO. The Group also requested that FAO, as co-sponsor, consults its governing bodies on the implementation of this decision.

Does anybody wish to take the floor on this Item? I see this is not the case. The document put before the Council for information has been taken note of.

#### **IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS (continued)**

#### **IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES (suite)**

#### **IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS (continuación)**

#### **12. Report of the 70<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, September 1999) (CL 117/5)**

#### **12. Rapport de la soixante-dixième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, septembre 1999) (CL 117/5)**

#### **12. Informe del 70º período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos (Roma, septiembre de 1999) (CL 117/5)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

The Report of the Seventieth Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters gives details of recommendations made by the Committee regarding various International Agreements in the field of fisheries and plant protection, as well as proposed changes regarding the Financial Regulations of the Organization and the Use of Gender Neutral Language in the Basic Texts. I should like Mr Beranek, the Chairman of the CCLM to introduce the report.

#### **Milan BERÁNEK (Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters)**

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to present the Report on the Seventieth Session of the CCLM. On the Agenda there were several items. I would like to stress several of the most important.

Firstly, there was an Agreement for the Establishment of the Regional Commission for Fisheries, RECOFI, under Article 14 of the FAO Constitution. At its Hundred and Sixteenth Session in June 1999, the Council abolished the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission and all its Subsidiaries Bodies, including the Gulfs Committee. At the time, the Council had also encouraged the Members of the Gulfs Committee to proceed with the process of its re-establishment as a Commission under Article 14 of the FAO Constitution.

The main elements of the discussion we had in our Committee you have reflected in the Report. The CCLM considered at the end that the Draft Agreement as attached to the Report of the Committee in Appendix A, was in proper legal form and consistent with the Basic Texts of the



Organization. The CCLM recommended the Draft Agreement be formerly approved by the Council at this Session, under the terms of the proposed Resolution attached to the report of the CCLM.

The second agenda item we had was Amendment to the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific Region. The Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission adopted by consensus, at its Session in July 1999, a Resolution proposing two sets of amendments to the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific Region. These amendments were designed to bring the Agreement into line with the revised text of the International Plant Protection Convention IPPC, which was adopted by the FAO Conference at its Twenty-ninth Session in 1997 and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, so called SPS Agreement, as well as with modern requirements for plant protection.

The Committee examined the proposed amendments, considered them to be in proper legal form, consistent with the Basic Texts of the Organization and recommended that such amendments be approved by the Council.

The Committee considered that the amendments did not involve new obligations for the Contracting Parties and they should therefore come into force with respect to all Contracting Governments as from the thirtieth day after their acceptance by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments.

The CCLM also noted the requested by the APPPC to the Director-General which is depository of the agreement not to circulate the second set of amendments providing for the deletion of the detailed measures to exclude South American Leaf Blight of Hevea from the Region, dealt in Article XIV Appendix B of the Agreement, until such time as a satisfactory regional standard on South American Leaf Blight of Hevea has been adopted by the Commission.

There were further agenda items dealing with three proposals of agreement for cooperation with FAO: Cooperation Agreement Between the Intergovernmental Organization for Marketing Information and Cooperation Services for Fishery Products in Africa, INFOPÊCHE, Cooperation Agreement Between the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization, and Cooperation Agreement Between the Centre for Marketing Information and Advisory Services for Fishery Products in Latin America and the Caribbean INFOPESCA.

All these three Agreements have been considered to be in proper legal form and consistent with the Basic Texts of the Organization. Therefore, the CCLM recommended them for approval of the Council and subsequently to the Conference at the next Session this year.

We had a further agenda item. This agenda item was mentioned several hours ago by the Chairman of the Programme and Finance Committee and it is the amendment of the Financial Regulation 6.9 and 7.1 to provide for the Establishment of a New Revolving Fund for FAO Products and Related Services other than Information Products.

The CCLM recalled that the Programme Committee requested that proposals regarding the handling of semi-commercial products developed under FAO programmes be presented for the guidance of the Governing Bodies. A set of proposals was prepared and these proposals recommend extending the scope of Financial Regulation 6.9 to provide for a New Revolving Fund for FAO Products and Related Services, other than Information Products. This required an amendment to the Financial Regulation 6.9 and consequently amendment also to Financial Regulation 7.1 which must be adopted by the FAO Conference.

The discussion on this agenda item is also reflected in the document CL 117/5. The CCLM recommended, after discussion, that the draft amendments and the covering Draft Resolution be submitted to the Council at this Session for endorsement and subsequently, to the Conference at its Thirtieth Session for approval.

the last agenda item we had before us was the Use of Gender-Neutral Language in the Basic Texts. Here, the CCLM after discussion, recommended that the Conference resolve this in the Basic Texts, that use of one gender be considered as including a reference to the other, unless the

context otherwise requires. It recommended to adopt a Conference Resolution, an interpretative Resolution, which is also attached to this Report.

Allow me in conclusion to thank the Members of the CCLM, representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, France, Malta, Senegal and the United States of America, as well as the Legal Counsel and Secretariat for the assistance and instrumental cooperation during the last term of the CCLM.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you very much Mr Beranek for the introduction of the Report of the Seventieth Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters held in Rome in September 1999.

I now wish to ask the Council whether anybody wants to take the floor to comment on the Report or the Draft Resolutions attached thereto.

#### **José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Antes de aprobar este informe, queremos agradecer la presentación que ha hecho del documento. Hay un apéndice, una decisión que se incluye en el documento sobre el cual nos gustaría tener mayores elementos, es el Apéndice B. El documento se refiere a la parte 3 "Enmiendas al Acuerdo de Protección Fitosanitaria por la Región de Asia y el Pacífico" que en sí determina la prohibición de una planta que afecta básicamente a nuestra Región América Latina. Sabemos que este es un órgano de carácter jurídico, pero el texto es totalmente técnico. Nos gustaría saber cuál es la competencia que tiene la Comisión Interina de Medidas Fitosanitarias en este tema y si, antes de proceder a esta decisión por parte de la Región afectada, que es la Región de Asia y el Pacífico, hubo algún diálogo, algún encuentro con las contrapartes de la Región. Estos son temas que no sé si quepan dentro de la competencia de Asuntos Jurídicos o son más bien temas de carácter técnico.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I see that nobody at the moment wants to raise another point so I should like to ask the Legal Counsel, Mr Moore, to give the explanations Mexico wished to have.

#### **LEGAL COUNSEL**

The answer to the question is yes. There were a couple of meetings which took place during the course of this year which dealt with the whole question of the amendment of this Agreement.

The first was a Technical Consultation, a Technical and Legal Consultation, which took place, I believe it was in February this year, in Bangkok, and made certain recommendations. These recommendations were then considered in some detail at the Twenty-First Session of the Asia and the Pacific Plant Protection Commission, in July 1999. It was at that Session that the Commission adopted, by consensus, the two sets of amendments that you see set out before you.

Basically, the first set of amendments, if I can just explain a little bit more in detail, the first set of amendments would update the mandate of the Asia and the Pacific Plant Protection Commission and give it certain powers and bring it into line with the SPS Agreement. They also provide for the power of the Commission to set regional and subregional standards, i.e. phytosanitary standards.

The second set of amendments are to delete certain provisions, the measures to exclude South American Leaf Blight of Hevea, which were originally in the Agreement itself, both in the main part of the Agreement and in an Appendix, in this case Appendix B to the Agreement. It was felt by a number of countries that these provisions were not perhaps in strict conformity with the SPS Agreement requirements and should eventually be deleted. However, a number of the rubber-producing countries, Members of the Commission, felt that they did not wish to have these measures deleted until such time as a satisfactory regional standard was in place. This is the reason for the two sets of amendments.

The first set of amendments will come into force immediately, and the second set of amendments will be circulated for acceptance only at such time as a satisfactory regional standard is adopted by the Commission.

In short, the answer to your question is, yes, it has been considered at length by the technical body that is competent for these matters.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you very much, Mr Moore, for giving us these explanations and thank you very much, Mexico, for raising these points which helped to clarify the subject matter.

I think that we can now conclude this item and state that the Council adopts the Report of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters, and the Draft Resolutions should be submitted to the Conference, attached to the Report. As I see no objections, this is the case, the Report and the Draft Resolutions are adopted.

*The report was adopted.*

*Le rapport est adopté.*

*El informe es aprobado.*

**13. Amendment to the Staff Regulations (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)**

**13. Amendement au Statut du personnel (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)**

**13. Enmienda del Estatuto del Personal (CL 117/9; CL 117/INF/16)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

As you may be aware, the Executive Director of the World Food Programme asked the Director-General of FAO to submit to the Council a proposal to amend the FAO Staff Regulations in order to allow WFP to issue indefinite appointments to its international professional staff.

As the Director-General can promulgate staff regulations with the approval of the Council, the Council is now requested to give its approval to the proposed amendments. The Legal Counsel of FAO will give further background on this item.

Mr. Moore, you have the floor.

#### **LEGAL COUNSEL**

As you have said, the item under consideration was inserted in the Agenda of your Council at the request of the Executive Director of the World Food Programme. As you know, in line with the General Regulations of WFP, the Executive Director has delegated authority for personnel management relating to the Programme.

In the course of the past year, WFP has been conducting a review of its personnel policies, in light of its functional requirements. One of the conclusions of this review was that the Programme should introduce an indefinite appointment for its staff in the professional and higher categories, that is from Grade P-1 to Grade D-1. The indefinite appointment, an appointment type that does not carry a precise date of expiry, would replace progressively continuing and fixed-term appointments. It would become gradually a single contractual tool for staff in the professional and higher categories.

WFP feels that this appointment is more in line with its fundamental nature as a programme financed by voluntary contributions. The PSA Budget, that is the Programme and Support Administration Budget, which covers Headquarters and Support Services, is financed exclusively from overhead charges on activities conducted by the Programme. Thus, WFP needs to be able to expand in a contracted staff not only in the field, but also in management and support functions at Headquarters, in a flexible and balanced manner.

From a management point of view, the appointment would be easier to administer. From the point of view of the staff, the indefinite appointment would respond better to a career with the

Programme as long as the resources and the core business remain stable. It will allow the Programme to attract and retain more high-quality staff.

This type of appointment is already used and being generalized at the UNHCR, for which it was initially instituted at the United Nations, whose activities are similar to those of WFP. A number of United Nations Agencies and programmes engaged in relief activities are considering generalizing this type of appointment. It is also used by relief organizations outside the United Nations family.

Article VII.6 of the General Regulations of WFP provides that the Executive Director shall administer the staff of WFP in accordance with FAO's staff regulations and rules and such special rules as may be established by the Executive Director, in agreement with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of FAO.

As the FAO Staff Regulations, however, do not provide for indefinite appointments, a limited amendment to the FAO Staff Regulations is required, making it possible for the Executive Director of WFP to offer indefinite appointments to its staff.

This is the amendment to the Staff Regulations that is before the Council for approval. I should make it clear that the provision does not apply at all to FAO staff. As already indicated, the indefinite appointment will be applied to staff in the Professional and Higher categories from Grade P-1 to D-1 in WFP only. When applying the new appointment type, acquired rights of serving staff will be strictly respected. A set of special rules setting out modalities for the implementation of the appointment type is being developed, along with relevant Manual provisions, for the implementation of the appointment for international Professional staff.

**Sra. María de los Angeles ARRIOLA AGUIRRE (México)**

Agradecemos la información que nos ha hecho llegar la Secretaría y estamos de acuerdo con estas enmiendas, no tenemos ninguna objeción. Sólomente queremos resaltar, como señala el párrafo 2, que este cambio simplificará y hará más equitativa la contratación de su personal. Nos referimos a esto porque, como lo hemos hecho ya manifiesto durante las ocasiones en que la Junta Ejecutiva del Programa Mundial de Alimentos ha tratado el tema de la contratación de personal, nuestro Grupo Regional ha insistido en la necesidad de que haya un equilibrio entre las distintas regiones, ya que no se ha reflejado en manera cabal, por lo menos por lo que se refiere a nuestro Grupo Regional. Entonces, al aprobar esta enmienda, esperamos que este equilibrio se pueda lograr en un futuro cercano.

**Mrs Laurie J. TRACY (United States of America)**

I am speaking here as the current President of the WFP Executive Board. The Programme is presenting here for Council's approval a proposal to change slightly the FAO Staff Regulations which have to guide WFP's approach to human resource management.

As Mr Moore mentioned, the changes do not affect FAO staff. The changes also do not affect the General Service staff of WFP. They only affect WFP's international Professional staff. The reason that WFP is seeking changes in the Staff Regulations is because FAO's Staff Regulations did not envision, when they were developed, the kind of contract that WFP now needs to have available. As Mr Moore mentioned, WFP is funded entirely by voluntary contributions which are made on a full-cost- recovery basis and it needs the flexibility, as the other relief organizations do, to expand and contract its international staff when circumstances require.

I think what was interesting to me in watching this process evolve, as I did as Board President, is the way in which they were developed in close collaboration, and in a very transparent way, with the WFP Staff Associations, with all types of types of staff, not just the international staff, and of course with the esteemed Legal Counsel in constant attendance. I was quite impressed by that.

I would also note that Human Resources Director, Dyane Dufresne, presented a very detailed overview of this - exhaustive some would say, complete with charts and pointers etc., - to the Bureau of the Board, the WFP Board, which is the interim committee comprised of all the

regional lists. We asked her a lot of hard questions, and I am happy to say she was able to answer all of them.

The changes simply permit WFP to hire its staff on an indefinite basis, rather than arbitrarily limiting some staff to fixed-term or contracts, which under the current regulations cannot be renewed, which leaves some in a very difficult situation, even when the core business, or the business for which they were hired, is continuing.

It also renders the system of contracts for worldwide Professional staff simpler and more equitable and eliminates difficulties that arise when staff serving in very similar capacities have two different kinds of contracts, which can happen quite frequently in WFP.

Finally, I think it brings, as Mr Moore said, WFP into line with its sister Agencies who are involved more in relief and emergency operations, such as UNHCR. UNICEF also has these changes under consideration. So, on behalf I think of the Bureau, we looked hard at this and we were satisfied with the answers we got. I, as President of the Board, would recommend to the Council that we approve the changes and I would also note that my Government also favours this adoption by Council.

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

On behalf of the Republic of Korea, I would like to support this document CL 117/9. When we think about altering the stable position of the staff, that is very important in making the project more effective. In this sense, I would like to support this item.

**João Maurício CABRAL de MELLO (Brazil)**

On behalf of the Brazilian delegation, I would just like to say that we have the same concerns as those expressed by the Mexican delegation.

**Martin C. KASIRYE (Uganda)**

The Uganda delegation broadly supports the amendment placed before us, and would also like to support the sentiments expressed by Mexico and Brazil.

**Ignacio TRUEBA JAINAGA (España)**

España como Miembro de la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA apoya esta propuesta que considera importante. El PMA está desarrollando últimamente una labor eficaz, ha hecho grandes esfuerzos desde el punto de vista de la organización de sus operaciones, desde el punto de vista de la clarificación y transparencia de la utilización de los recursos económicos y financieros y quiero respaldar plenamente lo que ha comunicado la Presidente de la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA, la distinguida Representante de los Estados Unidos. Por lo tanto, España apoya esta propuesta que sin duda redundará en un mejor y en un funcionamiento más eficaz del PMA.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)**

I have been convinced by all the arguments in favour of this indefinite appointment. May I ask Mr Moore why all the advantages of these new kinds of contracts could not be extended to FAO?

**CHAIRMAN**

If there are no more comments and questions, I should like to ask the Legal Counsel, Mr Moore, to reply to the remarks made.

**LEGAL COUNSEL**

I will reply to the last remark first. I think there is a difference in the funding mechanisms, the type of funding that we have. Ours is a Regular Programme financing with mandatory contributions from the Governments, whereas the whole point of the introduction of the indefinite appointment for WFP, as I understand it, is because they have voluntary funding and that funding can go up and down.

But, anyway, let us put it this way: that WFP has felt the need to introduce this particular type of appointment because of its particular funding situation. There is no intention, no proposal, that this be extended to FAO.

I think there are no other real questions. I should just point out, however, that the reference to making more equitable the contracting of its staff, in paragraph 2 of the paper, did in fact refer to the, how shall I say, the equity as between, as among the various staff of WFP. In other words, having a single contracting mechanism dealing with indefinite appointments rather than some staff with fixed-term appointments and some with continuing appointments, etc. This is what the reference was to in paragraph 2 of the document. I think that probably clarifies the reference for the purposes of the remarks made by Mexico, Uganda and Brazil.

I do not know if you have any further questions?

#### **CHAIRMAN**

If this answers the questions of Mexico, Brazil and Uganda, I think we can proceed to the approval of the proposed Amendments to the Staff Regulations. Can I take it that these amendments are approved? This is the case.

*The amendments were approved.*

*Les avenants sont approuvés.*

*Las enmiendas son adoptadas.*

#### **V. OTHER MATTERS**

#### **V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES**

#### **V. OTROS ASUNTOS**

#### **15. Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and other main Sessions (1998-99) (CL 117/INF/8)**

#### **15. Calendrier révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des réunions principales de 1998-99 (CL 117/INF/8)**

#### **15. Calendario de los períodos de sesiones de los Órganos Rectores y de otras reuniones principales de la FAO (1998-99) (CL 117/INF/8)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

We are now going on to Item 15, the Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and Other Main Sessions in 1998-1999 as contained in document CL 117/INF/8. You will note the proposed date for our next session is the 24 November.

Can I take it that the Council agrees that our Hundred and Eighteenth Session convene here on Wednesday, the 24 November?

*It was so decided.*

*Il en est ainsi décidé.*

*Así se acuerda.*

#### **16. Any Other Matters (CL 117/INF/15)**

#### **16. Autres questions (CL 117/INF/15)**

#### **16. Otros asuntos (CL 117/INF/15)**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Council's attention is drawn to Document CL 117/INF/15 which contains an amendment to WFP General Rule, XIII.1. which was approved by the WFP Executive Board. It is submitted to the Council for information. Does any Member of the Council wish to raise any other matters? This is not the case. That concludes Item 16.

*The meeting rose at 18:15 hours*

*La séance est levée à 18 h 15*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 18.15 horas*

# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Seventeenth Session Cent dix-septième session 117º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 9-11 November 1999 Rome, 9-11 novembre 1999 Roma, 9-11 de noviembre de 1999</b>
<b>FIFTH PLENARY MEETING CINQUIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>11 November 1999</b>

**The Fifth Plenary Meeting was opened at 21.05 hours  
Mr Sjarifudin Baharshaj,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding**

**La Cinquième séance plénière est ouverte à 21 h 05  
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharshaj,  
Président indépendant du Conseil**

**Se abre la Quinta sesión plenaria a las 21.05 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharshaj,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo**

**ADOPTION OF REPORT  
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT  
APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME**

**DRAFT REPORT – PARTS I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2; CL 117/REP/3;  
CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7; CL 117/REP/8; CL 117/REP/9)  
**LES PROJETS DE RAPPORT – PARTIES I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2;  
CL 117/REP/3; CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7; CL 117/REP/8;  
CL 117/REP/9)  
**LOS PROYECTOS DE INFORME, PARTES I-IX** (CL 117/REP/1; CL 117/REP/2;  
CL 117/REP/3; CL 117/REP/4; CL 117/REP/5; CL 117/REP/6; CL 117/REP/7; CL 117/REP/8;  
CL 117/REP/9)

**CHAIRMAN**

I call the Fifth Meeting of the Hundred and Seventeenth Council Session to order.

I would like to invite all delegates to ensure that they have before them the various parts of the Report which the Council is called upon to adopt. There are nine parts, numbered consecutively from CL 117/REP/1 to CL 117/REP/9.

Before I ask Ms Wögerbauer to introduce the Draft Report, the Secretariat would like to make an announcement to you.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

I should like to inform the Council that, in addition to all the Reports, which are now available in all languages, the Verbatim Record of yesterday's discussion, which is CL 117/PV/4, has just come out and we will be distributing it in the room in five minutes. It will be distributed here. This is the CL 117/PV/4, which reflects the discussion of yesterday.

**Ms Hedwig WÖGERBAUER (Chairperson, Drafting Committee)**

We had two meetings of the Drafting Committee: the first one yesterday evening, which lasted until 11.00 hours and the second one, starting at 09.30 hours working until 17.45 hours in the afternoon today.

Thanks to all Members of the Drafting Committee, we worked in a very constructive and fair way and in a real spirit of compromise. The outcome of our meeting you can find before you. It presents a compromise, and I do hope that there will be a proposal made to adopt this compromise *en bloc*.

I would like to add, if there are any language changes, please be so kind and announce them to the Secretariat directly.

May I also remind delegates of the unwritten rule that Members of the Drafting Committee should not intervene during the debate in Plenary on the Report.

**CHAIRMAN**

The Drafting Committee has worked intensively for many long hours to prepare the Draft Report. It examined all the issues in detail and I wish to thank you, and to acknowledge the hard work of all the Members of the Committee.

It seems to me that the result is a Draft Report which has been skilfully put together in order to achieve a final balanced text, which is generally acceptable, I hope, to all.

I would therefore like to ask the Council whether, in light of this, we could adopt the Report *en bloc*. Of course, we recognize that the text may not be completely satisfactory to all Members. Accordingly, after the Report is approved, *en bloc*, those Members wishing to take the floor may do so, and their comments will be printed in the Verbatim Records of this meeting.



May I have responses from the floor.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Quisiera apoyar tanto las palabras suyas como la sugerencia de la Presidenta del Comité de Redacción. Creo que los que asistimos al duro trabajo que tuvo el Comité de Redacción y especialmente la Presidenta del mismo en asegurar un informe que a nuestro modo de ver es equilibrado y que aunque no deja a nadie satisfecho en su plenitud, es más, deja a todos igualmente insatisfechos, me parece que es mucho más justo. Por esta situación, quisiera endosar y apoyar lo que usted ha sugerido, y que el informe se apruebe en bloque.

**A.M.M. SHAWKAT ALI (Bangladesh)**

I deeply appreciate the Herculean task that the Drafting Committee has performed and I wish to extend my compliments to the Chairperson and to all the Members of the Committee.

I think the proposal to adopt all the Reports *en bloc* is a fair one and there have been a lot of compromises, as I can see from the different Reports. Having said that, I will crave the indulgence of my fellow Council Members, to draw their attention to the documents CL 117/REP/6 dealing with the multifunctional issue, which was debated at length throughout the Council session.

I think the Draft, as it has been placed before us, is an excellent one but I feel somewhat uncomfortable with one word occurring in paragraph 5 and it is the last sentence, beginning with "... While recognizing the preparatory work done at the Maastricht Conference ...". Instead of "recognizing", may I propose, with the indulgence of the fellow Members of the Drafting Committee, which has done so much hard work, that it may be substituted by "noting".

The reasons are as follows: it was supposed to be an information document and paragraph 4 of the draft clearly recognizes that.

Second, in the course of the debate many of the distinguished delegates clearly stated that it did not, and I repeat, it did not reflect the views expressed in the Maastricht Conference by many of the participants, so it is an incomplete document.

Third, many delegates in the course of the debate, in the course of this session, stated that the multifunctional character of agriculture, the very concept needed to be examined in more depth before it is accepted, or may I say, recognized.

Fourth, some delegates, in the course of the debate, felt that all human activities are multifunctional. Why single out agriculture?

Fifth, on the reverse side, others, who supported the multifunctional concept, mainly relied on the fact that these wordings were offered in WFS (Word Food Summit) and the Rio Conference, Agenda 21. There is, however, a difference. The difference is: use of the words as such, and use of the concept itself.

Finally, as I stated yesterday, the full Report which is to be prepared by FAO is not before us. It will be available in early 2000. So, why recognize something for which the full Report is not available?

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Nous sommes aussi d'avis de porter un jugement favorable sur le travail considérable qui a été réalisé par le Comité de rédaction et nous ne souhaiterions pas, bien entendu, entraver un travail rapide sur ce document. Nous n'aurions, pour notre part, que deux observations à faire et si vous me permettez, je vais vous les formuler.

Elles portent uniquement sur le document CL 117/REP/9. La première sur le paragraphe 6 de ce document qui se réfère à notre débat et à nos échanges de vues sur l'intérêt que le Conseil aurait démontré à la possibilité de créer un Groupe de travail. Je ne pense pas que ce paragraphe rende compte des débats, au moins, de la manière dont il a été conclu sous votre égide. En effet, lors de la conclusion, la Présidence de ce Conseil a bien dit qu'il ne lui apparaissait pas faisable d'établir un tel Groupe de travail et qu'en conséquence, tout ce que le Conseil pouvait faire, était de

transmettre à la Conférence la Version 4.0 ainsi que le Rapport du Conseil. Je pense que ceci est une omission dans le paragraphe 6. Il conviendrait que le paragraphe 6 soit complété, pour tenir compte des conclusions qui ont été exprimées par la Présidence, et qui n'ont fait l'objet d'aucune observation.

Un deuxième point concerne le paragraphe 14 du même document CL 117/REP/9. Je pense qu'il y a une contradiction avec la conclusion de nos débats. En effet, dans la dernière phrase de ce paragraphe 14 qui constitue l'élément essentiel du dispositif de ce rapport, il est dit: "il (le Conseil) a suggéré que l'actuelle session adopte le Cadre stratégique, en tenant compte de l'ensemble des observations émises à propos de la Version 4.0"; mais alors, quel rapport avec nos conclusions, Monsieur le Président ? J'aurais sur cela des suggestions à vous faire pour la rédaction si le Conseil voulait bien les prendre en considération. Je pense que ce qui a été en fait acté, c'est que nous transmettions le Rapport du Conseil et la Version 4.0 à la Conférence. Ceci est un fait, et l'autre fait - mais qui n'est pas dans le même paquet - c'est qu'effectivement, et cela est tout à fait normal, des propositions ont été transmises par un certain nombre d'États Membres, et lors du débat sur la Version 4.0, ces amendements seront exprimés par les États Membres et seront pris en considération, si la Conférence veut le faire. Mais nous ne pouvons pas dire que le Conseil a demandé que l'on tienne compte de ces observations. C'est très différent.

#### **Moussa Bocar LY (Sénégal)**

Laissez-moi dire mon admiration pour le Comité de rédaction car, au sortir de ce débat difficile sur au moins trois questions essentielles: le Programme de travail et du budget, le Cadre stratégique, notamment les points concernant le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture, je me demandais comment on allait pouvoir s'en sortir. Est-ce qu'on n'allait pas créer une injustice en redonnant le fardeau au Comité de rédaction ? Je vois que le Comité de rédaction s'est acquitté de sa tâche de façon généralement très acceptable. Mais je ne serais pas honnête avec moi-même, si je ne soulevais pas la difficulté, le malaise que j'éprouve concernant un paragraphe du document CL 117/ REP/3, paragraphe 8, dont j'ai discuté d'ailleurs avec les Représentants de notre Groupe au Comité de rédaction. Et je voudrais être rassuré par le Président du Comité de rédaction et le Secrétariat car, si on lit le paragraphe 8, "le Conseil a approuvé la protection dans un certain nombre de domaines hautement pluritaires dans le scénario CNZ". Alors, je suis un peu gêné parce qu'il y a comme une implication, c'est comme si, en approuvant la protection de ce nombre de domaines, on se situe déjà dans l'approbation du scénario CNZ. Enfin du moins, c'est la logique qui transparait de ma lecture de ce paragraphe. Alors je souhaiterais être rassuré. Pourquoi ne pas analyser, envisager tous les cas de figure dans le cadre de programmes de domaines hautement pluritaires ? Pourquoi seulement se limiter au scénario CNZ ? N'y a-t-il pas un risque à déformer notre débat puisque, au contraire, nous ne nous sommes pas mis d'accord sur le scénario CNZ. Au contraire le maximum de pays, dont le plus important numériquement, le Groupe des 77, a plutôt appuyé la Croissance Réelle Zéro comme site minimum. Sur ce bénéfice, malgré les difficultés que j'aurais pu avoir au paragraphe 10 par rapport au paragraphe 9, où l'on met "de nombreux Membres" et "également de nombreux Membres", on peut dire numériquement, ce n'est peut être pas juste, mais je peux encore laisser passer. Mais là, j'éprouve un malaise que je souhaiterais être dissipé par le Secrétariat et d'abord par le Président du Comité de rédaction.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Before I give the floor to the Chairperson, are there any more interventions from the floor? From the Membership? I see none. I invite the Chairperson to respond to some of the questions and comments.

#### **Ms Hedwig WÖGERBAUER (Chairperson, Drafting Committee)**

I would like to refer, at first, to the intervention of Senegal. As I remember that discussion during the Drafting Committee, the ZNG scenario was put in during an intervention of Pakistan. As for the point of Bangladesh is concerned, I would rather like to have the remarks seen in the Verbatim Reports.

With regard to the points raised by France, we had a lengthy discussion on that point, and we at last came to a compromise not to have a conclusion at this point. We discussed the possibility of having it at the end of the statement within the conclusions, and after a long discussion we dropped the points made there. There was one intervention by Chile, if I remember correctly, and one intervention by, I think it was by maybe Canada, I am not quite sure about this, and then again Chile and Austria. So, I think I have covered this point, and the point of paragraph 14. I am not quite sure about if I have covered this point too.

There was a decision concerning paragraph 14 not to have a conclusion regarding the Chairman's Report in this paragraph. I hope this answers the questions posed by the delegation of France.

**Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)**

I would like to support Senegal's view. I do not think we had the right response on that. The paragraph 8 does give some kind of an indication that there is an endorsement. I would rather think that the correct wording would be "The Council noted the protection in ZNG scenario" instead of "endorse" because I do not think there is an endorsement as such at all. "The Council noted" would be more like it, or if you want to substitute it with "Some Members endorse" maybe, but not "All Members".

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

If I might turn to the comment made by the Representative of France concerning paragraph 14, and after listening to his comments, this is in CL 117/REP/ 9, Paragraph 14. I see that there is, in fact, some confusion by the way we have chosen the words. Indeed, we say, "...The Council suggested the adoption by the Conference session, taking into account all the comments, etc. . . ." We did not mean to say that the Council had taken into account all of the comments. We meant to say that the Conference would take into account all the comments which would be made on Version 4.0 and would subsequently adopt a Strategic Framework, but the wording now makes it appear as if the Council had taken into account all of the comments. We meant to suggest that the Conference would reach a decision after having taken into account the comments.

Second, with regard to the point raised by Senegal, Mr Wade of the Secretariat responded to this on two separate occasions because the Members of the Drafting Group also noted that this seemed strange. You may wish to request that Mr Wade explain this, but I believe that the answer had to do with the fact that there were, indeed, more priorities protected under Zero Nominal Growth than there were protected under Zero Real Growth.

**Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

Je voudrais, tout en appuyant la déclaration du délégué du Sénégal, attirer l'attention sur le fait que la place du paragraphe 8 du rapport CL 117/REP/3 par rapport aux éléments de détail qui pourraient pousser à adopter une option ou une autre en ce qui concerne le niveau du budget, serait comme privilégier déjà l'adoption d'une version par rapport aux autres. Nous proposons qu'on déplace ce paragraphe et nous appuyons également l'intervention du délégué de l'Inde où le Conseil a relevé, pas approuvé, a relevé, que dans l'option Croissance Nominale Zéro, on s'est soucié de la protection de certains programmes et non pas approuvé, parce qu'on a pas approuvé une version. Cela permettrait de lever ce qui paraît, en tout cas dans la version française lorsqu'on le lit avec cet échelonnement des chapitres de lever l'équivoque qui pourrait planer. Car avant d'arriver au niveau du budget, c'est comme si on avait déjà approuvé un de ces niveaux en privilégiant la Croissance Nominale Zéro. Donc nous proposons qu'on enlève le terme "approuvé" parce qu'il n'y a pas eu d'approbation. On a noté, et on a compris l'explication, mais on n'a pas approuvé quoi que ce soit. On le déplace après l'analyse des différentes options au niveau du texte à partir du Chapitre 9, là où on parle des niveaux du budget. Cela faciliterait un peu la compréhension pour lever l'équivoque.

**Tony WADE (Director, Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation)**

Yes, in the case of paragraph 8, the intention, both in the original draft which did not include the words "...in the ZNG scenario. . .", so it simply read, "...The Council endorsed the protection

offered to a number of high priority areas. . .", and then listed those. Most of those came from the previous Council, I might add. It was to make it clear that the Council agreed with the priorities that were expressed through that protection.

The distinguished delegate of Pakistan was concerned that that was endorsing the idea that there should be reductions in other areas, and wanted to emphasize the fact that this was a consequence largely of the ZNG scenario, although, in fact, these areas are largely protected in the ZRG scenario as well, I might add.

Given the interpretation that has been put on it and re-reading it, one can understand a little bit that it starts to sound like it is endorsing ZNG which was not the intent of any of the Members of the Drafting Committee, as I understand it, not in this paragraph. It might be easily solved to say that "The Council endorsed the protection "even" in the ZNG scenario offered to a number of high priority areas". By adding the word "even" in front, you make it very clear that it is nothing to do with endorsing the ZNG scenario, it is that even at that low level, these areas being protected was a good idea. Now, I do not know if it helps, but it is an attempt to trying to find a quick answer to what could become a tricky bit of drafting.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I think we should now not continue to try to adopt it *en bloc*. I would offer that we should go part by part. I think by doing so, we can focus on some of the problems of adopting this Report.

#### **Moussa Bocar LY (Sénégal)**

Je voudrais remercier tous ceux qui ont pris le temps et l'énergie d'aider à résoudre ce problème. Je crois que nous nous entendons bien maintenant et je suis content que M. Wade ait donné enfin la direction dans laquelle nous orienter. Dans le cadre des consultations que nous avons eues sur ce point, je vois ici au crayon qu'un collègue avait proposé quelque chose. Je ne sais pas si ça peut aider. Je le crois, et je vais le lire peut-être. Là où il y a dans le "scénario CNZ" ça sera remplacé par "dans tous les cas de figure". Je crois que cela correspond à l'explication donnée par M. Wade et je ne sais pas si cela pourrait aider à résoudre le problème. En tout cela me semble être satisfaisant.

#### **Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

I wonder if it might be possible for us to perhaps spend a little more time or look to another solution rather than go on and consider it paragraph by paragraph. We are very close to adoption *en bloc*. There are perhaps three to four points that have been made. If you do not feel that we can make progress that way, perhaps you could ask the Members who raised those points to have an informal meeting with the Drafting Committee to review those, but I would urge you to allow us to continue on for perhaps ten minutes. I think we can reach agreement. I think we have already solved three if not four of the problems, so would it be possible to allow us to continue working in Plenary?

#### **Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je voudrais d'abord remercier la Présidence du Comité de rédaction pour ses explications et surtout la délégation canadienne qui a fait un effort considérable de clarification, ce qui nous a beaucoup aidé. Plutôt que de nous réunir avec le Comité de rédaction et de relancer une prolongation de ce Comité, je pense si vous le permettez, qu'on puisse vous faire des suggestions de rédaction. Il ne reste que quelques points à régler. Pour reprendre ce que le Canada expliquait si bien: pourquoi cette dernière phrase du paragraphe 14 des conclusions ne pourrait-elle pas être coupée en deux, c'est-à-dire, mettre un point après "Cadre stratégique" et continuer en disant "Le Conseil a noté les observations émises par plusieurs Membres à propos de la Version 4.0"? Parce qu'il est vrai, chacun doit en convenir, que ces observations étaient émises par une voix ou par une autre et que la Conférence les prendra en considération. Donc, c'est une suggestion que je vous remets, donc la dernière phrase dirait "Il a suggéré que l'actuelle session adopte le Cadre stratégique. Le Conseil a noté les observations émises par plusieurs Membres à propos de la Version 4.0" C'est une première suggestion.

Pour le paragraphe 6 je n'ai pas eu de réponse mais j'ai cru comprendre de la Présidence du Comité de rédaction que le Comité n'avait pas voulu reprendre dans les conclusions, excusez-moi de la redite, mais je ne peux pas faire autrement, n'a pas voulu reprendre dans les conclusions du Rapport CL 117/REP/9 les conclusions du Président lors de l'examen de ce point. Je n'arguerai pas sur le problème que cela me pose, mais il n'empêche que ces conclusions étaient prononcées, alors j'aimerais savoir comment le Rapport peut rendre compte par un moyen ou par un autre de la conclusion réelle qui a été émise. Puisque lorsque le marteau est tombé, il n'y a pas eu d'observations. Donc il faudrait trouver là un moyen, je suis entre vos mains, il faudrait trouver un moyen qui, même si cela va sans dire, ça ira encore mieux en le disant.

Le troisième point c'est de remercier encore le Canada, et M. Wade pour l'explication qu'il a donnée à la délégation du Sénégal et à la délégation du Cameroun parce qu'effectivement le paragraphe 8 du rapport CL 117/REP/3, je ne souhaitais pas encombrer le débat, pose une vraie question et je pense que la solution qui a été proposée par le Sénégal pour la rédaction de ce paragraphe 8 est tout à fait convenable, qu'on dise "dans tous les cas de figure" ou "quel que soit le scénario". J'appuie donc la proposition faite par le Sénégal.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

I think there is still hope that we can accept this, adopt this *en bloc* and focus on the problematic versions here. I think Bangladesh had a very concrete proposal when he commented on the outcome of the Report, on the outcome of the Maastricht Conference, instead of endorsing acknowledging, he proposed that the word "noting" should be used. I think we do not have any difficulty with that. And France, I think has already indicated that there are changes in the text that make it such that it can be adopted with one exception, probably, on paragraph 6 of CL 117/REP/9, and I think that can be cleared up if we look at it intensively.

Senegal, with France and India, I think, can also be sorted out with the explanation by Mr Wade. The problem now is whether or not we are going to insert the words and change words or change the text now, such that it can be adopted *en bloc*, or can we accept those changes and ask the Secretariat and the Drafting Committee to make the necessary changes in the text later on.

Certainly, after the changes proposed, the Secretariat can go back to those delegates that had indicated their wish to have these changes in the Report; if that can be done, then I think that will help us to adopt this Report.

So, my proposal is that we have seen the solutions of the problems voiced by the one, two three, four, five distinguished delegates, and I propose that the Secretariat and the Chairperson of the Drafting Committee will work on this, in light of the discussion that followed. If that can be done, then we will adopt this Report *en bloc*.

#### **Hans-Christian BEAUMOND (Communauté européenne)**

Peut-être n'ai-je pas bien compris, mais vous suggérez d'accepter la proposition du Bangladesh, alors que le Bangladesh était Membre du Comité de rédaction. Je crois que c'est contraire aux règles qui ont été précisées en début de cette séance, à savoir qu'on n'allait pas laisser les Membres du Comité de rédaction changer ce qui avait été accepté par le groupe de rédaction, et la Présidente du Comité de rédaction avait effectivement proposé de noter simplement dans le "Verbatim" la remarque du Bangladesh.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

We have heard what was commented by Bangladesh. Whether it is breaking the rules or not, we have already heard his comments and I think most of us will agree with them. I think this issue is already resolved.

#### **Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)**

I just want to say that we support Bangladesh's proposal. If there is no other objection, the change could be incorporated.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

I believe that you made an excellent suggestion. We have heard four or five proposals. We should be able to take those into account, but I would like very much to hear in Plenary what those proposed changes are so that we can hear them and agree to them now, rather than be surprised when we see the Report of the Council at some future date. Once we hear those, then we will be in a better position to extend our support.

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

If you will please look at CL 117/REP/3, paragraph 8. This is the proposal by the delegations of India, Cameroon and Senegal. The first sentence should read "The Council endorsed the protection in all scenarios offered to a number of high-priority areas ...". And then it reads as is already drafted.

In CL 117/REP/6, Paragraph 5, the very last phrase in this last sentence should read, "While noting the preparatory work done at the Maastricht Conference ...". This is the proposal by the delegation of Bangladesh, as endorsed by the delegation of India.

Then in CL 117/REP/9, there is some language which we need to propose with regard to paragraph 6, as requested by the delegation of France. The delegation of France has instead proposed a wording of sorts for paragraph 14 of that very same REP, that is CL 117/REP/9. As it came out in the English interpretation, this would be the very last sentence in Paragraph 14 and it reads as follows: "The Council noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0, and that they will be considered by the Conference".

**CHAIRMAN**

Are we satisfied with the changes proposed by the Drafting Committee?

**RHO Kyeong-sang (Korea, Republic of)**

Could you repeat the CL 117/REP/9, paragraph 14 again, please?

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

This is paragraph 14 in CL 117/REP/9. You will please delete the original sentence, the very last sentence, in paragraph 14. You should replace that last sentence with the following wording: "The Council noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0 and that they will be considered by the Conference".

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

On est très proche de la proposition. Je vais lire très lentement ma proposition et vous verrez ensuite si elle répond à votre attente: "Il (c'est le Conseil) a suggéré que l'actuelle session adopte le Cadre stratégique, Version 4.0. Il a noté les observations émises par plusieurs Membres qui seront prises en considération lors de la Conférence.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Para muchos de nosotros ha sido un largo día y hemos discutido varias horas, no solamente esta parte del Informe, sino también las otras y creo que el sentimiento que había en el Comité de Redacción fue precisamente que habíamos alcanzado un buen nivel de compromiso. A mí me parece que la propuesta hecha por la Secretaría es la más adecuada, puesto que el proceso de evolución del Marco Estratégico tiene como finalidad su adopción por la Conferencia y, por lo tanto, estamos en ese proceso. Si nosotros adoptamos el Marco Estratégico, posteriormente no veo como la Conferencia modificaría las observaciones que se consideren. Creo que este es un proceso en evolución, es un proceso que debe dejar satisfechos igualmente a todos los países, todos los Estados Miembros, todos los Miembros y en ese sentido creo que facilitaría mucho el consenso en este segmento de la propuesta hecha por la Secretaría.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

As the Members of the Drafting Committee recognized, I am always in agreement with my colleague from Chile and I have to admit that I am in agreement with him this time. I can assure the delegate from France that other Members of his Region also suggested to the Drafting Committee that we should propose that the Council adopt Version 4.0. I must point out that a number of Members of the Drafting Committee also suggested that a number of countries were not in favour of adopting Version 4.0 as it now stands. So that did not get very far in the Drafting Committee, and certainly my country was one that was not ready to adopt Version 4.0 as it now stands. I can accept the proposal of the Secretary of the Drafting Committee reflecting the comments that were made, but I cannot accept the proposal of France.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Para ser sintéticos nos sumamos a lo expresado por el Representante de Chile y, ahora, por el Representante de Canadá. Mi país no estuvo en el Comité de Redacción, pero hace toda la coherencia lógica del proceso de análisis del Marco Estratégico, indicando que la propuesta que ha hecho la Presidenta del Comité de Redacción recoge no sólo los debates, sino que además recoge el espíritu que se ha tenido durante todo el proceso participativo del Marco Estratégico, por lo tanto mi delegación se suma a las delegaciones de Chile y Canadá en apoyo a la propuesta de la Señora Presidenta.

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je remercie les délégations du Chili, de l'Argentine et du Canada pour les éclaircissements donnés. Je pense que, pour ce qui concerne la délégation française, nous pourrions nous rallier à cette proposition. La nôtre provenait peut-être d'une ambiguïté du texte et vous m'excuserez si cette ambiguïté n'était pas levée pour nous, mais quand on disait "l'actuelle session", il est bien entendu que c'était la session de la Conférence dans notre esprit, et pas l'actuelle session du Conseil. Il y avait peut-être cette ambiguïté à lever. Est-ce que je pourrais vous demander que le Secrétariat nous relise une dernière fois sa proposition qui, je pense, peut réunir le consensus et nous permettre d'adopter en bloc.

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

The original proposal in paragraph 14 of REP/9 reads as follows: "The Council noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0 and that they will be considered by the Conference".

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Mais, cette phrase vient après. Elle ne remplace pas toute la dernière phrase. Parce qu'à ce moment-là, on ne parle plus dans les conclusions de la Version 4.0 que nous transmettons à la Conférence. Donc là, il y a vraiment une lacune. Il faut garder le fait que le Conseil a décidé de transmettre la Version 4.0 à la Conférence et pris note de toutes les observations faites par les nombreuses délégations et que celles-ci seraient prises en considération par la Conférence. Merci de lever cette nouvelle ambiguïté. Parce que si non, nous ne transmettons plus rien.

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

Perhaps we can amalgamate both proposals and it would read something along these lines: "It suggested that the present Conference session adopt the Strategic Framework Version 4.0. The Council noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0 and that they will be considered by the Conference".

**CHAIRMAN**

I think that is all clear and acceptable.

**José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)**

Creo que aquí hay una leve diferencia entre lo que proponía la delegación de Francia y lo que está proponiendo la Secretaría. La delegación de Francia proponía, simplemente, que se transmitiera la Versión 4.0 de la Conferencia, lo cual nos parece en términos procesales correcto. Lo que está proponiendo la Secretaría es que la Conferencia apruebe la Versión 4.0, cosa que es muy diferente y que creo se debe rectificar ya que es un matiz muy importante. Simplemente, que el Consejo transmita la Versión 4.0 a la Conferencia y que tome en consideración las observaciones que había planteado la Secretaría sobre esto.

**CHAIRMAN**

Would the Secretary, Drafting Committee again try to rephrase this sentence, please?

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

Perhaps we can try something along these lines: "The Council agreed to transmit Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework to the Conference and noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0 and that they will be considered by the Conference".

**CHAIRMAN**

Would that be acceptable to everyone?

**Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

Je crois que plus on cherche à corriger, plus on s'embourbe, parce qu'en fait, le Conseil a analysé la Version 4.0. Il a fait beaucoup d'observations et n'était pas en mesure de corriger tout de suite la Version 4.0 avant de la remettre demain à la Conférence. Il a convenu, et cela est repris au paragraphe 12, que c'est là que la version du Cadre stratégique pourrait être sujette à des révisions en temps utile. Je suppose que ces révisions tiendront compte des observations qui ont été faites pendant l'analyse du texte. Je crois que certaines délégations avaient même prononcé le mot de "flexibilité d'application" de l'utilisation de ces textes. Si l'on maintient le texte actuel du Secrétariat, à savoir que "l'actuelle session de la Conférence adopte le Cadre stratégique en tenant compte de l'ensemble des observations, lesquelles observations figureront dans le Rapport et dans le *verbatim*", cela permettra au Secrétariat de la FAO, au moment de la mise en application de ce Cadre stratégique de tenir compte de ces observations tel que prévu au paragraphe 12. Sinon, il faudrait transmettre tout simplement la Version 4.0 à la Conférence en même temps que les observations, et on verra ce que la Conférence fera de celles-ci.

**CHAIRMAN**

My understanding is that is exactly what was to be omitted by the Drafting Committee and it is replacing another sentence.

**Masato ITO (Japan)**

My comment is not on paragraph 14, which we are now discussing, I am a bit confused about the status of paragraph 6. I would like to clarify the situation, the proposal which was made by the French delegation. Because we share the same feeling as the French delegation.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

I had a formulation and this is regarding paragraph 14. The formulation I had was "... the Council agreed to transmit Version 4.0 of the document together with comments made thereon to the Conference for its consideration ..."

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je pense que nous nous rééloignons d'une solution. La proposition lue par le Secrétariat il y a quelques minutes nous semblait pouvoir réunir réellement un consensus. Si je peux la redire, puisqu'il semble qu'on en ait dévié. Nous avons dit: "le Conseil a suggéré de transmettre à



l'actuelle session de la Conférence le Cadre stratégique Version 4.0. Le Conseil a noté les observations émises par plusieurs Membres qui seront considérées ou prises en considération par la Conférence". C'était cela la proposition faite par le Secrétariat qui, me semble-t-il, répondait aux attentes du Chili et de l'Argentine. Pour éviter de relever le débat, je dois dire que pour le paragraphe 6, j'ai compris les observations faites par le Secrétariat et par la Présidente du Comité de rédaction, et je pense que si nous résolvons le paragraphe 14, nous serons près du consensus.

**CHAIRMAN**

I think that takes care also of the comments made by France on Paragraph 6.

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

This is the original proposal by the Secretariat as now modified by the delegation of France.

"The Council agreed to transmit Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework to the Conference and noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0, which will be taken into consideration by the Conference".

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Con relación a la propuesta de la Secretaría, yo prefiero la propuesta de Pakistán. No es lo mismo decir que uno transmite el documento y que toma nota de las observaciones, en todo caso lo que podríamos decir es que el Consejo transmite la Versión 4.0, tomando nota de las observaciones efectuadas de esa versión, y que ambas serán analizadas o decididas por la Conferencia. El espíritu ha sido que la Conferencia analizará y decidirá la aprobación de la Versión 4.0 propuesta y de las observaciones hechas. Si no tenemos dos planos diferentes, tenemos por un lado la Versión 4.0 y en plano secundario los comentarios hechos a la Versión 4.0. El espíritu que reinó en la adopción del Marco Estratégico fue que a las sucesivas versiones y a las observaciones que se hacían iban a confluir en una definitiva versión que iba a aprobar la Conferencia. Por eso mi delegación está mucho más satisfecha con la propuesta de Pakistán que las pone en un mismo nivel, tanto la Versión 4.0 como las observaciones para que sea la Conferencia quien la apruebe.

**CHAIRMAN**

It is time again to remind you of the constructive compromise spirit that we have to apply to resolving this problem, since it is so close to each other. Can we adopt, and you too Argentina, the proposed sentence as read out by the Secretary of the Drafting Committee?

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Argentina)**

Estamos poniendo en dos planos diferentes dos temas: la Versión 4.0 y las observaciones. Yo creo que tanto la Versión 4.0 como las observaciones deben ir juntas para que sean analizadas por la Conferencia. En un mismo plano, ninguno tiene supremacía sobre el otro.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

I am in complete agreement with Pakistan and with Argentina. I believe that the formulation proposed by Pakistan is much neater, more eloquent and contains all of the ideas. Nevertheless, I sense that there can be compromise around the text that was read by the Secretary of the Drafting Committee, and I am convinced that it contains all of the elements that are contained in the Pakistani draft expressed differently, but it does contain all the ideas. So I am willing to accept that text, and in the spirit of compromise, I would urge my colleagues also to accept that text and allow us to move on.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Me preocupa que los árboles no nos dejen ver el bosque, puesto que la Conferencia tiene el soberano derecho de adoptar, modificar, cambiar o postergar, o simplemente no adoptar el documento. Estamos terminando nuestros trabajos con un gran nivel de confusión puesto que este Consejo tenía el propósito, entre otros, de examinar la Versión 4.0, efectuar algunas observaciones entre este proceso participativo, amplio y transparente, y concuerdo con lo que se ha dicho, y transmitir esta Versión 4.0 con dichas observaciones a la Conferencia. La

Conferencia decidirá como las considera y como las toma en cuenta. Creo que la propuesta de Pakistán es la más adecuada y es una solución de compromiso.

**Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

Je serai bref et voudrais juste appuyer, au nom de notre délégation, la proposition du Pakistan qui reflète effectivement la hiérarchisation des travaux que le Conseil est appelé à faire, par rapport à ce que la Conférence, qui est souveraine, est appelée à faire également. Je soutiens la proposition du Pakistan qui représente vraiment la traduction de ce que je disais tout à l'heure en d'autres termes.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

I can read my formulation once again. "The Council agreed to transmit Version 4.0 of the document together with comments made thereon to the Conference for its consideration."

**CHAIRMAN**

Can we accept that and adopt this report?

**Patrick PRUVOT (France)**

Je suis navré de prolonger les débats, mais encore une fois je regrette de vous dire que j'ai l'impression que nous nous éloignons des positions qui semblaient être acquises tout au début. Chacun doit convenir que le Rapport ne peut que refléter ce qui s'est dit au Conseil, non seulement ce qui s'est dit, mais ce qui a été conclu. Or, la dernière phrase de ce Conseil, vous m'excuserez, c'est une traduction de l'anglais puisque c'était prononcé en anglais (continue en Anglais):

"It is only the fourth version plus the Report of the Drafting Committee that we will see tomorrow. I think we should close the discussion". (Continues in French)

La deuxième proposition faite par le Pakistan ne reflète pas cet état de chose, il me semble que la proposition faite par le Secrétariat en est beaucoup plus proche. Je demande vraiment aux Membres du Conseil de prendre en considération la réalité de notre débat et de nos conclusions qui figurent dans le *verbatim* CL 117/PV/4.

**Mrs Ulla HEIDEN (Denmark)**

Denmark would like, in the spirit of compromise, to support France and say that we think the wording suggested by the Secretariat is indeed a compromise wording. It is not entirely what we would have suggested, but we think that it expresses the closest we could come to a common decision on this. We urge the group and we urge the Drafting Committee to work on that basis.

**Moussa Bocar LY (Sénégal)**

On a suivi tous les débats et on comprend les préoccupations des uns et des autres. Je crois que c'est le Représentant de la France qui disait que "le mieux est l'ennemi du bien", si j'ai bien traduit. Alors je crois que le Représentant de la France a été très généreux en s'engageant dans un travail de rédaction qui, malheureusement n'a pas produit les effets escomptés. Au contraire, les contre propositions de certaines délégations ont un peu tendu à nous éloigner du consensus proposé par le Comité de rédaction dans sa sagesse. Compte tenu de notre analyse, je me demande si le Représentant de France, en examinant les réactions de sa proposition et les difficultés créées par les autres propositions n'accepterait pas de revenir à la proposition initiale du Comité de rédaction qui, à mon avis, était déjà assez claire comme ça, et très balancé et très clair. C'est ce que je proposerais pour qu'on revienne à la proposition initiale du Comité de rédaction dans sa grande sagesse.

**Luigi M. FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)**

Je n'avais pas pris la parole pour suivre la règle que les Membres du Comité de rédaction ne doivent pas prendre la parole. Mais, puisque la plupart des Membres du Comité de rédaction ont pris la parole, je me sens aussi en condition de le faire. Je trouve que finalement les positions ne

sont pas très éloignées. Je crois que la délégation française a beaucoup de raisons pour soutenir un texte plus articulé qui reflète mieux les discussions qui ont été faites ici. J'ai beaucoup apprécié la proposition du compromis pakistanais qui est plus courte, plus compacte. Mais si l'on veut trouver une position de compromis commun, il faudrait quand même tenir compte de deux phrases lues par le Secrétariat et qui paraissaient recueillir un consensus. Peut-être qu'en les lisant une autre fois avec l'esprit plus calme, et en précisant que la Conférence est souveraine pour décider - il faudrait quand même présenter les choses comme les débats se sont effectivement déroulés - je crois qu'on pourrait trouver facilement un compromis, du moins je le souhaite, sur le texte que la délégation française était tout près d'approuver.

**Ms Miriam M. SAIF (Secretary, Drafting Committee)**

This is the proposal by France: "The Council agreed to transmit Version 4.0 of the Strategic Framework to the Conference and noted the comments made by several Members on Version 4.0, which will be taken into consideration by the Conference."

**CHAIRMAN**

The Drafting Committee? Can I offer this as a solution to the paragraph 14 and we can adopt it?

I see no objections. It is adopted

*Draft Report, Parts I-IX, as amended, approved.*

*Le projet de rapport, Partie I-IX, ainsi amendé, est approuvé*

*El proyecto de informe, Parte I-IX, así enmendado, es aprobado.*

**CHAIRMAN**

Now with the adoption of CL 117/REP/9 of the Draft Report, we have adopted the Draft Report as submitted by the Drafting Committee, and I thank you very much for the cooperation.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Perdónenme que interrumpa nuestro acontecimiento. Quisiera pedirle la posibilidad de ofrecerle la palabra a la Presidenta del Grupo Regional de América Latina que tiene que hacer una solicitud a nombre del Grupo Regional.

**Sra. Suze PERCY (Observador de Haití)**

Quisiera aprovechar esta oportunidad para felicitar al Comité de Redacción por el trabajo que ha hecho. Si usted me lo permite, quisiera nada más pedir al Consejo que se incluya en el *Verbatim* de ayer el texto que ha presentado el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe y que este texto conste en el *Verbatim* del Consejo.

**CHAIRMAN**

There is a proposal here to include the text submitted by the Group of Latin America and Caribbean in the *Verbatim* Records. Is there any objection to that?

**Dietrich LINCKE (Germany)**

I'm sorry to have to intervene, but I wish to make some remarks on behalf of the European Union and its Member States. Since we have made clear that we would also, if we enter into a detailed discussion on the floor here, raise a number of points, we would have the same interest in inserting our points in the *Verbatim* Records.

**Humberto MOLINA REYES (Chile)**

Estamos terminando nuestros trabajos exitosamente. Al comienzo de nuestros trabajos la Presidenta de nuestro Grupo Regional expresó la posición frente a un documento que va a guiar, que va a orientar las labores de esta Organización durante los próximos quince años. Un Grupo Regional que representa numerosos países y que tiene al menos el derecho de expresar en este Consejo sus opiniones y que esas queden reflejadas en el *Verbatim*. No estamos solicitando que los demás Miembros acepten nuestros comentarios, estamos pidiendo sólo un derecho que no

quisimos leer todas nuestras observaciones ayer por respeto a este Consejo, porque entendemos lo limitado del tiempo. Ahora bien, ya que hemos acordado la forma, el método, como será considerado por el órgano de mayor poder que tiene esta Organización, me parece extraño que se objete ese derecho que tenemos los países de la Región. Si otro Grupo Regional hubiera hecho esta misma presentación, o un solo Miembro, tenga la plena seguridad que América Latina y el Caribe junto con otros Miembros hubiéramos perfectamente aceptado eso porque nada influye en las deliberaciones que la Conferencia va a tomar sobre el tema que nos trata. Por ello hago un llamado a mi distinguido amigo de Alemania, que estoy seguro comprenderá cuáles son los deseos de nuestra Región.

**Ronald ROSE (Canada)**

I agree with my colleague from Chile that they have the opportunity to have their statement included in the Verbatim Records of the Council. We certainly had a precedent at our last Council, when a Member of the same Region requested that the Havana Declaration be included in the Verbatim Records. For the same reasons, they took pity on us and chose not to take additional time in our Council to read out that Report but simply suggested it be included in the Verbatim Records. We have all had the opportunity to have all of our comments incorporated there. Every word that was said during this Council Meeting is included in the Verbatim Records already. I think that this is a courtesy that the Council should be able to extend to the Members of the Latin American and Caribbean Group.

**CHAIRMAN**

There is a direct appeal from Chile to the delegation from Germany. Can we accept this proposal?

**Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)**

I totally agree with Canada and Chile that all our comments have been included in the Verbatim Records. If one Regional Group said they will submit their comments to you, it is only fair that they be included in the Verbatim Records. I think I totally agree with this.

**CHAIRMAN**

If there are no objections, then we agree that the points be inserted in the Verbatim Records. I see no objections.

**Dietrich LINCKE (Germany)**

All right, thank you very much, the question is solved.

**DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

The Director-General did very badly want to be here with you this evening to close the Session, but because it went far beyond the scheduled time, it unfortunately conflicted with another engagement that he had. He did, however, wish for me to express on his behalf his appreciation to all of you for your good work during this Council Session. You clearly have had a very packed Agenda and you have had to deal with a number of very important and, I would say, somewhat difficult, perhaps even controversial, issues and quite frankly, you all know it has not been particularly easy.

But I do think that, in the end, you have adopted a satisfactory Report which will certainly be useful to the Secretariat, and we hope very much to the Conference in its deliberations beginning tomorrow and next week.

I would like to express my special appreciation to the Drafting Committee. They worked extremely hard. I know that those of us in the Secretariat who participated in all, or some, of their meetings, are very very thankful to them. They did a very, very good job, I think, with some very difficult issues.

Mr Chairman, I would also like to express, on behalf of the Director-General, and all of us, our appreciation to you for your guidance in helping us through this Session. Since it is late, I will not take more of your time, but I am inclined to recall the words of so many of you when you have

said: "in the spirit of compromise and partnership", just to remind you that many of these issues will be discussed again during the Conference. So I will ask you to recall your own words: "in the spirit of compromise and partnership", because our work is really not finished yet.

I and the Director-General look very much forward to seeing you all starting again tomorrow.

Thank you very much and good evening.

**CHAIRMAN**

The Hundredth and Seventeenth Session of the Council is concluded.

*The Meeting rose at 22.45 hours*

*La séance est levée à 22h45*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 22.45 horas*