

Rome, Roma, 2003



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 Twenty-fourth Session • Cent vingt-quatrième session • 124° período de sesiones

Rome, 23 – 28 June 2003

VERBATIM RECORDS OF PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL

Rome, 23 – 28 juin 2003

PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES PLÉNIÈRES DU CONSEIL

Roma, 23 – 28 de junio de 2003

ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES PLENARIAS DEL CONSEJO



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – TABLE DES MATIÈRES - INDICE

---

### FIRST PLENARY SESSION PRÉMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA (23 June 2003)

<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 124/1-Rev.1; CL 124/1-Add.1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 124/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)	
<b>1. Adoption de l'Ordre du Jour et du Calendrier</b> (CL 124/1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 120/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)	
<b>1. Aprobación del Programa y el Calendario</b> (CL 124/1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 124/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)	3
<b>16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters</b>	
<b>16. Autres Questions constitutionnelles et juridiques</b>	
<b>16. Otros Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos</b>	5
<i>16.1 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions</i>	
<i>16.1 Invitations d'États non Membres à assister à des réunions de la FAO</i>	
<i>16.1 Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO</i>	5
<b>7. Report of the 29th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) (Rome, 12-16 May 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)</b>	
<b>7. Rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale (CSA) (Rome, 12-16 mai 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)</b>	
<b>7. Informe del 29º período de sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial (CSA) (Roma, 12-16 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)</b>	6
<i>7.1 Intergovernmental Working Group on the Elaboration of Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security</i>	
<i>7.1 Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation suffisante dans le contexte de la sécurité alimentaire nationale</i>	
<i>7.1 Grupo de Trabajo Intergubernamental para la elaboración de un conjunto de directrices voluntarias con el fin de respaldar la realización progresiva del</i>	

*derecho a una alimentación adecuada en el contexto de la seguridad  
alimentaria nacional*

6

**SECOND PLENARY SESSION  
DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(23 June 2003)**

<b>7. Report of the 29th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) (Rome, 12-16 May 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (continued)</b>	
<b>7. Rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale (CSA) (Rome, 12-16 mai 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (suite)</b>	
<b>7. Informe del 29º período de sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial (CSA) (Roma, 12-16 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (continuación)</b>	28
<i>7.1 Intergovernmental Working Group on the Elaboration of Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (continued)</i>	
<i>7.1 Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation suffisante dans le contexte de la sécurité alimentaire nationale (suite)</i>	
<i>7.1 Grupo de Trabajo Intergubernamental para la elaboración de un conjunto de directrices voluntarias con el fin de respaldar la realización progresiva del derecho a una alimentación adecuada en el contexto de la seguridad alimentaria nacional (continuación)</i>	28
<b>5. Report of the 16th Session of the Committee on Forestry (Rome, 10-14 March 2003) (CL 124/8)</b>	
<b>5. Rapport de la seizième session du Comité des forêts (Rome, 10-14 mars 2003) (CL 124/8)</b>	
<b>5. Informe del 16o período de sesiones del Comité de Montes (Roma, 10-14 de marzo de 2003) (CL 124/8)</b>	43

**THIRD PLENARY SESSION  
TROISIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(24 June 2003)**

<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>	56
<b>13. Reports of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee (Rome, 5-9 May 2003): for discussion and/or decision (CL 124/4)</b>	
<b>13. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier (Rome, 5-9 mai 2003): pour examen et/ou décision (CL 124/4)</b>	
<b>13. Informe de la Reunión Conjunta del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas (Roma, 5-9 de mayo de 2003): para debate y/o decisión (CL 124/4)</b>	56
<i>13.1 Savings and Efficiencies in Governance</i>	
<i>13.1 Économies et gains d'efficience en matière de gouvernance</i>	
<i>13.1 Economías y eficacia en el ejercicio del gobierno</i>	56
<i>13.2 Other Matters Arising out of the Report</i>	
<i>13.2 Autres questions découlant du rapport</i>	
<i>13.2 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe</i>	56
<b>14. Report of the 89th Session of the Programme Committee (Rome, 5-9 May 2003) (CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)</b>	
<b>14. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du Programme (Rome, 5-9 mai 2003) (CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)</b>	
<b>14. Informe del 89º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa (Roma, 5-9 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)</b>	61
<i>14.1 Other Matters Arising out of the Report</i>	
<i>14.1 Autres questions découlant du rapport</i>	
<i>14.1 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe</i>	61
<b>15. Report of the 102nd and 103rd Sessions of the Finance Committee (Rome, 5-9 May and 19-20 May 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)</b>	
<b>15. Rapport de la cent deuxième et cent troisième session du Comité financier (Rome, 5-9 mai et 19-20 mai 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20 )</b>	
<b>15. Informe del 102º y 103º períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, 5-9 de mayo y 19-20 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)</b>	74

<i>15.1 Status of Contributions and Arrears (CL 124/LIM/1)</i>	
<i>15.1 Situation en ce qui concerne les contributions et les arriérés (CL 124/LIM/1)</i>	
<i>15.1 Estado de las cuotas y de los atrasos (CL 124/LIM/1)</i>	74
<i>15.2 Budgetary Performance 2002</i>	
<i>15.2 Exécution du budget 2002</i>	
<i>15.2 Ejecución del presupuesto de 2002</i>	74
<i>15.3 Split Assessments</i>	
<i>15.3 Système de recouvrement des contributions fondé sur l'utilisation de deux monnaies</i>	
<i>15.3 Asignación de cuotas en dos monedas</i>	74
<i>15.4 Scale of Contributions 2004-2005</i>	
<i>15.4 Barème des contributions 2004-2005</i>	
<i>15.4 Escala de cuotas para 2004-2005</i>	74
<i>15.5 Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographic Distribution (CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)</i>	
<i>15.5 Représentation géographique équitable (CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)</i>	
<i>15.5 Metodología para la determinación de una distribución geográfica equitativa (CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)</i>	74
<i>15.6 Other Matters Arising out of the Report</i>	
<i>15.6 Autres questions découlant du rapport</i>	
<i>15.6 Otras cuestiones planteadas en el informe</i>	74

**FOURTH PLENARY SESSION  
QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
CUARTA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(24 June 2003)**

<b>15. Report of the 102nd and 103rd Sessions of the Finance Committee (Rome, 5-9 May and 19-20 May 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)</b>	
<b>15. Rapport de la cent deuxième et cent troisième session du Comité financier (Rome, 5-9 mai et 19-20 mai 2003) (CL 124/16 ; CL 124/20 )</b>	
<b>15. Informe del 102º y 103º períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, 5-9 de mayo y 19-20 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)</b>	86
 <b>12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005 (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)</b>	
<b>12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005 (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)</b>	
<b>12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005 (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)</b>	103



**FIFTH PLENARY SESSION  
CINQUIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(25 June 2003)**

<b>III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS</b> (continued)	
<b>III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION</b> (suite)	
<b>III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS</b> (continuación)	118
<b>12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continued)	
<b>12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (suite)	
<b>12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continuación)	118

**SIXTH PLENARY SESSION  
SIXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
SEXTA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(25 June 2003)**

<b>12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continued)	
<b>12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (suite)	
<b>12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005</b> (CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continuación)	146
<b>9. World Food Programme</b>	
<b>9. Programme alimentaire mondial</b>	
<b>9. Programa Mundial de Alimentos</b>	157
<i>9.1 Annual Report of the WFP Executive Board on its Activities in 2002</i> (CL 124/11)	
<i>9.1 Rapport annuel du Conseil d'administration du PAM sur les activités du PAM en 2002</i> (CL 124/11)	
<i>9.1 Informe anual de la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA sobre sus actividades en 2002</i> (CL 124/11)	157
<b>11. Programme Evaluation Report 2003</b> (C 2003/4)	
<b>11. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2003</b> (C 2003/4)	
<b>11. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 2003</b> (C 2003/4)	169
<b>8. Convening of Second Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators</b> (CL 124/17)	
<b>8. Convocation du deuxième Forum mondial des responsables de la réglementation en matière de sécurité sanitaire des aliments</b> (CL 124/17)	
<b>8. Convocatoria del Segundo Foro Mundial de las Autoridades de Reglamentación sobre Inocuidad de los Alimentos</b> (CL 124/17)	175

**SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION  
SEPTIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
SEPTIMA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(26 June 2003)**

<b>10. Preparations for the 32nd Session of the FAO Conference</b>	
<b>10. Préparatifs de la trente-deuxième session de la Conférence de la FAO</b>	
<b>10. Preparativos para el 32º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO</b>	186
<i>10.1 Arrangements for the Session and Provisional Timetable (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.1 Organisation et calendrier provisoire de la session (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.1 Preparativos para el período de sesiones y el calendario provisional (CL 124/12)</i>	186
<i>10.2 Deadline for Nominations for the post of Independent Chairman of the Council (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.2 Date limite pour la soumission de candidatures aux fonctions de Président indépendant du Conseil (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.2 Plazo para la presentación de candidaturas al cargo de Presidente Independiente del Consejo (CL 124/12)</i>	186
<i>10.3 Nomination of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of Commission I and Commission II (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.3 Nomination des candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des Commissions I et II (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.3 Presentación de candidaturas para los cargos de Presidente de la Conferencia y Presidentes de las Comisiones I y II (CL 124/12)</i>	186
<i>10.4 Nomination of Nine Members of the Credentials Committee (Countries) (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.4 Nomination des candidatures des neuf membres de la Commission de vérification des pouvoirs (pays) (CL 124/12)</i>	
<i>10.4 Presentación de candidaturas para nueve miembros del Comité de Credenciales (países) (CL 124/12)</i>	186
<b>4. Report of the 64th Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems (Rome, 18-21 March 2003) (CL 124/6)</b>	
<b>4. Rapport de la soixante-quatrième session du Comité des produits (Rome, 18-21 mars 2003) (CL 124/6)</b>	
<b>4. Informe del 64º período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos (Roma, 18-21 de marzo de 2003) (CL 124/6)</b>	188

**6. Report of the 17th Session of the Committee on Agriculture  
(Rome, 31 March-4 April 2003) (CL 124/9)**

**6. Rapport de la dix-septième session du Comité de l'agriculture  
(Rome, 31 mars - 4 avril 2003) (CL 124/9)**

**6. Informe del 17º período de sesiones del Comité de Agricultura  
(Roma, 31 de marzo-4 de abril de 2003) (CL 124/9)**

199

**EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION  
HUITIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
OCTAVA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(26 June 2003)**

<b>3. Report of the 25th Session of the Committee on Fisheries (Rome, 24-28 February 2003) (CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)</b>	
<b>3. Rapport de la vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches (Rome, 24-28 février 2003) (CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)</b>	
<b>3. Informe del 25º período de sesiones del Comité de Pesca (Roma, 24-28 de febrero de 2003) (CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)</b>	216
<b>16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:</b>	
<b>16. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, dont:</b>	
<b>16. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:</b>	234
<i>16.2 Applications for Membership in the Organization (CL 124/18)</i>	
<i>16.2 Demandes d'admission à la qualité de membre de l'Organisation (CL 124/18)</i>	
<i>16.2 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organización (CL 124/18)</i>	234
<i>16.3 The Number and Length of Terms of Office of the Director-General (Article VII.1 of the Constitution of FAO) (CL 124/13)</i>	
<i>16.3 Nombre et durée des mandats du Directeur général (Article VII.1 de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO) (CL 124/13)</i>	
<i>16.3 Número y duración de los mandatos del Director General de la FAO (Artículo VII.1 de la Constitución de la FAO) (CL 124/13)</i>	234
<i>16.4 Amendments of the Statutes of the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CL 124/19)</i>	
<i>16.4 Amendements aux Statuts du Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est (CL 124/19)</i>	
<i>16.4 Enmiendas de los Estatutos del Comité de Pesca para el Atlántico Centro-Oriental (CL 124/19)</i>	236
<i>16.5 Composition of the Programme and Finance Committees (CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)</i>	
<i>16.5 Composition du Comité du programme et du Comité financier (CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)</i>	
<i>16.5 Composición del Comité del Programa y del Comité de Finanzas (CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)</i>	237

<b>17. Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and Other Main Sessions 2003-2004 (CL 124/INF/8)</b>	
<b>17. Calendrier 2003-2004 révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des autres réunions principales de la FAO (CL 124/INF/8)</b>	
<b>17. Calendario revisado para 2003-2004 de los períodos de sesiones de los órganos rectores y de otras reuniones importantes de la FAO (CL 124/INF/8)</b>	248
<b>10. Preparations for the 32nd Session of the FAO Conference (CL 124/12)</b>	
<b>10. Préparatifs de la trente-deuxième session de la Conférence de la FAO (CL 124/12)</b>	
<b>10. Preparativos para el 32º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO (CL 124/12)</b>	248
<i>10.3 Nomination of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of Commission I and Commission II</i>	
<i>10.3 Nominations des candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions I et II</i>	
<i>10.3 Presentación de candidaturas para los cargos de Presidente de la Conferencia y presidentes de las comisiones I y II</i>	248
<i>10.4 Nomination of Nine Members of the Credentials Committee (Countries)</i>	
<i>10.4 Nomination des candidatures des neuf membres de la Commission de vérification des pouvoirs (pays)</i>	
<i>10.4 Presentación de candidaturas para nueve miembros del Comité de Credenciales (países)</i>	248
<b>18. Any Other Matters</b>	
<b>18. Autres question</b>	
<b>18. Otros asuntos</b>	249
<i>18.1 Margarita Lizárraga Medal (CL 124/INF/13)</i>	
<i>18.1 Médaille Margarita Lizárraga (CL 124/INF/13)</i>	
<i>18.1 Medalla Margarita Lizárraga (CL 124/INF/13)</i>	249
<i>18.2 Nomination d'un représentant de la Conférence de la FAO au Comité de la Caisse des pensions du personnel (CL 124/2-Rev.1)</i>	
<i>18.2 Appointment of a Representative of the FAO Conference to the Staff Pension Committee (CL 124/2-Rev.1)</i>	
<i>18.2 Nombramiento del Representante de la Conferencia de la FAO en el Comité de Pensiones del Personal (CL 124/2-Rev.1)</i>	250

**NINTH PLENARY SESSION  
NEUVIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE  
NOVENA SESIÓN PLENARIA  
(28 June 2003)**

<b>ADOPTION OF REPORT</b>	
<b>ADOPTION DU RAPPORT</b>	
<b>APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME</b>	254
<b>DRAFT REPORT - PARTS 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)</b>	
<b>LES PROJETS DE RAPPORT - PARTIES 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)</b>	
<b>LOS PROYECTOS DE INFORME, PARTES 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)</b>	254





# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>FIRST PLENARY MEETING PREMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>23 June 2003</b>

The First Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.35 hours

Mr Aziz Mekouar,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La première séance plénière est ouverte à 10 h 35  
sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,  
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la primera sesión plenaria a las 10.35 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Je voudrais d'abord vous demander de m'excuser d'être arrivé aussi tard et d'avoir commencé avec une demi-heure de retard, mais nous étions en train de discuter de choses importantes qui, j'espère, nous porteront à une solution d'un problème que nous avons traité ce matin.

Je déclare ouverte la première séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil de notre Organisation. Permettez-moi tout d'abord d'accueillir les États qui ont entamé leur mandat de Membres du Conseil en début 2003: l'Arabie Saoudite, l'Australie, la Côte d'Ivoire, l'Égypte, la Finlande, la France, le Guatemala, l'Inde, L'Indonésie, l'Italie, Maurice, le Nigéria, le Pakistan, le Royaume-Uni, la Syrie et le Swaziland.

Je voudrais par ailleurs faire une brève annonce avant que ne commencent nos travaux: La Communauté européenne participe à cette session conformément aux paragraphes 8 et 9 de l'Article II de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO. J'ai été prié de vous informer que la Déclaration de la Communauté européenne et de ses États Membres figurent dans le document d'information CL 124/INF/8 qui a été distribué à tous les Membres du Conseil. J'attire votre attention sur cette déclaration.

Nous allons maintenant recevoir Monsieur le Directeur général.

## DIRECTEUR GÉNÉRAL

Monsieur le Président, je voudrais vous remercier de me permettre de m'adresser à cette auguste assemblée et de souhaiter la bienvenue à tous les Membres du Conseil. Cette réunion revêt une importance toute particulière, puisque c'est la réunion qui va préparer la Conférence et qui va surtout discuter du programme d'activités de l'Organisation pour la période 2004-2005. C'est donc sur la base de vos décisions que nous allons connaître les priorités de nos États Membres et les ressources qui seront mises à notre disposition pour pouvoir les mettre en œuvre.

Je voudrais donc, à cette occasion, attirer votre bienveillante attention sur le fait que cette Organisation a fait de gros efforts, dans des conditions financières souvent difficiles, et que, de 1994 à maintenant, nous avons eu une baisse de 28 pour cent des postes de l'Organisation. Naturellement, ceci n'a pas pu ne pas avoir de conséquences sur notre capacité à faire le travail que vous avez bien voulu nous confier. Et je voudrais aussi rappeler que cette situation s'est développée durant une période où l'on nous demandait de faire plus et mieux, et notamment où l'on venait de nous fixer l'objectif de diminuer de moitié le nombre de personnes qui ont faim dans le monde, en collaboration naturellement avec les États Membres, les institutions du système des Nations Unies et nos collègues des institutions financières internationales et du système de Bretton Woods.

Comme vous le savez, nous avons fait quelques progrès, mais nettement insuffisants. Si les tendances actuelles se maintiennent, l'objectif, prévu pour 2015, de réduire de moitié les 800 millions de personnes souffrant de la faim, ne sera atteint qu'en 2150. Il faut pour cela, comme la décision en a été prise lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation: *cinq ans après*, au mois de juin dernier, que nous puissions redonner la priorité au développement agricole, et à la sécurité alimentaire, et pas seulement en terme d'aides d'urgence même si ce sont des aides généreuses et appréciées et qui permettent d'empêcher que des personnes meurent de faim. Mais il faut le faire pour prévenir et pour créer les conditions telles que l'on ne soit pas obligé de tendre la main et de faire chaque année appel de nouveau à l'aide internationale pour nourrir à coups de milliards de dollars des personnes, qui, si elles avaient bénéficié de la moitié ou du tiers de ces ressources, pour faire notamment des petits ouvrages de maîtrise de l'eau, intensifier leurs cultures et diversifier leur production, seraient à même de nourrir leur famille et d'avoir un environnement plus favorable à l'économie, et de leur pays et de leur région.

Je voudrais donc vous rappeler que dans les propositions que nous avons faites pour le budget, nous avons proposé une hypothèse qui prévoit la Croissance Réelle Zéro. Cette croissance va se traduire par une augmentation de 36 millions de dollars soit 5,5 pour cent, bien en deçà de ce qui

est prévu dans le Plan à moyen terme adopté par l'Organisation, où il est prévu pour cette même période 2004-2005, une augmentation de 54,5 millions de dollars, soit un taux de 8,4 pour cent. Nous avons essayé, en tenant compte des observations, de réajuster le budget dans des limites qui étaient difficiles, puisque l'on n'a jamais pu avoir d'instructions sur ce qu'il fallait diminuer. On nous a toujours dit ce qu'il fallait augmenter mais jamais ce qu'il fallait diminuer. Nous avons quand même essayé de faire quelques ajustements pour refléter les points de vue qui étaient exprimés dans les documents des organes de la FAO. Nous espérons encore une fois, qu'après tant d'années de vache maigre, nous allons revenir à une situation un peu plus normale.

Nous allons aussi solliciter vos orientations sur les questions relatives notamment aux conditions dans lesquelles les contributions vont être faites, puisqu'avec la naissance et le développement de l'Euro, nous sommes dans une situation où à peu près 40 pour cent des contributions proviennent de pays avec une monnaie Euro et à peu près 44 pour cent de nos dépenses sont effectuées en Euro. Ceci crée une nouvelle réalité, et si nous n'en tenons pas compte, nous allons continuer à prendre des risques liés au taux de change extrêmement élevé. Fort heureusement, nous avons eu la prudence, après l'approbation du dernier budget, de faire des achats de devises à l'avance, ce qui nous a évité de subir les pertes importantes, de l'ordre de 30 pour cent, qui auraient résulté d'une mise en œuvre progressive du budget sur la base du taux du marché international.

D'autres questions sont aussi soumises à votre bienveillante attention telles que les conditions de paiement des obligations vis-à-vis du personnel, qui ont été accumulées sur une période assez longue et qui nécessiteraient, si nous changeons de méthodes de comptabilisation, de déboursier à peu près 14,1 millions de dollars par biennium sur douze biennia, donc sur 24 ans, pour parvenir à rattraper les engagements cumulés depuis la création de l'Organisation. Il y a aussi la question des contributions sur lesquelles des demandes ont été faites. Il y a le problème de la détermination des conditions dans lesquelles la représentation géographique pourrait être équitable: allons-nous maintenir le système de la FAO, qui est relativement unique, ou allons-nous adopter un système similaire à celui qui existe au sein du système des Nations Unies et dans d'autres institutions internationales? C'est une question qui vous est posée.

Il y a naturellement d'autres questions sur lesquelles je ne veux pas revenir pour ne pas prendre trop de votre temps. En tout état de cause le Secrétariat, comme toujours, est à votre disposition pour vous apporter toutes les informations et tous les éclaircissements qui seront de nature à favoriser votre travail.

## **I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION**

### **I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE**

### **I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO**

#### **1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable**

(CL 124/1-Rev.1; CL 124/1-Add.1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 124/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)

#### **1. Adoption de l'Ordre du Jour et du Calendrier**

(CL 124/1-Rev.1; CL 124/1-Add.1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 124/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)

#### **1. Aprobación del Programa y el Calendario**

(CL 124/1-Rev.1; CL 124/1-Add.1; CL 124/INF/1; CL 124/INF/6; CL 124/INF/12; CL 124/INF/21)

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous allons donc passer à l'adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier. On passe au premier point de l'ordre du jour: Adoption de l'ordre du jour provisoire et du Calendrier de la session, tels que présentés dans les documents CL 124/1-Rev.1, CL 124/1-Add.1, CL 124/INF/1 et CL 124/INF/6. En ce qui concerne l'ordre du jour de la Session, je vous prie de vous assurer que vous avez bien la version révisée qui se trouve dans le document CL 124/1-Rev.1. J'aimerais aussi attirer votre attention sur le document CL 124/1-Add.1 qui contient d'une part, le point 7.2: Présentation des

rapports sur la suite donnée au Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, inscrit à l'ordre du jour sur demande des États-Unis, avec l'appui de la Grèce agissant au nom de la Communauté européenne et de ses quinze États Membres, et d'autre part, le point 16.5: Composition du Comité du programme et du Comité financier, ajouté à l'ordre du jour sur demande du Japon au nom du groupe Asie de la FAO. Vous trouverez copie des demandes des États-Unis et du Japon dans les documents portant la référence CL 124/INF/12 et CL 124/INF/21.

Par ailleurs, je voudrais indiquer que le point 15 de l'ordre du jour comprendra non seulement l'examen du rapport de la cent deuxième session du Comité financier mais aussi l'examen du rapport de sa cent troisième session, qui s'est tenue les 19 et 20 mai à Rome.

Enfin, je voudrais vous informer que le Directeur général a reçu une demande d'admission à la qualité de Membre de l'Organisation de Tuvalu. Cette demande sera examinée au point 16.2 de l'ordre du jour provisoire.

Je voudrais maintenant savoir si l'ordre du jour de la session, avec les précisions que je viens de donner est adopté? L'ordre du jour est adopté.

En ce qui concerne le calendrier de la session, un projet provisoire figure dans le document CL 124/INF/1. Le sous-point portant sur les comptes vérifiés de la FAO 2000-2001, qui était le sous-point 15.1 dans la première version de l'ordre du jour, a été retiré de la version révisée de l'ordre du jour, c'est-à-dire du document CL 124/1-Rev.1. Dès lors, ce sous-point doit également être retiré du calendrier de la session. Par ailleurs, il est proposé que le sous-point 7.2: Présentation des rapports sur la suite donnée au Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, soit examiné immédiatement après le sous-point 7.1 cet après-midi. Le sous-point 16.5: Composition du Comité du programme et du Comité financier, pourrait être examiné après le sous-point 16.4 jeudi après-midi. Je voudrais savoir si le calendrier proposé avec les modifications que je viens d'indiquer est approuvé par le Conseil? Le calendrier de la session est adopté.

Je profite de cette occasion pour en appeler à votre coopération afin de respecter notre emploi du temps et de nous permettre de commencer nos réunions à l'heure. Nous avons un ordre du jour chargé et peu de temps à disposition.

Nous passons au point deux: Election de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/INF/9. Après consultation entre les groupes régionaux, nous disposons des propositions suivantes pour les trois postes de Vice-Présidents du Conseil. Son Excellence Don Alfredo Néstor Puig Pino (Cuba), Son Excellence Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck (Allemagne) et son Excellence Mohammad Saeid Noori-Naeini (République islamique d'Iran). Y a-t-il des objections? Je voudrais féliciter les trois Vice-Présidents pour leur élection. Je vous prie d'acclamer les trois Vice-Présidents.

Il me semble que nous n'avons pas encore de Président du Comité de rédaction et les consultations sont en train de se poursuivre. J'espère avoir un nom cet après-midi.

*Adopted*

*Adopté*

*Aprobado*

**Simon DRAPER (Observer for New Zealand)**

I have managed to have consultations with the G-77 Chair regarding Drafting Committee and, in terms of the OECD nominations for the Drafting Committee, we nominate the United States of America, Australia, Japan, Italy, Germany and Finland. I believe, the Chair of the G-77 also has nominations.

**Vincent KIRABOKYAMARIA (Uganda)**

I am happy to inform the Council that we have elected for the Near East Group, Syria and Qatar; for the Asia Group, China and Sri Lanka; for the Latin American Group, Chile and Guatemala; and for Africa, Kenya and Libya. We have not yet crystallized on the Chair of the Drafting Committee. We shall advise in due course.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Et nous passons maintenant au point 16 de l'ordre du jour intitulé: Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, invitation d'États non Membres à assister à des réunions de la FAO. Conformément à notre calendrier de travail, on examine le sous-point 16.1 de l'ordre du jour et je donne la parole à Madame Gardner, Secrétaire générale de la Conférence et du Conseil, qui va nous renseigner sur ce point.

**16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters****16. Autres Questions constitutionnelles et juridiques****16. Otros Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos**

*16.1 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO Sessions*

*16.1 Invitations d'États non Membres à assister à des réunions de la FAO*

*16.1 Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO*

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

As usual, a request was received from the Russian Federation to attend this Council Session in the capacity of Observer and an invitation was issued on 6 June 2003 subject, of course, to approval by the Council. The decision before the Council is whether to approve the admission of the Russian Federation as Observer at the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session of Council.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Est-ce que le Conseil est d'accord pour que la Fédération de Russie assiste à cette session en qualité d'observateur? Pas d'objection? Très bien. Il en est ainsi décidé.

Je souhaite par ailleurs vous informer que depuis la dernière session du Conseil, la Fédération de Russie a été invitée sur sa demande à participer aux réunions de la FAO suivantes: la dix-septième session du Comité de l'agriculture tenue à Rome du 31 mars au 4 avril 2003, la vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches tenue à Rome du 24 au 28 février 2003 et la seizième session du Comité des forêts tenue à Rome du 10 au 14 mars 2003.

Je vous informe aussi que l'Ukraine a été invitée à participer sur sa demande à la vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches tenue à Rome du 24 au 28 février 2003.

S'il n'y a pas d'observations sur le point 16.1 de l'ordre du jour, on considère donc que nous en avons terminé avec ce point.

Je voudrais attirer votre attention sur le document CL 124/INF/4 qui fournit les informations nécessaires sur les méthodes de travail du Conseil et sur le document CL 124/INF/4 qui porte sur l'application des décisions prises par le Conseil à sa cent vingt-troisième session.

**7. Report of the 29th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)**

**(Rome, 12-16 May 2003)** (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)

**7. Rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale**

**(CSA) (Rome, 12-16 mai 2003)** (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)

**7. Informe del 29º período de sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial (CSA)**

**(Roma, 12-16 de mayo de 2003)** (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2)

*7.1 Intergovernmental Working Group on the Elaboration of Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security*

*7.1 Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation suffisante dans le contexte de la sécurité alimentaire nationale*

*7.1 Grupo de Trabajo Intergubernamental para la elaboración de un conjunto de directrices voluntarias con el fin de respaldar la realización progresiva del derecho a una alimentación adecuada en el contexto de la seguridad alimentaria nacional*

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous pourrions passer, comme nous avons encore le temps, au point 7 de l'ordre du jour qui a trait au rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale qui s'est tenue à Rome du 12 au 16 mai 2003. Les documents pertinents portent la référence CL 124/10 et CL 124/LIM/2. Dans le document CL 124/10, j'attire votre attention sur les paragraphes 9, 18, 21, 23, 27 et 28 qui contiennent les recommandations du Comité que le Conseil est plus particulièrement appelé à examiner. Nous examinerons aussi le sous-point 7.1 de l'ordre du jour intitulé: Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation suffisante dans le contexte de la sécurité alimentaire nationale. Les paragraphes 10 à 14 du document CL 124/10 se rapportent plus particulièrement à cette question. Je rappelle que ce Groupe de travail a été établi par le Conseil à sa dernière session en tant qu'organe subsidiaire du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale. Comme cela est mentionné aux paragraphes 26 à 28 du rapport de la cent vingt-troisième session du Conseil, je voudrais inviter M. Thibier, Vice-Président du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale, à introduire ces points de l'ordre du jour.

**Michel THIBIER (Vice-Président, Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale)**

Le Rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de sécurité alimentaire mondiale figure dans le document du Conseil CL 124/10. Le rapporteur attire l'attention de cette honorable Assemblée sur les recommandations de ce Comité figurant aux paragraphes 9, 18, 21, 23, 27 et 28 de ce rapport. Je me propose de vous présenter ici les points essentiels discutés lors de cette très intéressante session tenue ici à Rome au siège de la FAO du 12 au 16 mai 2003. Après vous avoir informé des principales conclusions tirées à l'issue de ce Conseil, j'indiquerai les recommandations émanant de cette instance adressées d'abord aux Gouvernements, puis au Secrétariat de la FAO et enfin à toutes les parties.

Les conclusions principales de cette réunion du Comité de sécurité alimentaire mondiale sont les suivantes:

Le Comité a trouvé la nouvelle initiative de séries de conférences portant sur la sécurité alimentaire tout à fait judicieuse et plus que bienvenue. Le Comité a particulièrement apprécié la communication du conférencier invité cette année, M. Michel Camdessus, ancien Directeur général du Fonds monétaire international.

Le Comité soutient et supporte les concepts introduits dans les deux documents présentés à l'occasion de cette réunion: le Programme de lutte contre la faim, dont la première version avait été présentée à l'occasion d'un événement parallèle à la réunion du Sommet mondial de

l'alimentation: *cinq ans après*, il y a tout juste un an, et celui de l'Alliance internationale contre la faim, également mentionné à l'issue de ce Sommet de 2002.

Comme conclusion essentielle, il a été souligné que l'Alliance internationale contre la faim devrait se rapprocher de quelques exemples satisfaisants d'alliances nationales et inviter celles-ci à renforcer leurs efforts. L'Alliance internationale et les alliances nationales devraient être encouragées à travailler ensemble.

Enfin, ce Comité exprime, comme je vous l'annonçais, une série de recommandations pour approbation par le présent Conseil. Ces recommandations sont destinées aux Gouvernements, au Secrétariat de la FAO, et à toutes les parties.

Concernant les Gouvernements, trois recommandations sont faites:

Première recommandation: Initier de façon urgente des programmes de lutte contre la faim et mobiliser les ressources adéquates pour mettre en œuvre les alliances contre la faim au niveau national impliquant toutes les parties prenantes.

Deuxième recommandation: Encourager l'aquaculture avec un impact minimum sur l'environnement.

Troisième recommandation: Intégrer les stratégies de *management* des désastres de façon à réduire la vulnérabilité des populations.

Concernant le Secrétariat de la FAO, trois recommandations sont faites:

Première recommandation: Élargir le champ du document d'évaluation et porter une attention particulière aux causes de l'insécurité alimentaire, aux facteurs qui conduisent à la réduction de la faim, dans les pays qui ont conduit de telles opérations avec succès. Parmi les facteurs, citons ceux liés à la sécheresse, à l'épidémie du SIDA et au virus VIH, aux éléments relatifs au genre ou encore au commerce et comparer aussi les performances des pays, individuellement, dans leur façon d'atteindre les objectifs fixés lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation ou dans la Déclaration du millénaire.

Deuxième recommandation: Mettre en œuvre le Programme "Parapluie II" (*Umbrella II*) pour renforcer la capacité des pays en voie de développement dans les négociations commerciales de l'OMC, analyser les faits du soutien à l'OCDE à l'agriculture dans les pays en voie de développement ou les moins développés, et estimer le total des revenus tarifaires revenant aux pays développés à partir de leurs importations de produits agricoles, des forêts et des pêches depuis les pays en voie de développement.

Troisième recommandation: Encourager la participation des pays en voie de développement aux réunions du Codex Alimentarius et accroître les actions d'acquisition de compétence dans les pays en voie de développement dans les domaines de la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, de la santé animale et de la santé des végétaux.

Il y avait des recommandations pour les Gouvernements et pour le Secrétariat de la FAO, il y a aussi cinq recommandations destinées à toutes les parties.

Première recommandation: Accélérer la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, construire les capacités de négociations commerciales des pays en voie de développement et augmenter les opportunités à l'exportation,

Deuxième recommandation: Soutenir et améliorer les programmes de la FAO pour la coopération Sud-sud dans le cadre du Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire (PSSA) et du Programme de coopération technique (PCT).

Troisième recommandation: Créer des politiques de l'environnement nationales et internationales et allouer des ressources financières à l'agriculture et au développement rural comme indiqué à Monterey en 2002.

Quatrième recommandation: Attirer l'attention sur l'intérêt du potentiel de l'aquaculture pour réduire la pauvreté,

Cinquième recommandation: Augmenter les ressources financières pour les programmes d'urgence et de gestion à long terme de désastres, en faisant particulièrement attention aux problématiques liées au changement du climat.

Le Comité a décidé que le sujet thématique qui sera traité lors de la trentième session de notre Comité de sécurité alimentaire mondiale, sera le suivant: Les meilleures pratiques pour réduire la pauvreté et l'insécurité alimentaire dans les terres marginales - leçons acquises des expériences fructueuses dans les pratiques de l'agriculture durable et des politiques économiques dans des pays sélectionnés.

Le Comité a aussi reconnu le travail effectué par le Groupe de travail intergouvernemental et approuvé le rapport du CSA à l'ECOSOC à travers le Conseil.

A ce propos, et afin de donner plus de temps aux Membres du bureau du Groupe de travail intergouvernemental, sur le droit à l'alimentation, pour consulter avec les régions et les parties prenantes, les lignes directrices volontaires, le bureau de ce Groupe a, après consultation avec le Directeur général, décidé de reporter d'un mois la seconde session de ce Groupe de travail intergouvernemental, c'est-à-dire que de fin septembre, date initialement envisagée, la réunion sera reportée du 27 au 29 octobre 2003.

Enfin, plusieurs Membres du Comité ont informé ledit Comité de leur intention de demander au Conseil de discuter le format du rapport concernant le suivi du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation avec l'objectif de mettre en place un système de rapport plus pertinent. Je crois que cela se rapporte au point 7 du présent agenda. Le Comité a décidé d'inclure ce point à l'ordre du jour à la prochaine session de ce Conseil.

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je voudrais maintenant demander à M. de Haen, Sous-Directeur général chargé du Département des affaires économiques et sociales de nous faire part de ses commentaires.

#### **Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

I have nothing to add to the report by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on World Food Security. We, the Secretariat, are at the Council's disposal to listen to its eventual guidance. The Secretariat will do everything possible to follow-up on it. At this time, I have nothing to say in addition to what the Vice Chair has said.

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Merci Monsieur de Haen. Y a-t-il des commentaires? Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de France.

#### **Claude CHÉREAU (France)**

Je voudrais vous demander de donner la parole à la délégation de la Grèce au nom de l'Union européenne.

#### **Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. The European Community endorses the Report of the Committee on World Food Security which met in Rome from 12 to 16 May 2003. The European Community wishes to draw the attention of the Council to the recommendations included in this Report and in particular, those related to the assessment of the food security situation. In this connection, we would like to introduce a proposal for discussion.

The European Community feels that it would be useful if we could introduce a more strategic approach for the next session of the CFS. The CFS session under this item would also be focussed on the experience of some countries in enhancing food security and reducing hunger.

A different approach would be that of the Secretariat presenting examples of countries from different regions together with their experiences in working with food security-related issues, in order for us to learn from such experiences. This approach would be instrumental to focus on



issues that really make a difference and it would initiate a more meaningful discussion among committee members. From such an exercise we would be able to extract and establish what policies have been effective in pursuing the World Food Summit goal. In particular, the European Community would be interested in learning from experiences in which food security objectives have been integrated to poverty reduction strategies.

This proposal is in line, with that of other Members, of having a more meaningful national reporting on the follow-up of the World Food Summit Plan of Action. We would appreciate if other members gave consideration to this proposal and we would like to hear a first reaction from the Secretariat. The European Community would appreciate if the Secretariat would come up with some recommendation to this effect by the next session of the Council.

**Haris ZANNETIS (Cyprus)**

My delegation is speaking on behalf of the countries acceding to the European Union and present at this meeting, namely, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. We wish to associate ourselves with the statement just made by the delegate of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

Now speaking on behalf of my delegation and while endorsing the Report of the Twenty-ninth Session of the Committee on World Food Security, we wish to give some comments on the work of the Intergovernmental Working Group to elaborate the guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food. We consider their decision to elaborate a set of voluntary guidelines, for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, as a positive step which will help interested countries to formulate their national policies to achieve food security for all.

In order to be helpful, these guidelines must indicate practical strategies and policies which will be easily implemented by Member Nations when fighting hunger and ensuring food security for all their people. The first session of the Intergovernmental Working Group was successful and has made progress in its efforts to develop the voluntary guidelines. We are certain that the Intergovernmental Working Group will receive the earned merits to successfully conclude its tasks.

**José Graziano DA SILVA (Brasil)**

En primer lugar, quiero manifestar la satisfacción de Brasil de estar presente en esta sesión sobretodo porque nuestro Gobierno ha elegido el tema del combate al hambre como prioridad número uno. El Presidente Lula, al lanzar el programa "Hambre Cero", destacó como fundamental para el país la ambición que, al final de su mandato de cuatro años, todos los brasileños puedan comer por lo menos tres veces al día y satisfacer sus necesidades nutricionales. Lo que queremos enfatizar primeramente, es la importancia de la participación de la FAO en este proceso de construir un programa para combatir el hambre e implantar una política de seguridad alimentaria. En los meses de diciembre y enero la FAO envió una misión conjunta del Banco Mundial, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo y expertos nacionales para elaborar el programa. Con esto quiero señalar la importancia que reviste la comunidad internacional al apoyar las propuestas de nuestros países con il fin de conseguir un programa masivo para combatir el hambre.

El segundo punto a señalar es la importancia de incluir en nuestras constituciones, en nuestras legislaciones, el derecho a la alimentación como un derecho de todos. Nosotros deberíamos enfatizar no sólo las constituciones nacionales sino toda la legislación internacional debería promover el aspecto de un derecho de todos los humanos a la alimentación al mismo nivel del derecho a la vida, porque en realidad se trata de eso: el hambre es un atentado a la vida.

La experiencia brasileña ha demostrado la importancia de combinar medidas de asistencia de corto plazo con reformas estructurales. Este es un problema que no podemos abandonar, la idea de que promover el desarrollo es fundamental como un camino de combate al hambre. No bastan medidas de transferencia de ingresos, medidas de mejores prácticas, si un país no consigue desarrollarse. Con esto volvemos al tema del comercio internacional de productos agrícolas que, muchas veces, limita la capacidad de producción y expansión de las agriculturas nacionales.

Antes de concluir quisiera añadir un punto: la importancia de la participación y movilización. Nosotros logramos conseguir en Brasil una unidad nacional contra el hambre, eso desde un punto de vista político es fundamental, la movilización de un país, la disposición política de enfrentarla. Aún más que la movilización en términos genéricos, es preciso crear mecanismos de participación. Reforzar la idea de que los países traten de crear mecanismos, consejos para todos, a fin de implementar sus programas de forma participativa. Esto es muy importante, porque la idea de que la alimentación es un derecho, implica que un derecho no se regala, más bien se conquista; por ello es preciso conseguir que los pobres, que las personas que tengan hambre posean tengan canales de participación. Es fundamental diseñar nuevos instrumentos de políticas como también nuevas instituciones que garanticen la participación de estos sectores que necesitan de la política de seguridad alimentaria.

**Nobuo KATO (Japan)**

At the outset I would like to thank the Secretariat for preparing such a comprehensive CFS Report. My delegation does not reiterate what we mentioned specifically at the last CFS but I will deliver several main points briefly.

First of all, I have no objections to endorse this draft report including documentation. My delegation has reiterated many times that in order to achieve food security we should pay more attention to the importance of sustainable agricultural and rural development, particularly to improve agricultural productivity, domestic distribution markets and sanitary and phytosanitary conditions, in these developing countries, to enhance their competitiveness. In the meantime, due consideration should be given to appropriate stockpiling and imports of agricultural products in order to maintain more sustainable food security.

Coping with the issues on food security resource mobilization to the agricultural sector is of vital importance. Japan provides about 40 percent ODA, among OECD countries, to the agricultural sector in spite of continuing decline of agricultural investment in the world. As indicated in the recommendations of Part III, concerning World Food Security situations, I also think that any party concerned should make utmost efforts to allocate more resources to agriculture and rural development.

On the other hand, agricultural trade is a key element for food security as described in the Rome Declaration. Japan decided recently that 118 agricultural products, be added to the current 209 items under GSP will be applicable to all developing countries as of 1 April 2003. In addition, 198 items were expanded as duty free and quota free agriculture and fisheries' products from overseas. Japan also supports WTO capacity-building programmes through FAO Trust Funds and the other tools. I do not think it is appropriate to underline the importance of trade and market access only, as appears in paragraph 18, which are comments and suggestions in the context of anti-hunger programmes. The trade and market issues should be examined taking into account the diversities of the European countries' internal and external conditions of their exports.

Mr Chairman, regarding engagement on the normative and operational activities, Japan appreciates FAO's normative activities such as IPPC and Codex which could contribute to ensuring quality and safety of the marketing of foods at the international level. The largest net food-importing country, as is Japan, also benefits from such activities. In the meantime my delegation observes that field programmes of FAO, including SPFS, are clearly of most direct benefit to developing countries in assisting them to tackle development programmes. I think that the programmes should be implemented in a more effective and transparent manner, using a participatory approach with gender considerations, through sustained support of regional or country offices.

I look forward to more comprehensive and tangible information on FAO's country or regional level activities, including the basic strategy and representative projects in the website, for example, for better understanding of FAO's activities among stakeholders. I believe Telefood micro-project is considered to be a promising tool to improve local food security and there would be a possibility to facilitate NGO participation. In the last year total Telefood fund-raising in

Japan has been of about US\$450 000. The contributions made by individuals and Japanese agricultural farmers amounts to about 70 percent of the total, in spite of suffering from a long economic stagnation. In view of the recent decline in Japanese ODA, the Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries would like to continue to promote the fund-raising campaign. In light of this, my delegation hopes that FAO will consider efficient monitoring and evaluation of micro-projects of Telefood, advising, for example, on the use of collected funds in the performance of the projects concerned thus contributing to the International Alliance Against Hunger.

As regards Right to Food, my delegation is also of the view that Guidelines should be voluntary as should be the nature and procedures within the context of national food security strategies, as mentioned in paragraph 13. Also, as my delegation stated at the last CFS, additional financial contributions will not be required to increment the activities according to the Guidelines generated in the future.

In relation to the fight against hunger, my delegation supports a twin-track approach. Moreover, we think the Anti-Hunger Programme should not go beyond World Food Summit primary actions and other existing frameworks.

Lastly, Mr Chairman, let me touch upon the Tokyo International Conference on African Development, which is so called TICAD III, which will be held in Tokyo at the end of September, Japan looks forward to the participation and contributions of high-level officials from FAO as agriculture is regarded as the most grave element in TICAD III. I would like FAO to join the preparation process positively as the other international organizations, such as World Bank and the UNDP, are doing.

**Anton KOHLER (Switzerland)**

Switzerland would like to suggest the adoption of the CFS Report of the Twenty-ninth Session. However, we would like to add that the Swiss delegation fully supports the statement made by delegation of Greece on behalf of the European Community. This corresponds more or less to the suggestion which we made during the last CFS, namely, to report in a supplementary or complementary way the present reporting procedures in a way that countries or even sub-regions may expose their situations, present their problems in more detail and submit their plans, their strategies and measures to overcome their constraints for discussion in the CFS.

In the last CFS, we also mentioned a second vital element, namely, to attach high priority to the side events, where country reports and programmes should also be discussed and analyzed in-depth. This would add value to the present procedure which, to the Swiss delegation, seems to be very static. We felt that during the last CFS there should have been a more process-oriented situation rather than focusing on reporting the status of implementation and obstacles on the way to fulfilling the goals of the World Food Summit.

So, again I would like to repeat that the European Community proposal is also welcome to the Swiss delegation.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

We congratulate the Committee for its excellent report; we endorse the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee. We share the concerns of the Committee on the insufficient progress made in reducing the number of hungry persons. We would, in this context, like to recall the statement made by the Director-General of FAO that political commitment was most needed at the national level to give the problem the priority it deserves. We are fully in agreement with this; we would like to mention that the Government of India attaches the highest priority to the elimination of hunger from our country.

We have probably the largest public distribution system in the world, supplying annually 18 million tonnes of food grains at affordable prices to 180 million families, a distribution network of about half a million outlets. In addition, 15 million families, identified as the poorest of the poor, are provided food grains at highly-subsidised rates in an effort to create a hunger-free India. We

are happy to note that, while assessing the food security situation, the Committee has viewed seriously international trade, including trade distortions and its impact on food security. We believe that in our efforts to secure the livelihood of billions of families in developing countries, the areas that are of immediate concern are the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers to agricultural exports from developing countries, and the phasing out of trade-distorting agricultural subsidies. In this context, we strongly endorse the recommendations of the Committee to all concerned to identify and enhance measures to increase export opportunities for developing countries for all types of agricultural, forestry and fishery products, including processed ones. Also, to ensure that domestic agricultural trade and aid policies of all the countries, particularly developed countries, are coherent and conducive to sustainable development and poverty reduction in developing countries.

We urge all concerned to act upon this, not only for a true spirit of international cooperation but in the interest of humanity. We have to note sadly that despite the commitments expressed at Monterrey, resources from FAO have stagnated. The call of the Committee for higher allocation for agricultural and rural development has our full support. Similarly, FAO's programmes which have contributed to eliminating food insecurity in developing countries to a great extent, especially the LIFDCs, need to be fully supported and enhanced.

Turning to the thematic issue considered by the Committee, we note with concern that the number of natural calamities is increasing exponentially and the number of affected people has trebled since the 1970s. The Asia Region gets disproportionately affected by these calamities while the view that they affect the poor the most is almost half evident. We welcome the endorsement to analyze the impact of climate change on poverty, natural resource degradation, food production systems and food security. We hope to see from this analysis the link between climate change and environmental degradation highlighted in detail in future, paving the way for appropriate action. We believe that the underlying causes for climate change occur largely outside the developing world and need to be addressed by those concerned as a priority. While we would have liked to see a more emphatic recommendation in this regard, we assume that this will be taken care of under the recommendation of the Committee to the effect that: proper attention be given to climate change issues; support initiatives related to understanding and combating it be undertaken, as appropriate, to go along with the recommendations; and those concerned be urged to take the necessary steps in earnest.

#### **Worwate TAMRONGTANYALAK (Thailand)**

On behalf of the Thai delegation I would like to express my appreciation to the Secretariat in preparing a fully comprehensive Report.

My delegation finds that the document CL124/10 has clearly identified the roles for governments and FAO. In this connection my delegation is very grateful to the Members of the Twenty-ninth Session of the Committee on World Food Security.

I only want to highlight the following points related to food security.

Firstly, as recommended in paragraph 9, to "directly and urgently combat hunger through national initiatives". I am very pleased to inform the Council that our present Prime Minister, Dr Thaksin Shinawatra, has declared a policy to alleviate poverty in Thailand within six years, by 2010. It is well known that poverty is a major cause of food insecurity. In this connection, the fight against poverty is strong and this strong political view has been conveyed to the public. However, a political view at the top level is not enough, and Plans of Action must be implemented as well. A series of measures are now being implemented by the Government. My delegation urges FAO Members to pay great attention to the political view together with a Plan of Action.

Secondly, my delegation would like to appeal to FAO to continue assisting developing countries in their multilateral negotiations, as much as possible, in the field of agriculture.

Thirdly, is the issue of food safety and food standards in the same paragraph 9. My delegation welcomes the promotion of representatives from developing countries to participate in the Codex

Alimentarius Meeting. Moreover, this promotion should be expanded to other food standard setting bodies namely, IPPC and OIE.

Fourth, my delegation endorses the Anti-Hunger Programme and the International Alliance against Hunger. I firmly believe that these initiatives would assist our FAO Members to achieve the World Food Summit targets no later than 2015.

Lastly, the role of agriculture in improving food security and nutrition. Thailand fully agrees with the recommendations as highlighted in paragraph 21.

My delegation is of the view that the transfer of technology to the quality and safety of agricultural products must be given top priority. In this regard, FAO has to provide technical assistance in order to ensure the safety of agricultural products to the consumer, especially to the poor.

**Mrs Meglena PLUGCHIEVA (Bulgaria)**

The delegation of the Republic of Bulgaria is pleased to see you chairing this meeting of this Session of the Council. I would like to thank the Secretariat for presenting the Report of the Twenty-ninth Session of the Committee on World Food Security which was held in May 2003 in Rome.

My delegation is in favour of adopting the report. Bulgaria fully supports the recommendations of the Committee to Governments, FAO and all parties concerned as expressed in paragraphs 9, 18, 21, 23 and 28. If we want the projected goals to be achieved, it is essential that all parties do their best to implement the recommendations falling under their mandates. We endorse also the report of the Committee on World Food Security through FAO Council, to ECOSOC presented in Council Document CL 124/LIM/2. I would like to take the opportunity to support the proposal made by Greece on behalf of the fifteen Member States of the European Community. Bulgaria as a country from the second group of the fifth enlargement of the European Union fully supports this proposal.

Regarding the arrangements for the next session of the Committee, my delegation supports the inclusion in the agenda of the item's best practices in reducing poverty and food insecurity in marginal lands. We hope that this dramatic issue for consideration of the Thirtieth Session will contribute to the efforts for fighting hunger and reducing poverty around the world.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

First of all, we would like to congratulate the excellent work of the Committee on Food Security Report. We also support the recommendations made by this Council.

Indonesia would also like to extend its view on the Voluntary Guidelines of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security. These views include the elaboration of a set of Guidelines which should not be extended beyond the declaration of the World Food Summit: *five years later*, especially on the use of the term voluntary. Therefore, the Guidelines, when they are approved, should not necessarily be legally-binding. It should contain guidelines that guide the Member Nation in protecting, fulfilling and respecting the right to adequate food.

Another point is that food and human life are equally important. In our country, and I believe in other developing countries as well, food is part of our valuable culture. Therefore, the Voluntary Guidelines should in the first place, appreciate, consider and accommodate actions taken by local communities in respecting, fulfilling and protecting human life in their neighbourhood by developing their own mechanisms. The Guidelines should not degrade that value and rather expand that value into the international community and international relationships.

If we agree with this assumption, the Guidelines should therefore identify actions taken by all communities in FAO Member Nations and seek common values. Even though these Guidelines are from a local perspective on common ground values, the responsibility of implementing the Guidelines does not lie only on local and national communities, but as the Declaration recognizes,

the responsibility should also extend to the international communities with varying stakeholders, including trans-national cooperation.

We would also like to share our views and experiences regarding the SPFS programmes. These kinds of programmes are of importance in assisting developing countries, like Indonesia, to empower the local community in alleviating its poverty and achieving food security. We suggest, therefore, that the Council continues to support and expand the SPFS programmes to more communities in Indonesia.

Finally the Council should recommend that the Intergovernmental Working Group continues to work to pursue more complete and comprehensive guidelines, besides the fact that FAO and its developed Member Nations consider the work of IGWG as one of their priorities, and, therefore provide financial arrangements for the completion of the Voluntary Guidelines.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

Este intercambio de opiniones nos alienta a decir algo, se han dicho cosas muy interesantes que compartimos en líneas generales. En primer lugar quisiéramos agradecer el informe presentado por el Vicepresidente del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial y en ese marco, específicamente en el Grupo de Trabajo sobre el Derecho a la Alimentación, reiteramos que sin duda la responsabilidad nacional es prioritaria y básica, pero creo que tendríamos que hacer mucho más énfasis en lo que significa la cooperación internacional. En ese contexto, deseamos reiterar la importancia de evitar tendencias destinadas a la clasificación de países como base para determinar asignaciones de ayuda, o para concentrar la cooperación internacional. En líneas generales nos parece que la cooperación, sea vertical o sea horizontal, debe llegar donde se presenten situaciones de inseguridad alimentaria y su asignación no debe verse limitada por este tipo de clasificaciones o de concentraciones.

En segundo lugar, en relación a la Alianza Internacional contra el Hambre, mi país ha ya establecido un punto focal nacional en noviembre pasado con la presencia del Director General. Pero precisamente en el marco del esbozo de Alianza que nos presentó la Secretaría en la reunión del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial pasado, nosotros quisiéramos enfatizar dos aspectos adicionales que nos parecen interesantes: primero la necesidad de establecer sistemas nacionales de información e interconexión que permiten una coordinación efectiva para la toma de decisiones, mejora en la capacidad de análisis, diagnóstico, programación, prevención y seguimiento, especialmente con el fin de evitar repercusiones negativas de las políticas de seguridad alimentaria en las capacidades locales de producción, distribución, transporte y comercialización. Creemos que la FAO puede cubrir un importante rol en este sentido apoyando el fortalecimiento de las capacidades nacionales. Y segundo, la posibilidad de elaborar lineamientos de políticas alimentarias, subregionales y regionales, comenzar a pensar en la necesidad de establecer programas regionales de seguridad alimentaria que permitan una útil retro-alimentación de las políticas nacionales.

**Mohammad Saeid NOORI-NAEINI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

Let me join others in congratulating the Secretariat for preparing the excellent report. We endorse the Report and its recommendations but my delegation does have some considerations which we hope will appear in the final Report of the Council.

First, as a general point of view, I would like to mention that food security cannot be dealt with in isolation. It certainly should be considered in the context of rural agricultural development of the countries which are food insecure. In this respect, I would like to support the statement made by Japan, which has stressed the importance of agricultural development and I would also like to commend the new policy undertaken by the Government of Canada, which was recently announced where they have put sustainable agriculture and rural development in their agenda with a high priority. We hope that this sets an example for other developed countries to follow the same pattern, and especially in their assistance to food insecure countries to take into account this important consideration.

A few specific recommendations on page 3, on the recommendations which are for all concerned parties. First of all my delegation would like to say that we do not think that these recommendations are listed in order of importance, because, as it was mentioned by Japan and by Indonesia, the last bullet which says: "support and improve effectiveness of FAO's field programmes, such as the Special Programmes for Food Security, Technical Cooperation Programme, and Programmes for South to South Cooperation", has very high priority for most of the developing countries. If the recommendations are therefore mentioned in the order of priority and importance, this last bullet should become the first bullet.

The second bullet recommends "build capacity of developing countries for their more effective participation in multilateral trade negotiations on agriculture in the World Trade Organization". While we strongly support this, we would like to mention that this is not the only capacity-building need of developing countries. The capacity-building at the total level and its totality is needed for most of the developing countries and these recommendations should not exclude other kinds of capacity-building, especially those which are related to food security.

I will come to page 4, which is the Report on the First Session of the IGWG. As the Chairman of that Group, I would like to thank Cyprus, Indonesia, Peru and others who have supported the work of this Group and commended our first meeting. I would like to mention that in addition to this Report and in addition to the Chairman's Report - which is available if someone needs to have it - the Government of Italy, together with Jacques Maritain Institute and FAO, organized an International Seminar on the Cost of Hunger and the Right to Food. It took place last Friday and Saturday and was an excellent seminar, with the participation of Nobel Prize winners from developed and developing countries. The main issues which were discussed were on cost of hunger and safety nets and Ministers from both developed and developing countries expressed their views and their attempts toward having the Right to Food in their laws.

I would like to ask the Secretariat if FAO could distribute the Report of this Seminar, which I think would be very beneficial to our future work. There will also be a Workshop on the same issue in Berlin during the first week of September 2003 and I would like to remind all the Council Members to participate because this is another step to help us in our deliberations in the second meeting of IGWG which has been postponed to October 2003. The main reason for this postponement from September to October was because we wanted to give more time to countries and regions to consider the Guidelines which would be very soon distributed, and to also benefit from these seminars and studies which are going on on the experiences of some countries.

In recent FAO initiatives in the Fight Against Hunger, we welcome both Anti-Hunger Programmes and International Alliance against Hunger, but in the comments and suggestions I do have some points.

In paragraph 18 on page 5, which reads: "The substantive contents of the Anti-Hunger Programme were widely supported", with which we do fully agree. The twin-track approach especially found widespread acceptance as a sound conceptual basis for policies on hunger reduction.

We are talking about a Plan but we confess that the document is still a conceptual basis. There is a great distance between conceptual basis and a Plan of Action. While we support this very strongly, we would like to see a document which looks more like a Programme and not a conceptual basis, and we emphasize that we hope that this document will be finalized so we can endorse it in this year's Conference.

**Tony P. HALL (United States of America)**

The United States would like to ask the Council to consider a major item of unfinished business; that is, the heart of the mandate of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). FAO is to be commended for providing an increasingly useful assessment of the world food situation. The number of undernourished people in developing countries is now estimated at just below 800 million.

However, this figure is a decrease of barely two and a half million per year over the last eight years. This is far below the 24 million a year required to achieve the World Food Summit goal of cutting in half the number of hungry people by the year 2015. Moreover, if we compare the two recent three-year periods of 1997-1999 and 1998-2000, it shows that there has been an actual increase of 15 million undernourished people in the world between the two periods.

Like many of you, I have a personal commitment to make sure that we meet this goal. We have all seen some of the people to whom we are referring, whether in person or in pictures, their lives literally depend on us in our achievement of this goal. If we do not, they and their children are condemned to the prison of poverty forever. The assessment of our lack of progress is alarming. The CFS agenda item 3 suggested that the Committee might wish to recommend that Member Nations and the international community take more concerted actions to accelerate the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action so as to achieve the reduction of the undernourished by half by 2015. This almost goes without saying.

However, what is more important, what must precede such an action is for the Committee to understand why progress is so slow. A great deal of work has gone into reporting on follow-up but very little has been learnt. The United States, supported by several other Members, has requested that the reporting system be reviewed and revised. The results of this first cycle of reporting were unsatisfactory.

Many countries did not provide information in time to be compiled, or at all. Information was general and difficult to compile in a meaningful format. A great deal of work by FAO and the reporting countries and institutions went into this process.

Unfortunately, very little was learnt about the implementation. The Committee is now faced with the prospect that unless it changes the procedures for reporting World Food Summit follow-up, another arduous and meaningless round of work will be put into motion. Unless the Council intervenes, there is no feasible way to change the reporting system before the next session in September 2004. The unsatisfactory reporting would go on as previously scheduled.

The United States requests that the Council encourage the CFS Bureau, aided by the Secretariat, to prepare a new proposal for reporting World Food Summit follow-up: One, Members have expressed preferences that the reporting would make minimum additional demands on the respective countries.

Two, make maximum use of information generated by food insecurity and vulnerability information and mapping system.

Three, be meaningful - that is, performance-based, reporting only on most significant actions and related to expected results, if possible; and

Four, be supplemented with case studies of successful country experiences from which lessons learnt can be extracted.

The United States requests that these actions we have recommended be reported back to the next Council meeting in November 2003, with the expectation that a new reporting system could be adopted by the next meeting of the CFS in September 2004.

#### **Paul MURPHY (Canada)**

Canada is concerned about the lack of measured progress towards the goal of having the number of malnourished people halved by the year 2015. We are committed to helping to achieve the target for global food security as set out in the Rome Declaration on Food Security in 1996.

Canada reaffirmed this commitment in the 2003 budget, which maintained the annual eight percent increases in Canada's overseas development assistance. This will translate into an increase of 1.4 billion Canadian dollars over the next three fiscal years, with the objective of doubling the overseas assistance budget by 2010.



As a representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran mentioned, this includes a significant emphasis on agriculture-related Overseas Development Assistance.

The expenditures in this area will grow from current levels of about 95 million Canadian dollars to 500 million Canadian dollars over the next five years. Canada welcomes FAO's initiative to focus on the potential for trade to contribute to overall economic and agricultural growth and to the reduction of food insecurity.

The agricultural trade reform, as mandated in the Doha Development Agenda, will also benefit developing countries by generating new trade opportunities amongst them. Canada encourages FAO to help enhance food security in developing countries by providing capacity-building support that would help them take advantage of trade opportunities.

In consideration of the thematic issue for the next meeting of the Committee on World Food Security, FAO should document specific experiences where international trade has contributed to food security and helped countries to take advantage of trading opportunities. In addition, Canada would like to support the proposal made by the representative of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, of a similar nature.

With respect to the Anti-hunger programme and the International Alliance Against Hunger, Canada supports the spirit of these initiatives, but we strongly encourage FAO to make use of funding and programmes already in place to achieve the goals of these programmes.

In addition, Canada would like further clarification regarding the differences between the Anti-Hunger Programme and the International Alliance Against Hunger, as well as their involvement and collaboration with other multilateral organizations and international initiatives currently in place, in order to promote a better understanding of how these different initiatives would operate.

Finally, Canada supports the consideration by the Council of initiatives for improving the quality of reporting on follow-up to the World Food Summit Plan of Action, as proposed by the United States of America.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

Es un placer verlo nuevamente en Roma presidiendo las sesiones de este Consejo. Agradecemos el informe del Vicepresidente del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial y desde luego mi delegación brinda su apoyo a este excelente documento.

Quisiera hacer algunas observaciones. Sería conveniente que, para la evaluación de la situación mundial, la Secretaría de la FAO elabore un informe más detallado señalando los logros y rezagos en relación a la seguridad alimentaria mundial, ya que el informe que se presentó en la Sesión del Comité es muy general y no permite saber cuáles son las regiones que han avanzado en esta materia o los programas que se aplican para combatir de manera más directa la inseguridad alimentaria. En este sentido, las propuestas de Suiza son adecuadas.

En el informe hay un tema en el que estaremos atentos, me refiero a la evolución que pueda tener el informe conjunto de expertos de la FAO y la OMS sobre "Dieta, nutrición y prevención de enfermedades crónicas". Consideramos que estudios como éste no deben inhibir la producción agrícola de los países en desarrollo ni generar nuevas barreras al comercio internacional.

Por otra parte, es indispensable continuar el fortalecimiento del programa para la capacitación del personal de países en desarrollo con el fin de que participen de mejor forma en las negociaciones comerciales internacionales de la OMC y de manera inmediata en la reunión ministerial que se realizará en Cancún este año.

Esperamos que la FAO revitalice sus actividades para conseguir recursos extra-presupuestarios con este fin. Ya los 80 funcionarios de diferentes países capacitados por la FAO han mostrado la conveniencia de esta importante actividad. Pero se necesita ampliar este esfuerzo.

El Consenso de Monterrey expresó la necesidad de aplicar mayores recursos al desarrollo. Sería conveniente que este Consejo haga un llamado para que el financiamiento internacional se oriente

hacia el desarrollo rural y al mejoramiento de las condiciones de la población campesina, con el fin de brindarles oportunidades para superar sus actuales necesidades.

Con respecto a la declaración que hizo Grecia a nombre de la Unión Europea, realizaremos un análisis a fondo de esta propuesta. Una primera reacción es que al parecer minimiza el aspecto internacional, el cual también influye en las situaciones nacionales sobre seguridad alimentaria.

Finalmente, en relación con el párrafo 3 del punto 9 dirigido a los Gobiernos, consideramos muy conveniente sustituir el término "intervención", cuando se refiere a los organismos internacionales. Podría utilizarse el término "apoyo" o "asistencia" o algún otro que evite interpretaciones poco afortunadas.

**Julius KIPTAURUS (Kenya)**

My delegation would like to congratulate the Committee for doing excellent work on the CFS report.

On the issue of food security, the Government of Kenya has attached great importance in dealing with food security. I would like to report that currently, as a country, we have launched the SPFS in 14 districts throughout the country. We hope to reduce poverty levels by 50 percent in the next ten years. We have started to document and upscale successful technologies in the selected areas of the country. We hope this will assist us in reducing food insecurity in the arid and semi-arid areas. We also thank our developing partners on this endeavour to support our proposal.

**Noah M. NKAMBULE (Swaziland)**

I just want to take this opportunity to join the other members who have congratulated the Chair for leading these deliberations so efficiently.

Mr Chairman, even though my delegation did not participate in the last session of the CFS, we wish to express and endorse the Report and the recommendations contained therein. In particular, we wish to emphasize the need for FAO to report on the impact of HIV and AIDS on food security.

We believe this issue is of particular importance to countries such as ours since the epidemic is already devastating a large proportion of our population, thereby exacerbating our food insecurity and poverty situation. Such a situation calls for more innovative initiatives in addressing agriculture and poverty. I wish to report that my country has already initiated grassroot programmes to address these issues in collaboration with civil society.

Secondly, Mr Chairman, my delegation wishes to express its strong support to FAO's field programmes, such as the Special Programme for Food Security, Technical Cooperation Programme and the South-South Cooperation Programme. Such programmes have a direct and positive effect on eliminating hunger in the developing world.

Lastly, may I, on behalf of my delegation, express my country's sincere appreciation to various friendly Governments and Organizations who provided food aid to my country and other sister countries in southern Africa when we were hard hit by devastating drought during the past season. In particular, I wish to express our appreciation to FAO and WFP who have continued to assist with technical expertise in assessing the food needs for the affected areas. It is discouraging to note, that even this year certain areas of my country have suffered total loss of potential food production as a result of the drought. WFP and FAO have already responded by fielding joint assessment teams. This is appreciated.

Before I conclude my intervention, I wish to express my delegation's satisfaction in the efficient manner that you and your colleagues in the Bureau are conducting this meeting.

**Ángel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)**

Creo oportuno referirme a algunos temas que considero importantes dentro de la evaluación de la situación de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial incorporados en este Informe del 29º Período de Sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria.

Vemos con satisfacción que hay una mayor preocupación a nivel internacional y también al interior de los países con respecto a la aplicación de políticas públicas con el propósito de poder superar las situaciones de pobreza y de inseguridad alimentaria. Vemos también con satisfacción que no obstante se hayan hecho pequeños pasos, el tema está rondando en los diferentes foros y hay una preocupación permanente.

El desarrollo agrícola y el desarrollo rural son temas importantes con el propósito de poder superar estas lacras. El tema de la movilización de recursos, tanto públicos como privados o internacionales, orientados justamente a dar un entorno apropiado para este desarrollo marcan una tendencia interesante, insuficiente todavía pero vemos que hay una preocupación. La preocupación permanente de los países por la creación de puestos de trabajo remunerados adecuadamente con el propósito de poder efectivamente tener acceso a los mercados de productos alimenticios, indica una dirección correcta respecto a los caminos para superar estos problemas.

También quisiera referirme al tema redundante de la sequía, de cómo poder enfrentar estos períodos que uno ve con preocupación y que cada vez son más frecuentes. No digo nada nuevo si digo que sin agua no hay agricultura, por lo tanto debería haber una preocupación permanente con el propósito de extremar su uso, mejorar su gestión, mejorar en definitiva la capacidad de los pueblos, de las comunidades, de las localidades con el propósito de poder usar en forma adecuada y en una gestión óptima un recurso que es limitado. Ahí hay un desafío interesante para esta Organización y para los países que con mayor frecuencia sufren este fenómeno. El fenómeno de la sequía es un fenómeno recurrente, afecta sectores ya vulnerables de tal modo que hay una preocupación en el sentido de poder mejorar la calidad de los suelos, pequeñas medianas o grandes obras de riego, hay un desafío interesante que creo es necesario abordar.

Con respecto al comercio agropecuario, el informe da algunas señales interesantes. Desde luego que el comercio agropecuario permitirá a los países en desarrollo poder tener mayor disponibilidad de recursos. Creo que cualquier iniciativa, programa que busque mejorar todo lo que significan los medios de intercambio económico respecto al comercio agrícola, creo que apuntan a lo correcto con el propósito de que estos países puedan superar situaciones de pobreza.

También el tema que cada día adquiere mayor importancia respecto de la preocupación de las comunidades sobre la inocuidad de los alimentos, es de permanente actualidad. La opinión pública está preocupada de la calidad de la inocuidad de los alimentos que consume. Hay una preocupación y yo creo que tanto esta Organización como los Países Miembros preocupados de mejorar las capacidades para enfrentar esta situación están en la senda correcta.

Quisiera también destacar el papel de la acuicultura en la mejora de la seguridad alimentaria y la nutrición. Vemos con satisfacción que este subsector de la economía, la acuicultura, poco a poco adquiere una mayor transcendencia. Una parte importante en nuestros alimentos de carácter pesquero provienen de la acuicultura, es un tema interesante. Para mi país la acuicultura es un sector de la economía dinámico que provee una cantidad importante de puestos de trabajo y estamos convencidos de que su desarrollo también podrá ayudar a solucionar el problema de inseguridad alimentaria en muchos lugares. Nuestro país en el Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial manifestó su apoyo a estas actividades y aquí las apoyamos nuevamente.

Finalmente, quisiera referirme muy brevemente al tema de los efectos de las catástrofes en la seguridad alimentaria, un tema que vemos con preocupación, que episodios de esta naturaleza se repiten de tal manera que más que una necesidad urge el establecimiento de mejorar las capacidades de los pueblos, de las localidades que sufren estos eventos. El mejorar las capacidades significa establecer planes de prevención, aquí como en muchos otros eventos la prevención es una manera moderna de enfrentar estas situaciones. Hay elementos técnicos con el propósito de entregar estos antecedentes a nuestras poblaciones. Creo que el establecimiento de estrategias de prevención y de mitigación de catástrofes que afectan a la agricultura e introducen grados crecientes de inseguridad alimentaria debería motivarnos a establecer estos planes y programas.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia broadly endorses the conclusions of the Committee on Food Security and, particularly, those that relate to the role of agricultural trade, food safety and food standards, and aquaculture in contributing to food security. We would, also, just highlight, as others have, support for the need to look at the approach to follow-up reporting for the WFS. We would emphasize, in looking at this, that we also need to ensure that not just national dimensions are taken into account in addressing food security, but also that the international context in contribution to food security is recognized.

In this regard, we would particularly wish to support comments that have already been made by others on the importance of trade to food security and on the impact of trade distortions on food security, as well as emphasizing the importance of food standards and FAO's role in this area.

With regard to this particular area, we would particularly welcome the CFS' agreement to new analytical studies examining the links between trade and food security. In view of the potential importance of these studies for developing countries and particularly in the context of the current WTO negotiations, the Secretariat should give priority to these studies so that they can be completed in a useful timeframe for Members.

We would also, as has just been well outlined by the Representative of Chile, like to applaud the CFS' recognition of the important role that aquaculture can play in improving food security and the need to support and promote the sustainable development of aquaculture. We, therefore, strongly support the CFS' recommendation to strengthen the activities of the Sub-committee on Aquaculture.

Finally, just on the Anti-Hunger Programme and on the International Alliance against Hunger, we would wish to then support the earlier comments by Canada in this regard.

We would also endorse the conclusions of the CFS on the Anti-Hunger Programme on the importance of highlighting the significance of trade and market access for food security, and for this to be addressed in any redraft.

**José Graziano DA SILVA (Brasil)**

Quisiera hablar muy brevemente sobre una cuestión que me parece recurrente y que puede movilizar esfuerzos. Estamos trabajando con una gran Organización dirigida por un Director General que respetamos donde tenemos delegaciones significativas con sus respectivos representantes que aportan nuevas ideas, etc. Para nosotros es muy importante trabajar sobre métodos, sobre cómo debemos encarar nuevas formas de consulta entre las delegaciones, entre delegaciones y el Secretariado para mejorar los resultados.

He escuchado las sugerencias de varias delegaciones no solamente sobre la manera de promover una mejor aproximación de los temas que discutimos con la formulación más participativa de las agendas sino también la forma de informar a los distintos Comités de lo que pasa. Hemos oído con mucha atención las sugerencias que vinieron tanto de los Estados Unidos como de la Unión Europea sobre estos métodos que para nosotros es muy productivo discutir, pero que no podemos trabajar con visiones que sean localizadas o aisladas de la realidad. El hambre es un problema que viene de nuestros modelos de desarrollo y está en la punta final de un proceso de exclusión. Entonces cuando trabajamos sobre la cuestión del hambre debemos trabajar sobre un contexto tanto nacional como internacional. Por esto quiero afirmar que estamos listos para un trabajo productivo tanto sobre la propuesta europea como la americana, pero no debemos jamás perder de vista que el hambre no es solamente un problema a ser solucionado desde un punto de vista nacional, sino que hay cuestiones internacionales que deben ser consideradas.

Los países pueden presentar sus casos pero también deben presentar soluciones. Debemos tener un informe de la situación tanto local, nacional como internacional, sea en comercio, sea en finanzas como en los flujos de cooperación donde la FAO tiene un papel importante. Debemos enfatizar este aspecto de cooperación internacional incluso en la preparación de negociadores

internacionales para trabajar en la OMC y para hacer frente a toda la cuestión internacional que es difícil solucionar. Desarrollo es el nombre de todo el juego.

**Alfredo Néstor PUIG PINO (Cuba)**

Ante todo deseo agradecer a la Secretaría por este informe que nos ha presentado y que ha motivado, por el nivel de intervenciones que ha tenido, toda la atención de los Estados Miembros, de ahí su importancia.

Antes de continuar quisiera expresarle nuestra satisfacción por tener la oportunidad de compartir con ustedes las labores de este Período de Sesiones del Consejo. Estamos de acuerdo en que será un Período de Sesiones importante en tanto que elevará las recomendaciones pertinentes a la próxima Conferencia de la FAO.

Nuestra delegación respalda plenamente las recomendaciones recogidas en este documento del 29 Período de Sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria, particularmente aquéllas que están recogidas en el párrafo 9 del Informe. Reconocemos los esfuerzos de la FAO para mejorar el estado de la seguridad alimentaria en el mundo y en la lucha contra la pobreza, sin embargo notamos con mucha preocupación los pocos avances alcanzados en este sentido.

El Informe del Período de Sesiones del Comité recoge ampliamente un sinnúmero de recomendaciones, todas ellas tendientes a cumplir los compromisos contraídos para disminuir el hambre y la pobreza en el mundo. Sin embargo a mi delegación le preocupa que estas recomendaciones no se vean respaldadas por igual con compromisos concretos de recursos para cumplir las mismas.

Vemos con buenos ojos, en este sentido, la disposición de algunos países donantes de incrementar sus recursos y contribuciones para el desarrollo agrícola. Creo que estos son ejemplos que pueden poner de manifiesto o ponen de manifiesto la importancia del plano internacional para mejorar la inseguridad alimentaria y la pobreza en el mundo con mayor aporte de recursos para nuestros países.

Compartimos la preocupación expresada por la delegación de México con respecto a los informes que fueron presentados sobre la dieta y nutrición que pueden limitar o contribuir a disminuir o a desalentar la producción de algunos productos básicos de nuestros países. Consideramos que la FAO debe tomar nota para que este tipo de información no se produzca de esta forma.

Apoyamos la intervención hecha por la delegación de Japón reconociendo la importancia de que se dediquen recursos financieros al desarrollo del sector agrícola.

Nuestra delegación respalda los esfuerzos que realiza la FAO con respecto a los programas que desarrolla en el campo, particularmente en lo que se refiere al Programa Especial para la Seguridad Alimentaria (PESA) en el marco de los Programas de Cooperación Sur-Sur. Nuestro país está presente en un grupo de países en desarrollo a través de este Programa. Apoyamos los esfuerzos de la FAO con los pocos recursos de que disponemos, nuestros recursos humanos incluso a un costo inferior al costo que pudieran tener nuestra asistencia técnica en el plano internacional. Creemos que de esta forma podemos contribuir modestamente a estos esfuerzos. Continuamos trabajando en esta dirección e incluso seguimos promoviendo el PESA en algunos países de nuestra región caribeña. Allí también estará presente la asistencia técnica cubana como una muestra modesta de lo que se puede hacer cuando existe voluntad para contrarrestar el hambre y disminuir los efectos de la seguridad alimentaria.

**Claude CHÉREAU (France)**

Je voudrais juste vous demander une clarification parce que, depuis le début de cette discussion, plusieurs délégations ont fait état à la fois du point 7.2 et du point 7.1. Si cela est effectivement un débat sur l'ensemble des points, je dois dire que l'Union européenne ne s'est pour l'instant exprimée que sur le point 7.2 et qu'elle aurait besoin de s'exprimer sur le point 7.1 à travers la délégation grecque.

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Il me semble que nous sommes en train d'aborder le point 7 en son intégralité. Si l'Union européenne doit faire une intervention à ce sujet, elle sera la bienvenue mais je devrai d'abord passer la parole à d'autres délégations annoncées.

### **Sra. Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOTTI (Guatemala)**

Mi delegación aprueba el informe del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial y quiere manifestar su apoyo a las delegaciones de Brasil, México, Chile y Australia en lo que se refiere a la acuicultura, Perú en lo que se refiere al marco de la cooperación internacional que debe ser abierta a todos los países sin clasificaciones restrictivas, y apoyamos lo expuesto por Cuba, especialmente por el esfuerzo del apoyo a la Secretaría del Programa de Seguridad Alimentaria (PESA).

Mi delegación estará pendiente de los resultados de examen que el Comité de Agricultura (COAG) hará en un período extraordinario de sesiones del Informe Conjunto de Expertos de la FAO/OMS sobre "Dieta, Nutrición y Prevención de Enfermedades Crónicas" ya que dicho informe puede significar una repercusión directa en el consumo de azúcares libres y otros productos, provocando una incidencia en el mercado agrícola de los mismos, resultados que serán presentados al 125<sup>o</sup> Período de Sesiones del Consejo. Estos estudios no deben transformarse en nuevas barreras al comercio. Además enfatiza la necesidad de financiar de manera efectiva el Codex Alimentarius y la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria para el establecimiento de normas internacionales basadas en la ciencia, además de permitir la plena participación de los países en desarrollo en esos foros.

Consideramos de suma importancia la propuesta de estudios sobre productos básicos, entre ellos azúcar y café, prosiguiendo el análisis de las tendencias de la composición y orientación de las exportaciones agrícolas, teniendo muy en cuenta, entre otras tareas, la de cuantificar las consecuencias económicas, tanto las políticas proteccionistas y las medidas de ayuda, causa de distorsión del comercio como los efectos de la concentración del mercado de las empresas transnacionales. Asimismo, consideramos de importancia primordial el fortalecimiento de la voluntad política para lograr el derecho a una alimentación adecuada que debe tener igualmente un carácter internacional para que éste respalde su realización progresiva en los contextos nacionales.

### **Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

My delegation would like to start by congratulating the Secretariat for a job well done with respect to the Reports contained in CL 124/10. I would also like to convey my country's endorsement of the Report, as well as, the report intended to be conveyed to ECOSOC, found in document CL 124/LIM/2.

The Report in itself is very well articulated but the thought of it as a whole is a bit worrying. We are still saying that not much progress is being made with respect to the fulfilment of the vision of the World Food Summit. That is a sad note. It is on this note that one would want to equate some of the points raised on the recommendations on page two and three. With respect to the recommendations for Governments, I guess all we can tell the international community at this stage is that most countries are trying, mine certainly is one of them. I fully embrace the Anti-Hunger Programme being promoted by FAO in the hope that at a certain stage we will come to terms with the realities on the ground, but I would like to specifically draw the attention of this audience to some of the recommendations where I think something is missing.

With respect to the recommendation for FAO, one thing that I would have wished added is the documentation concerning the impact of debt overhung on food security, although, I am particularly impressed with the first three bullets on page three.

Everything has been said about trade distortions which I totally agree with, but one area that many of us in Africa in particular have been helping on is the chronic debt overhung. This is not to say

that we are oblivious to the landable key pit programme being promoted by the World Bank and the IMF, but the technicalities of the implementation of that scheme itself lends themselves to a lot of questions. If we are to go by that scheme as it is, it would take maybe close to fifty years before some of the debts that are now weighing us down will come to any substantial reduction. I would, therefore, have loved to see that one element included in at least the first or last bullet point of page three.

The other comment I would wish to make is with respect to the recommendation for all concerned, also on page three. "Build capacity of developing countries for their more effective participation in multilateral trade negotiations." I thought this concerns FAO more than the countries concerned. We have been talking about this for quite some time and one is gladdened by the effort being made by FAO to strengthen our hands in the developing world in the negotiations exercise. In support of what His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran said with respect to the last bullet on page three: I do not think I would say more, because the exposure of FAO in the field is becoming more and more important to us. I am, of course, aware of the opposite view being held in some quarters that FAO should concentrate more on the thematic issues as against the field exposure. My country, however, holds a different view.

Finally with respect to the thematic issue, I would just like to add a little point on paragraph 23 where the Governments are being asked to develop short- and long-term strategies to reduce vulnerability to disasters. I thought that this is one area in which FAO may come provide assistance.

With that comment, I would like to conclude with a simple statement with respect to the Report of the First Session of the Intergovernmental Working Group. It concerns the Elaboration of a Set of Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressing realization of Right to Food. I fully endorse everything that has been said. I was part of the discussion, but I think I heard a comment alluding to some form of legislation in order to put in place the need for realizing this objective.

By the time the first draft of the Report is out maybe we will have time to talk more on this, but one would want to caution just at this point. That these are intended to be Voluntary Guidelines. I am not sure how a legislation can come into force without having to stipulate the remedies. Once you have stipulated obligations and remedies, the question of being voluntary is eliminated immediately. We therefore feel that care needs to be taken in marrying these two aspects of the question of trying to get the Governments committed vis-à-vis the fact that the Governments also had limited resources. After all the very statement of the Right to Food is already enshrined for those of us who have ... at least Nigeria does, is already enshrined in the fundamental principals of third policy. It is the matter of implementation that is a problem. I think this document, by the time it comes up, will help Governments realize these objectives, as enshrined in the fundamental objectives, and direct principals of the third policy. I therefore wish us to exercise a little caution as we go along with the work of this Committee in providing guidelines. Once again, I congratulate the Secretariat for a very good Report.

**Ackah Pierre ANGNIMAN (Côte d'Ivoire)**

Je voudrais, au nom de ma délégation, remercier également le Secrétariat pour la qualité du rapport relatif à la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale. Ma délégation approuve ce rapport et souhaite que les différentes recommandations puissent être appliquées.

Mon pays a été objet d'une agression depuis le 19 septembre 2002 et cette situation a entraîné de graves perturbations socio-politiques et socio-économiques. Il y a eu des milliers de déplacés et de victimes de guerre. L'activité économique, en général, et l'activité agricole ont été fortement ralenties. Le nouveau Gouvernement de réconciliation nationale issu des Accords de Linas-Marcoussis met actuellement tout en œuvre pour faire revenir la confiance et instaurer une paix durable.

Je voudrais saisir cette occasion pour remercier la FAO pour l'appui qu'elle apporte à mon pays, notamment en ce qui concerne tous les aspects liés aux intrants agricoles dans le cadre du

Programme de coopération technique. Un certain nombre de programmes se sont arrêtés, notamment ceux du PSSA, à cause de la guerre mais nous espérons pouvoir reprendre bientôt ces activités grâce à un retour de la paix que le Gouvernement et mes concitoyens préparent avec conviction. Je voudrais également remercier le PAM pour toute son assistance dans le cadre de cette situation exceptionnelle que connaît la Côte d'Ivoire. Nous apprécions beaucoup les efforts du PAM pour tous les déplacés.

Je voudrais terminer en faisant deux observations sur le rapport. La première observation concerne le paragraphe 9 à la page 3, en ce qui concerne le commerce des produits agricoles, où il est recommandé à la FAO d'analyser l'incidence du soutien accordé par les pays développés à leur secteur agricole sur les pays en développement et les pays les moins avancés. Je crois que c'est un point important parce que le commerce mondial reste inégal et le soutien des pays développés à leur secteur agricole a des incidences très graves sur l'évolution des pays en développement.

Il est évident que si nous recherchons la sécurité alimentaire pour les pays et les populations, cette question devrait être analysée dans le contexte national, mais aussi dans le contexte international, et nous regarderons de très près l'analyse que fera la FAO pour aider les pays en développement à être présents eux-mêmes et à prendre part à cette question importante.

La deuxième observation concerne le rôle de l'aquaculture dans l'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et la nutrition. Je pense que nous soutenons cette recommandation importante mais nous voulons également que cette recommandation puisse être élargie à l'ensemble du secteur de l'élevage parce que nous savons que dans les pays en développement, l'élevage joue un rôle capital et contribue à assurer la subsistance de 70 pour cent des populations rurales pauvres de la planète. À ce titre, nous savons les efforts substantiels que la FAO fait, à travers le Programme EMPRES, mais nous pensons que dans le cadre de la sécurité alimentaire, cet aspect aurait aussi dû faire l'objet d'une recommandation au même titre que l'aquaculture.

**Claude CHÉREAU (France)**

Juste pour rappeler, Monsieur le Président, que j'avais demandé la parole pour la délégation grecque.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de France, j'avais effectivement pris note du fait que vous aviez demandé la parole mais cela viendra par la suite.

Nous reprendrons nos travaux cet après-midi. Il y a encore plusieurs délégations inscrites.

Je passe maintenant la parole à la délégation du Ghana. Ce sera la dernière intervention de ce matin et nous reprendrons nos travaux à 14 h 30.

**Kwaku Owusu BAAH (Ghana)**

On behalf of the delegation of Ghana, we would like to congratulate you and the good work that you are doing.

We wish to make a short intervention on the Report prepared by the Committee on World Food Security. We want to begin by first associating ourselves with the delegations of Mexico and the United States of America. These two delegations, in their contributions to the discussions of the Report, made some comments to the effect that this Report would have been wonderful if some kind of situational analysis had been undertaken as part of it. This would have put in perspective what the situation has been *vis-à-vis* programmes and interventions that have gone on in the past. I really want to say that perhaps this suggestion should be given attention so that some kind of situational analysis be undertaken as quickly as possible.

We also want to say that perhaps in making this Report it would have been useful for us to know what some of the success stories have been in some countries, especially *vis-à-vis* the Special Programme on Food Security, because we know that the SPFS is ongoing in several countries. I do not want to speculate that they have all been a failure. We believe that there have been some



success stories and such success stories ought to have been shared in order to know what have been the reasons behind the successes and what have been the reasons behind the failures in some regard, so that there would be some lessons that we could all learn. I say so because in my country, Ghana, we are going through this SPFS Programme.

Now having said that, let me quickly attempt to say a couple of things about some of the experiences that we have had in the implementation of our SPFS. The first point I would like to make is that perhaps we must also begin to address issues of post-production activities as parts of the design of SPFS and all programmes that try to address issues of food security. After all, food security has two faces - both physical and economic assets to food. There have been situations in my country where farmers have actually responded to the interventions that are put in place in the SPFS only to realize, at the end of the day, that they have so much food that they cannot dispose of, and cannot process. In situations like this, you can expect that farmers become demotivated because they responded first to some interventions and were able to increase their productions, only to realize that there were no post-production activities to respond to some of these supply issues. We think that future programmes should address some of these problems.

I would also like to say that food insecurity is more of an endemic situation in war-torn countries and regions. Perhaps we must also begin to look at situations and try to assert the implications of all the factors in food security studies because there are problems of refugees, there are problems of internally-displaced persons, either in the countries where wars are being fought or in neighbouring countries, where refugees migrate and settle. We need to take a critical look at the implications of these problems on food security or food insecurity.

The delegation of Chile made a good point with regard to food safety. We want to share the concerns of the Delegation of Chile. It is important for us to begin to look at situations of food safety. In my country, we are already looking at this because people are beginning to ask questions about the kind of food they eat, the involvement within which the food is even sold for consumers. These are worrying things that we think need to be addressed.

Finally, there is the issue of international trade barriers, what are called the non-tax barriers, and many times one realizes that it has nothing to do with quality of food. One cannot export food because the quality is not acceptable to the importing country. We are happy that this is addressed on page four. We think that is a very important issue that must be addressed and addressed quickly so that as production goes up, we will be able to look outside domestic matters to find assets for what we produce.

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Dans la session de l'après-midi, nous avons quelques délégations qui ont demandé la parole dont la délégation de l'Union européenne.

*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 Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>SECOND PLENARY MEETING DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>23 June 2003</b>

The Second Plenary Meeting was opened at 15.00 hours  
Mr Aziz Mekouar,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La deuxième séance plénière est ouverte à 15 h 00  
sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,  
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la segunda sesión plenaria a las 15.00 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

**7. Report of the 29<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS)**

(Rome, 12-16 May 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (continued)

**7. Rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale**

(CSA) (Rome, 12-16 mai 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (suite)

**7. Informe del 29º período de sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial (CSA)**

(Roma, 12-16 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/10; CL 124/LIM/2) (continuación)

*7.1 Intergovernmental Working Group on the Elaboration of Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security (continued)*

*7.1 Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation suffisante dans le contexte de la sécurité alimentaire nationale (suite)*

*7.1 Grupo de Trabajo Intergubernamental para la elaboración de un conjunto de directrices voluntarias con el fin de respaldar la realización progresiva del derecho a una alimentación adecuada en el contexto de la seguridad alimentaria nacional (continuación)*

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je déclare ouverte la deuxième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil.

Nous allons poursuivre l'examen du point 7 de l'ordre du jour. En principe, au cours de la réunion de ce matin, nous aurions dû aborder le sous-point 7.1 de l'ordre du jour, pour après aborder le sous-point 7.2. Comme il y a eu des interventions sur le point 7.2 et des interventions sur le point 7.1, nous allons donc examiner le point 7 dans son ensemble.

Les délégations qui estiment ne pas avoir abordé comme ils l'entendaient l'un des deux points: 7.1 ou 7.2, pourront reprendre la parole.

**Veli-Pekka TALVELA (Finland)**

Finland speaks here on behalf of the Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland. We also want to indicate our support to the statement which will be given a little bit later, a statement of Greece on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

The Nordic Countries welcome the work completed at the First Session of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the elaboration of a Set of Voluntary Guidelines to support the progressive realization of the Right to Adequate Food. The Nordic Countries consider that the process is on the right track and we wish to give all our support to this work. We look forward to receiving the first draft of the Voluntary Guidelines prepared by the Bureau of the IGWG in time for submission to the Second Session of the Group in October this year.

The Nordic Countries are committed to attend the future sessions of the Group and any eventual intercessional activities that may be decided by the Bureau. We also encourage other Members to take an active part in the deliberations.

**Claude CHÉREAU (France)**

Comme je vous l'avais indiqué je voudrais vous demander de donner la parole à la délégation de la Grèce au nom de l'Union européenne.

**Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS (Observer for Greece)**

Mr Chairman I have two statements to deliver, the first one deals with item 7.1. I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. The European Union appreciates the work completed at the First Session of the Intergovernmental Working Group and welcomes the decision taken by the Group to mandate its Bureau to prepare the first draft of the Voluntary Guidelines in time for submission to the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Working Group in September this year. It is positive to note from the views and proposals presented during the

Intergovernmental Working Group discussions, that the areas of convergence outnumbered the areas of divergence. The European Union thus hopes that the Intergovernmental Working Group at its September session can agree on substantial elements of the guidelines and initiate further discussions on important areas of divergence under the guidance of its Bureau.

The European Union prior to the First Session contributed by submitting its preliminary views and proposals on the Guidelines and feels a strong commitment to contribute to the momentum of the work of the Intergovernmental Working Group. The European Union looks forward to participating in future sessions of any inter-sessional activities that may be decided upon by the Bureau. We encourage other Members also to participate actively in the deliberations.

Now the statement on item 7.2. Again I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. We had the opportunity, at the CFS session in May, to express our concerns with the current level, quality and value of the reporting on the World Food Summit follow-up that has taken place until now and we had made some suggestions for its improvement. We, therefore, welcome the discussion on this matter at the Council, with the view to revising the format used, so as to have more meaningful and timely reporting by all Members. We propose that the Council authorizes the CFS Bureau, in close collaboration with the Secretariat, to carry out a study to: First, analyze the current difficulties in the reporting process and the underlying reasons for the reporting system not to have delivered satisfactory results. Second, examine ways of improving the existing reporting system. Third, build the FIVIMS and the experience of previous reporting to identify a set of indicators, both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

We invite Member Nations, including those who have never produced a report, to engage in voluntary case studies in order to learn from the application of a simplified and improved methodology. We would like to see the recommendations of this study as soon as possible, either to be presented at the coming Session of the Council or at the latest at the next Thirtieth Session of the CFS so as to introduce the revised reporting system without delay.

**Dhanasena HETTIARACHCHI (Sri Lanka)**

On behalf of the Sri Lankan delegation, I would like to make two comments on the report.

Firstly, on the Recommendation for Governments, I wish to inform the Council that Sri Lanka is now embarking on a more focused programme of activities to revitalize the agricultural economy. With the unprecedented commitment of US\$4.5 million for five years recently made at the Tokyo Donor Forum, a major percent of it will go towards the agriculture sector. This will help transform the agriculture sector by increasing productivity with the use of new technologies. We are confident that this will considerably help the agricultural-dependent farming population.

Secondly, we thank FAO for the SPFS programme now ongoing in Sri Lanka. We have adapted it towards the needs of the Sri Lankan situation and are hopeful that we can make it a revolutionary concept and a successful approach to agricultural development.

**Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

La délégation camerounaise voudrait d'abord féliciter le Secrétariat et le remercier pour la qualité du document soumis à l'examen du Conseil qui reprend les principales recommandations du dernier Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale.

Notre délégation est d'accord sur ces recommandations et souhaite leur approbation. Nous tenons cependant à attirer l'attention du Conseil sur certaines observations qui nous paraissent plus importantes. Il s'agit des alliances contre la faim, au niveau national, intégrant les organisations internationales.

Cette idée est très pertinente parce qu'elle reflète la réalité quotidienne lorsqu'on veut traduire dans les faits une recommandation comme celle visant l'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire vu le nombre important de facteurs qu'il faut prendre en compte. Seulement, comme il s'agit d'organisations internationales, il nous paraît très important pour les besoins d'efficacité qu'un effort de concertation soit fait au sommet de ces organisations pour accélérer le processus. L'un

des principaux problèmes auxquels sont confrontés les pays en développement, à l'instar du nôtre, le Cameroun, est celui des ressources destinées au financement de l'agriculture en très grande partie assurée par de tout petits paysans. Malgré la volonté politique qui est indéniable, les grandes orientations des bailleurs de fonds vont parfois à l'encontre des recommandations pertinentes, comme celles qui ont été prises en 1996 au Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, et qui, à ce jour n'ont été traduites dans les faits qu'avec beaucoup de difficultés, d'où les résultats très faibles que l'on constate à chaque évaluation.

Comment rendre les recommandations du Conseil de la FAO intéressantes pour la Banque mondiale, le FMI, la BAD et la BID, etc.?

Comment atténuer les contradictions entre les volontés exprimées par les États au sein du Conseil de la FAO et les oppositions que ces mêmes États présentent lorsqu'il faut les mettre en œuvre au niveau de l'OMC, même lorsque ces recommandations sont pertinentes et évidentes?

Notre délégation appuie naturellement la recommandation visant le renforcement des capacités des pays en développement pour leur participation aux négociations. Cela est nécessaire, mais il nous paraît également utile d'élaborer des stratégies concrètes de concertation entre les institutions, qui pourraient atténuer ce que nous pouvons qualifier aujourd'hui de contradiction et qui freine énormément la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Nous sommes d'accord avec la délégation du Brésil qui nous a rappelé que le droit à l'alimentation est tout simplement le droit à la vie, et que ce droit devrait nous pousser à oser de temps en temps à expérimenter de nouvelles voies. C'est pour cela que notre délégation encourage le Secrétariat de la FAO à étudier et à soumettre au Conseil des mécanismes nouveaux pour accélérer le processus de recherche et de mise en place des fonds nécessaires au développement de l'agriculture, sans lesquels la solution de sécurité alimentaire dans nos pays serait toujours difficile.

**Naceur BEN FRIJA (Tunisie)**

La délégation tunisienne voudrait saisir l'occasion de l'examen du document CL 124/10 sur la sécurité alimentaire pour faire connaître très succinctement les efforts de la Tunisie en matière de lutte contre la pauvreté et son Plan d'action dans le cadre du dixième Plan de développement économique et social 2002-2006.

La Tunisie entend poursuivre ses efforts durant le dixième Plan de développement, en particulier dans le domaine agricole, des pêches, de l'aquaculture et des produits transformés. Une attention particulière sera accordée aux zones les moins développées et disposant de potentialités agricoles importantes de sorte qu'elles puissent contribuer à l'effort national de développement du secteur agricole, dans le cadre de l'approche globale de la Tunisie à lutte contre la pauvreté et pour le développement. Dans ce contexte, nous comptons notamment sur la coopération avec la FAO pour développer nos cultures céréalières, les projets prioritaires de promotion agricole durable ainsi que la sauvegarde de nos acquis. Je voudrais rappeler rapidement que la Tunisie a déjà engagé des programmes visant à améliorer les conditions des citoyens défavorisés, en mettant en place les mécanismes de solidarité nationale dans le cadre de la politique de micro-crédits octroyés par la Banque tunisienne de solidarité et du Fonds de solidarité nationale. Les activités réalisées depuis le Sommet mondial de l'agriculture de 1996 ont permis la création d'emplois, la mise en valeur des terres par l'irrigation, l'accès aux crédits, la commercialisation et la transformation des produits ainsi que la création d'installations de stockage.

Les moyens mis en place à améliorer à court, moyen et long terme, l'accès au bien-être, compte tenu de leur réussite, à ce stade, ont incité la Tunisie dans un esprit de solidarité internationale à proposer en 1999, avec le soutien de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies, la création d'un Fonds mondial de solidarité pour lutter contre la pauvreté dans le monde et favoriser la croissance et la stabilité. La délégation tunisienne souhaite voir apparaître dans le rapport du Conseil l'expérience de la Tunisie en matière de sécurité alimentaire et sa proposition d'un Fonds mondial de solidarité.

**Nobuo KATO (Japan)**

I wish to deliver my comments on agenda Item 7.2. As previous speakers have mentioned, my delegation is also worried about the current undesirable situation of undernourished people in the world, so consequently the reporting system used for the World Food Summit follow-up is essential.

Based on my experience, it would appear that the present format covers an extensive range of questions, consequently, each person, including NGOs, is required to respond to essay type and indistinct questions. As a result, the involvement of a number of staff members, who have different interpretations of the questions, causes difficulty in harmonizing the level of each answer.

I really felt that it was not easy to analyse each country's report where there seemed to be diversity in responses. Therefore, my delegation supports the proposal made by the United States that the present reporting format should be improved or simplified, thus making it easier to analyse each country's report more effectively and thus enabling us to obtain a more meaningful outcome.

**Jacques CHAVAZ (Suisse)**

Nous voulons apporter un commentaire concernant le point 7.1, Le droit à l'alimentation. La Suisse accorde une grande importance à l'élaboration des directives volontaires visant à assurer la concrétisation progressive du droit à une alimentation adéquate dans le contexte de sécurité alimentaire mondiale. L'élaboration de ces directives volontaires doit absolument être finalisée dans les délais restant de quinze mois. C'est uniquement de cette manière que les directives volontaires pourront contribuer effectivement à réduire d'ici 2015 de moitié la proportion de la population qui souffre de la faim.

Mon pays se félicite des progrès enregistrés lors de la première séance du Groupe de travail intergouvernemental et espère que la dynamique engagée, lors de cette première réunion, va se poursuivre. Nous attendons avec intérêt de recevoir prochainement le premier projet de directives volontaires.

À ce stade, j'aimerais mettre en évidence trois points.

En tout premier lieu, j'aimerais réitérer la volonté de mon pays de continuer à porter sa contribution aux travaux de réalisation de ces directives. Le Gouvernement suisse a, par ailleurs, décidé de fournir également un appui financier aux dits travaux.

Deuxièmement, j'aimerais souligner que le droit à une alimentation adéquate est un droit de l'homme universel, fondamental et indivisible. Il est étroitement lié à de nombreuses questions cruciales traitées dans d'autres accords ou instruments internationaux. Pour ma délégation, il est donc essentiel que les directives volontaires tendent au renforcement de la cohérence du système multilatéral. Cela contribuera à une meilleure coordination des efforts et renforcera ainsi la mise en œuvre du droit à une alimentation adéquate.

Troisièmement, l'obligation première de réaliser le droit à une alimentation adéquate, incombe aux gouvernements nationaux. Ce sont ces gouvernements nationaux qui portent la responsabilité d'adopter des mesures ciblées aux niveaux politique, légal et administratif. Toutefois, d'autres parties prenantes, telles que les organisations internationales, les ONG ainsi que le milieu de l'économie et de la science, jouent aussi un rôle important en la matière.

Nous proposons par conséquent de suivre une 'multi-stakeholder approach' pour l'élaboration des directives volontaires. Ces dernières ne devraient pas seulement aborder les rôles et les responsabilités des gouvernements nationaux mais aussi ceux des autres parties prenantes – *stakeholders* – de manière à ce que ces dernières s'associent aux directives et que leurs responsabilités respectives soient clairement identifiées dans leurs domaines de compétence. Ce n'est que par la somme des actions des gouvernements et des autres parties prenantes que nous contribuerons à la réalisation progressive du droit à une alimentation adéquate. Les directives volontaires devraient refléter cet état de fait. La Suisse est consciente que l'essentiel du travail reste à faire. Mon pays entend apporter sa contribution de manière engagée dans un esprit constructif.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

The Czech Republic would like to make the following statement, speaking on behalf of countries in accession to the European Community. The countries acceding the European Community represented at this meeting namely, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia wish to associate themselves with the statements concerning agenda Items 7.1 and 7.2 pronounced by Greece speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**N. MASOKA (Zimbabwe)**

On behalf of the Africa Group we would like to welcome you and to thank you very much indeed for the manner in which you are conducting the proceedings. We also would like to thank the Secretariat for the very lucid and clear statements which they have made and for the documentation that they have provided us for the proceedings.

We have all come here in recognition of the responsibilities on our shoulders, that is, to translate the decisions of many international commitments taken by our governments: a) the Millennium Development Goals; b) World Food Summit: *five years later*; c) World Summit on Sustainable Development; d) the Monterrey Consensus; e) the ECOSOC Report, just to name a few.

Countries must be willing to share responsibilities, risks and resources to achieve the shared objectives that our governments have agreed upon. We have to recognize that policies taken by some Governments may have a negative impact on Member Nations in achieving food security. With respect to governments' role in achieving the target, the Africa Group believes in providing a conducive environment for government, civil society and private sector to play their respective roles. We commend the clear proposal of responsibilities with respect to the world food security situation.

It is the Africa Group's belief that FAO's role should also cover greater support to the special Programme for Food Security, as well as increases attention to programmes that assists the poor and the hungry directly, otherwise the target will not be met. We commend Canada's commitment to increasing agricultural financing. In addition to that, we would also like to support the Government of Japan in the statement that they have made that they are reallocating more resources to agricultural growth.

Regarding the need to advise countries on trade, we would want to hope that the criteria for such assessments will be agreed upon and revised regularly to assess its relevance and usefulness. We urge more attention for programmes that target the poor.

On agricultural trade, we urge the developed countries to honour the pledges they made during the Monterrey Conference and the World Food Summit on Sustainable Development as this results in an increase in agricultural investment by our Member Nations. We urge that as partners reviewing the agricultural policies, the concerns we have raised are taken on board.

On the right to food, we believe in differentiating national responsibilities from international ones, this is because some of the international institutions' policies impact on members states' right to food. Sometimes during the war food is used as a weapon, we believe the primary responsibility of member states is to provide the right to food legally through a constitution bill of rights or legislation. This would enable the citizens to have a basis for claiming their right to food. In addition, we recommend regulating its implementation to enable civil society and the private sector to participate. However, this should be a result of a national agenda to which all stakeholders should subscribe, such as Brazil's Zero Hunger Programme, thus supporting NEPAD initiatives in Africa.

On behalf of the Zimbabwean delegation, I would like to inform members that Zimbabwe has developed its national Hunger Programme to which all interested stakeholders are contributing. The starting point for us is to conclude the ongoing land reform programme and forecasts on the agrarian reform. As systems approach to ensure success is a prerequisite and this includes: a) providing productive assets, such as the provision of land as a productive resource, together with



farmer training; also, research and the extension of farm machinery is the access to agricultural inputs as is the introduction of contract farming supported by the private sector; b) supporting issues of health relating to maternal health, nutrition and HIV/AIDS.

With these few words, we endorse the recommendations of the Committee on the World Food Security and the eight members to be fully committed in implementing the proposed strategies. The HIV/AIDS impact on African Member Nations should not be overlooked.

**Ms Rahma MSHANGAMA (Tanzania, United Republic of)**

On behalf of the Tanzanian delegation, may I thank you and the Secretariat for the good organization of this meeting and the good reports.

My country wishes to applaud Canada, Japan, Australia and other nations for the total engagement they wish to involve themselves in, rather than trade alone. Certainly, we thank FAO for the initiatives we are taking together, for example, in the Special Programme for Food Security and in various technical assistance programmes. However, for the purpose of sustainable food security, we appeal that FAO programmes are expanded so that the impact of such programmes are well realized by the beneficiaries.

The United Republic of Tanzania supports and endorses the Report on Food Security as a measure to cut food shortage, which normally resulted into hunger and poverty. My country has come up with an agricultural sector development strategy document whose objective is to create an enabling conducive environment for improving production, the productivity of crops and the livestock sector. As a basis for improving farmers' incomes and reducing rural poverty, the agricultural sector development strategy is soon to produce an Agricultural Sector Development Programme in collaboration with the development partners.

The Agricultural Sector Development Programme aims at reorienting and reinvigorating the national income economy. It is going to be the main tool of central governments in connecting and monitoring agricultural development and other nationwide reforms.

The Agricultural Sector Development Programme is guided by the principles of poverty reduction strategy, rural development strategy and the Tanzania Development Vision of 2020/25.

We appreciate FAO's role in guiding this process and we promise to continue to work together for the benefit of our people.

**Segfredo R. SERRANO (Philippines)**

My delegation would like to commend the CFS for its report which we endorse. We would also like to express our appreciation to the leadership of the Committee, for the insights and inputs of fellow members in the deliberations, with regard to the agenda that we are tackling.

It is with interest and concern that we listen and trap the interventions most particularly on CL 124/10. We will not repeat the items that have often been part or elements of the interventions but we would like to add the following, for the consideration of the Chair, the Committee and colleagues.

It is with interest that we see under "Recommendations" a bullet which says "document and analyse ways in which trade, including trade distortions, have affected food security in countries ...". This is well and good, but in view of apparently the *de facto* interpretations of many parties in the ongoing negotiations with regard to the meaning of the term "trade liberalization", we would like to caution that we must be very definite about what we mean by "trade liberalization". There are parties involved in the ongoing negotiations and most of the major parties seem to define trade liberalization only in terms of tariff reductions and market access.

The Philippines would like to remind all Members and colleagues that a more useful and comprehensive view of trade liberalization is at the same level of importance breaking market access barriers as in commitments to reforms in export competition measures and trade distorting

domestic support which especially prejudice the trade interests of the developing countries. This is an important point for us. How exactly do we define an operationalized trade liberalization.

I'd also like to make a point on the same page, under the first bullet of the second part "With Regard to Agricultural Trade Matters", which refers to assisting developing Member Nations in their multilateral negotiations through training, analyses and capacity building. The ongoing negotiations in agriculture, as well as other areas of negotiations in the so-called Doha Development Round, while missing most of the deadlines, are well on the way. We submit that our efforts here would be very useful. It is the suggestion of the Philippine delegation that, given the current proliferation and preponderance of bilateral negotiations and plurilateral negotiations, which are essentially in response to the inertia in the ongoing multilateral negotiations, developing Member Nations may also benefit from technical assistance and capacity-building in managing these more immediate and more difficult types of negotiations on trade, particularly on agriculture and food.

Let me just say that developing countries have technical assistance grants. Developed countries have technical assistance and grants TCPs and GSPs. These are very important elements when addressing food security and are important elements in the development programmes of the developing countries. However, they are not and never will address the core of how developing country members can attain and sustain food security.

This representation submits that fairer rules in international trade would in essence give domestic producers access to their own domestic markets, which in developing countries are currently being clobbered by the heavily-supported foreign competition. These would also be useful in attaining food security goals for the developing countries.

The unfairness of the subsisting international trade rules have been documented to even blunt or constrain initiatives by developing countries when addressing their food security problems, even reform-issues, such as Governments which are very important in attaining sustained food security.

We submit that fairer trade rules, the integration of commitments, not only in market access and tariff reductions, but those distorting trade that prejudice the trade interests of the developing, and the food insecurity, should and must have our rightful focus in assisting our developing country Members.

#### **Elías REYES BRAVO (México)**

Con respecto al tema 7.2, mi delegación está de acuerdo en que se mejoren los informes relativos a la aplicación del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. La mejora debe ser cuantitativa y cualitativamente, con datos representativos de las actividades realizadas que se refieran a cuestiones concretas de la seguridad alimentaria, haciendo énfasis en la disponibilidad, la regularidad de los ministros y el acceso de la gente o las personas a los alimentos.

Mi delegación considera que en este proceso de mejora se hace patente la necesidad de la elaboración de informes más sencillos y concretos, como también la necesidad de fortalecer los debates del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial, cuya responsabilidad es inminente si consideramos que está encargado del seguimiento de la Cumbre y que es el heredero del Consejo Mundial de la Alimentación, cuyos trabajos en materia de formulación y de estrategias alimentarias nacionales fueron útiles para muchos países.

#### **Wilson ODWONGO (Observer for Uganda)**

Uganda welcomes and endorses the recommendations of the Committee on Food Security like most of the other delegates have done. We would like to take this opportunity to inform the Council that Uganda is also fully cognizant of the linkage between poverty and food insecurity and is using agricultural development as a major instrument for the alleviation of poverty and food insecurity. It is upon this basis that we have embarked on the implementation of a comprehensive food and nutrition security policy which has the following principles. The policy looks at food as a human right: food is treated as a national strategic resource; and the policy emphasizes the cross-cutting nature of food and nutrition as they affect men, women and children.

Gender considerations and needs for all vulnerable groups are integral to all policy components and a human rights based approach is going to be used for the integration of the policy. It is on this basis that we would be willing to share the experiences of this policy with other Members during the next meeting.

We have, right from the beginning, as has been echoed by some of the Members, experienced a lot of problems with market access and terms of trade. It is on this basis that we support the request of Australia and others that have indicated that the Secretariat should focus and put more emphasis on studies that aim to address issues related to trade and food security issues.

**Flávio MIRAGAIA PERRI (Brasil)**

Para terminar, deseabamos mencionar un punto que tiene relación con los trabajos muy bien conducidos por nuestro amigo Embajador Noori-Naeini del Grupo de Trabajo sobre las Directrices para el Derecho a la Alimentación. Nosotros estamos muy interesados en que de este trabajo surjan directivas que tengan relación con la realidad, que no sean simplemente una serie de sugerencias sobre leyes nacionales, constitucionales u otras; y, que también guarden relación con la participación social necesaria en los Consejos.

Actualmente estamos experimentando en Brasil la idea de que no solamente se incluya en la Constitución brasileña la idea del derecho a la alimentación, sino que también estamos instrumentando a las comunidades para trabajar con el derecho a la alimentación. Porque para nosotros, para Brasil, el derecho a la alimentación es algo así como el derecho a la vida. No podemos pensar al derecho a la alimentación como algo que las personas puedan elegir, y así trabajamos en toda la gama de acciones posibles. No podemos ignorar que esto es algo que Brasil hace, no solamente porque tiene la convicción, sino que sabe que es así por la observación y estudio de las situaciones internacionales.

Nosotros conocemos que, muchas veces, los países no están en condiciones de alimentar a sus pueblos porque sufren de restricciones internacionales, sea de un punto de vista de formación de la ley comercial internacional, o porque existen dentro de esta ley restricciones, subsidios y otros tipos de formas proteccionistas que impiden a sus productores de rendir, de hacer el dinero necesario para conducir sus negocios internos. Este no es el caso de Brasil, que produce hoy una cantidad de alimentos que serían suficientes para el doble de su población, pero el país necesita trabajar también con la producción de todas las partes del país. El 40 por ciento de la capacidad ociosa que existe en Brasil puede derivarse de la producción de pequeños propietarios, o producción familiar, etc. que serán apoyados en un ambiente internacional y desde un punto de vista del mercadeo.

Pero no es sólo ello, también está la cuestión del financiamiento, de la asistencia técnica, donde la FAO tiene un papel particular. Esta asistencia, que magníficamente está prestando la FAO a nuestro programa de "Hambre Cero", es algo que debería extenderse a todos los países como una forma de ayuda a la organización interna de cada caso, es decir de cada país. Así también, este apoyo a la organización interna tiene un significado mayor cuando se extienda a la preparación de los negociadores para las tratativas ya sean en la Organización Internacional del Comercio, o en las negociaciones bilaterales, especialmente aquéllas que tengan relación con la agricultura y los productos agrícolas.

Nuestra preocupación es que trabajemos en conjunto y que no nos limitemos a un sólo aspecto ya sea nacional o puramente legal. No estamos para cuestiones de puro carácter legal, son prácticas y éstas nos cuestionan.

**Moussa Bocar LY (Observateur de Sénégal)**

C'est un plaisir que de vous revoir à Rome. J'ai été discipliné, parce que je pensais que le Secrétariat allait vous conseiller de donner en premier la parole aux Membres du Conseil, alors le Sénégal ne l'est plus, et de la donner ensuite aux observateurs, comme l'est maintenant le Sénégal. C'est pourquoi nous avons attendu sagement que les membres aient fini de prendre la parole. Mais

j'ai vu que certains observateurs avaient pris la parole et je me suis donc permis de la demander avant que vous ne clôturiez ce point important de l'ordre du jour.

Permettez-moi d'appuyer le rapport du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale, rapport auquel a contribué notre délégation. Nous voudrions aussi, comme le Zimbabwe en a parlé dans sa première partie au nom de l'ensemble du Groupe africain, et je pense que le rapport en tiendra compte, appuyer le Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire, et la question du NEPAD, ce nouveau partenaire pour le développement de l'Afrique, que le Sommet mondial de l'alimentation: *cinq ans après*, en juin dernier, avait endossé.

Nous nous félicitons du progrès fait, notamment à travers l'appui de la Communauté internationale, par le G-8 de Gênes en Italie, qui a adopté un Plan d'action dans lequel la sécurité alimentaire est bien présente parmi les priorités, et nous suivons avec intérêt l'application de ce Plan d'action, notamment dans sa partie sécurité alimentaire.

Permettez-nous aussi de rendre hommage au Canada, notamment pour sa politique qui tend à revoir, dans le sens de l'agriculture et du développement rural, son aide au développement, de même que le Japon. Nous n'oublions pas également les États-Unis d'Amérique, notamment pour le volet "Alimentation scolaire" qui revêt une importance particulière, notamment dans la perspective, en septembre prochain, de la Réunion de Dakar des Ministres de l'éducation du Sahel. S'agissant des travaux du Groupe de travail intergouvernemental chargé d'élaborer des directives volontaires sur le droit à l'alimentation adéquate, nous appuyons les efforts de ce Groupe vers l'élaboration de ces directives, que nous souhaitons, comme d'autres, très concrètes. Nous saisissons donc cette occasion pour remercier tous les bailleurs qui ont tenu à appuyer les ateliers et séminaires nationaux, qui ont pour but de tenir compte des réalités nationales et d'entraîner une dynamique dans le sens de la compréhension d'abord, et de la mise en œuvre ensuite, du droit à une alimentation adéquate.

Nos hommages vont donc en particulier à l'Allemagne, au Royaume de Norvège et nous exhortons les autres bailleurs à suivre cette voie.

Concernant le contenu concret de ces directives, nous reconnaissons avec d'autres la responsabilité nationale, qui est primordiale, mais aussi, à côté des responsabilités nationales, la coopération internationale. D'ailleurs, le Pacte international sur les droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, reconnaît comme une obligation internationale cette coopération. Je crois que tous ceux qui ont eu à présenter des rapports au titre du Pacte international sur les droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, reconnaissent que c'est une obligation internationale de coopération internationale, et nous ne voyons donc pas opposée la responsabilité nationale à la coopération internationale, comme pour dire que ces directives se limiteraient seulement à la responsabilité nationale. Nous pensons que ces directives devraient aussi embrasser la coopération internationale.

Enfin, sur ce même point, nous pensons, comme le Professeur américain Mark Cohen, qui le *week-end* dernier a fait un brillant exposé sur le droit à l'alimentation et le coût de la faim, que nous devons nous concentrer sur les zones où il y a le plus grand nombre de pauvres, car c'est dans ces zones que nous pouvons faire des progrès plus rapides dans le cadre de la réduction du nombre de personnes souffrant de la faim et de la malnutrition dans le monde. C'est pourquoi, ces efforts, qu'il s'agisse d'ateliers ou de réalisations concrètes, doivent se faire en particulier là où nous notons le plus grand nombre de personnes souffrant de faim et de malnutrition. Je crois que le rapport du CSA est assez édifiant à ce niveau.

Permettez-moi de terminer par le point 7.2: Présentation des rapports sur la suite donnée au Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, pour signaler tout d'abord une erreur qui s'est glissée dans la version française CL 124/INF/12. À la dernière page, nous sommes heureux de voir y apparaître le NEPAD, mais nous ne pensons pas que ce soit là sa place. Nous voulions le signaler au Secrétariat. Cette erreur, d'ailleurs, n'apparaît pas dans le texte anglais. Quand au contenu de ce point lui-même, nous ne sommes pas, en principe, contre l'examen de toute possibilité d'améliorer les rapports, mais nous voudrions simplement dire qu'un travail avait été fait et nous notons la

recommandation qui est faite de réaliser une étude pour déterminer les raisons du faible taux de réponses, selon la procédure que nous connaissons jusqu'à présent. Je crois que Monsieur de Haen, lors de la dernière réunion du CSA, avait déjà eu à en parler et nous serions heureux de l'écouter à nouveau pour qu'ils nous dise comment et quand cette étude pourrait être réalisée. Car je crois que c'est à partir de cette étude que nous pourrions essayer d'imaginer un nouveau modèle de rapport. Je vois également que les co-auteurs de ce nouveau point à l'ordre du jour nous informent qu'il y a deux options. Nous penchons pour l'option qui viserait à conserver au CSA tout son mandat car nous connaissons le Conseil et l'Organe directeur, mais le CSA avait été mandaté par le Sommet lui-même pour le suivi des progrès réalisés dans ce domaine et nous ne voulons pas que le CSA voit son mandat torpillé. Nous souhaiterions donc plutôt appuyer l'étude de projet révisé qui pourrait être examinée par le CSA à sa trentième session. Nous préférons cette formule à la première.

**Sra. Hilda Graciela GABARDINI (Observador de Argentina)**

Quisiera en primer término expresarle la satisfacción de mi delegación al verlo presidir estas sesiones y augurarle que lo acompañe el mismo éxito que usted obtuviera en funciones anteriores. Hago extensivo este augurio a la Mesa que lo acompaña.

Brevemente quisiera referirme al documento CL 124/10; agradecemos a la Secretaría el Informe del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial y expresarle que mi delegación puede refrendarlo y aprobar las recomendaciones en él formuladas, con especial énfasis en aquéllas que figuran en el punto 9 del mismo.

Me referiré brevemente a la declaración que esta mañana formulara el Representante de Grecia a nombre de la Unión Europea. Creemos que lo dicho allí merece ser considerado con atención, sin embargo, al igual que lo expresaran las delegaciones de Brasil, de Perú, de México y de Senegal recientemente y aunque pensamos que es fundamental el rol de cada país en la seguridad alimentaria de su población, nos preocupa que dicha propuesta pueda llegar a minimizar el aspecto de la cooperación internacional. Creemos que ello influiría negativamente en las condiciones nacionales en materia de seguridad alimentaria.

**Carlos Luis POZZO BRACHO (Observador de Venezuela)**

Al igual que otras delegaciones deseo expresar la satisfacción de Venezuela de verlo nuevamente en Roma presidiendo el Consejo y también expresar nuestro agradecimiento al Dr Thibier que ha presentado el informe del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial. En su oportunidad, como miembros del Consejo, nosotros dimos el apoyo a ese informe y vemos que el Consejo le va a dar su apoyo en esta oportunidad.

Nosotros quisiéramos referirnos a un punto del informe que ha presentado la delegación de Estados Unidos como punto 7.2. Con referencia al derecho a la alimentación, mi delegación no quisiera dejar pasar esta sesión del Consejo sin reiterar el apoyo otorgado al Grupo Intergubernamental y, en esta ocasión, a los trabajos que se realizarán para la elaboración de las Directrices Voluntarias. Venezuela ha estado siempre interesada en trabajar para que los Estados, sobre todo los países en vías de desarrollo, tengan condiciones que le permitan superar los problemas de inseguridad alimentaria de su población. Hemos dicho en reiteradas oportunidades que la FAO debe cumplir un papel preponderante, de esta manera nosotros renovamos hoy ese apoyo y seguiremos trabajando para que en el término acordado el Grupo de Trabajo produzca las Directrices Voluntarias.

Es importante que el Consejo haga un reconocimiento a aquellos países, sobre todo en Europa, que han venido demostrando interés por esta labor y aportando apoyo no sólo financiero sino también institucional y académico. Durante el fin de semana pasado, por ejemplo, el Gobierno de Italia con organizaciones no-gubernamentales, entre las que figura el Instituto Jacques Maritain, organizaron una Conferencia muy interesante. El Embajador de la República Islámica de Irán esta mañana propuso que la FAO pusiera a disposición de las delegaciones los resultados de esa Conferencia. Creo que es importante que esos resultados se pongan a disposición de nuestras

delegaciones. Seguramente la FAO conseguirá, junto con el Gobierno de Italia, la manera de satisfacer esta petición.

Es importante también manifestar reconocimiento a aquellas delegaciones de países europeos que, como Suiza, acaban de manifestar su apoyo a las labores del Grupo de Trabajo.

Esta mañana la delegación de Brasil hizo una presentación muy buena sobre lo que, muchos de los países en vías de desarrollo consideramos debe contener el proyecto de Directrices Voluntarias, es decir la cooperación internacional no debe faltar de lo que en fin de cuenta vayamos a negociar en octubre.

El propósito principal debe, por supuesto, recaer en los países en desarrollo. Sus políticas nacionales deben ser los principales motores para las decisiones que se tomen en el área de la seguridad alimentaria. Pero la cooperación internacional no debe estar al margen, por ello nosotros apoyamos ese enfoque.

Por último, quisiera manifestar que mi delegación encuentra muchos méritos en la propuesta que ha hecho la delegación de Estados Unidos con respecto a la rendición de informes que se relacionan con la aplicación de las políticas nacionales en cumplimiento de los compromisos de la Cumbre Mundial de la Alimentación. Ahora bien eso merece ser apoyado sencillamente porque su propósito es crear las condiciones para que sobre todo los países en desarrollo puedan presentar informes de una manera más eficiente. A nuestro juicio eso significa también que, a través de la FAO, se puede apoyar la creación de capacidades o el fortalecimiento de sus instituciones de manera que las condiciones para una mejor presentación de los informes se logren como resultado de esa decisión.

**Mohamed Mahmoud El Hanan EL HASSAN (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)**

I should like to thank you and congratulate you on behalf of the people and Government of Sudan. I congratulate you on your Chairmanship of this important Session of our Council. All nations in the world have their eyes focussed on the deliberations of this Council, because we are dealing with food security.

Food security is more important than military security. Nobody on this planet earth can do away with food and can go without food. However, we can live without military security. This is the very best of human kind. This is the very essence of life itself. Therefore, my brothers and sisters here, I believe that you are entitled to deal with this very poor issue affecting the life and dignity of human beings. That is why your concern with food security is relevant.

Together with Australia and Canada, you have been selected as one of the representative countries to deal with these issues. Sudan has a wealth of resources: land, water and human resources. What is lacking is technical capabilities and capital funds. This is where the responsibility of friendly nations and generous nations comes to play: to supply us with technology, capital and know-how so as to tap these tremendous resources in order to render service to our respective people.

We have asked a lot. We have talked a lot, but deeds have not followed our words and that is why we have to stop paying lip service to these lofty ideals and start work. We have listened to the valuable presentations and we support all of these ideas.

**Mrs Margaret MOHAPI (Observer for South Africa)**

Firstly, I would like to thank you and FAO and the Secretariat for the excellent job in preparing and providing us with such informative and excellent documents.

My delegation would like to support Greece's proposal. South Africa has worked on the implementation of integrated food security and nutrition programmes which highlighted the importance of intergovernmental partnerships and partnerships across society without undermining the Five Pillars of NEPAD. In terms of trade and negotiations, we also support Brazil's interaction regarding their multilateral trade negotiations on agriculture. South Africa, in terms of the Right to Food has included this last in the Constitution. This is an issue that is the

public domain and that has pursued the private sector and the Government to come up with innovative ways of addressing hunger.

With regard to the assessment of the food security situation, we request FAO to pay particular attention to drought and drought-related issues as well as the growing scarcity of water. We therefore extend the request to FAO to continue to support technical skills on water management and disaster.

**Kiala Kia MATEVA (Observer for Angola)**

Puisque ma délégation intervient pour la première fois, elle voudrait exprimer sa satisfaction à vous voir parmi nous. Je voudrais également féliciter le Secrétariat pour le document qu'il a présenté au titre du point 7.

Ma délégation a participé à la vingt-cinquième session du Comité de la sécurité alimentaire mondiale, elle n'a donc pas de difficultés à adopter le document qui nous a été présenté. Je voudrais à cette occasion appuyer les déclarations du Cameroun, du Zimbabwe qui a parlé au nom du Groupe africain, et de la délégation du Sénégal qui a présenté plusieurs réflexions sur ce point, que ma délégation fait siennes. Quant à la proposition de l'Ambassadeur de la République islamique d'Iran qui consiste à mettre à la disposition des participants les résultats de la Conférence organisée par le Gouvernement italien et la FAO la semaine dernière, nous en profitons pour présenter nos félicitations au Gouvernement italien, la mise en œuvre de cette proposition doit être faite au cours de cette session.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Il me semble qu'il n'y a plus de délégation qui souhaite prendre la parole sur ce point. Monsieur de Haen, voulez-vous répondre aux préoccupations de nos délégations?

**Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

We have listened attentively to the many comments made. Not so many questions were raised. A few, however, were brought up and I am pleased to reply to them.

Most of the interventions were made with regard to the assessment of the world food security situation, conducted by the Committee on World Food Security, and the underlying reporting. We have noted that you wish the Secretariat to improve further the assessment methodology, the comprehensiveness of the assessment and, in particular, we have noted the wish of many of you to identify factors of success and failure with regards to the reduction of the number of hungry people in the respective countries.

You also mentioned the importance of trade and its impact on food security and, there again, the analogies underway by the Secretariat are to be further improved. We have noted that as well. We have also noted the added emphasis that you want to see on the impact of HIV/AIDS on food security.

There were a number of other similar suggestions already included in the Report of the Committee. However, we have taken due note and will do our best to provide the next Committee on Food Security with a better assessment report.

Then there was this very specific proposal submitted by Greece on behalf of the European Community, supported by a number of countries, including the countries acceding to the European Community, as well as others, including Switzerland. Just to make sure that we have correctly understood you: what we did understand is that those who supported this proposal wish a more strategic approach to the presentation of practical experiences in the fight against hunger, as well as the identification of factors relating to success and failure.

Of course we are prepared to do this, but I believe we need some more clarification from Council on two questions. One is whether this would already apply to the next CFS and whether you wish an extra report on successes and failures, or whether you, alternatively, just wish the standing assessment document to be extended. But, of course, as extension is not possible because there is

a length limit for documents, it would have to be at the cost of something else. Further, I would suggest that some guidance be given on whether you want an extra document, as it sounded to me, or just a change in the standing document.

Secondly, guidance is also needed on whether this discussion of concrete cases of success and failure should be held during the CFS, during the assessment item, or as an extra item, or, as was proposed by Switzerland, simply in the form of Side Events.

I believe that some guidance is needed on these very specific points to enable us to follow up in the appropriate way.

Several delegates referred to the Anti-Hunger Programme paper, as well as the International Alliance against Hunger, both of which had been discussed by the Committee on World Food Security under the item "Recent Initiatives". Regarding the Anti-Hunger Programme paper, Canada wished to have an explanation – on the difference of the latter with the International Alliance against Hunger.

Just in very brief terms, the Secretariat views the Anti-Hunger Programme paper as a call for concrete action to reach the World Food Summit target of halving the number of hungry by 2015. The paper contains priorities that countries may wish to choose. It proposes a twin-track approach, combining direct measures, to support the most needy with longer-term investments in agricultural and rural development. It indicates something on the cost and benefits of such a Programme. So, altogether, it is a call for concrete action, including policies and the policy environment that is specifically described in it.

On the other hand, the International Alliance against Hunger is a proposal for an institutional mechanism, as I would put it, executed at international level and, in particular, also at national level. It is an institutional mechanism to advocate the implementation of such concrete programmes as the Anti-Hunger Programme, to mobilize political will and create ownership at the respective levels by all stakeholders for the implementation of concrete programmes. So it is an institutional mechanism, on the one hand, and a concrete call for the Programme to be implemented at all levels, on the other hand.

Just to conclude, the Anti-Hunger Programme is not a Programme for FAO. It is a proposal for programmatic action at all levels around the world. I hope this clarifies the distinction between the two.

The distinguished delegate of Canada also requested an explanation on the involvement of other agencies in the International Alliance Against Hunger. As was discussed during the World Food Security Committee, a core group of Rome-based Agencies including IFAD and WFP, as well as the International Plant Genetic Research Institute (IPGRI), representing the CGIAR, have come and worked together and expressed their intention to continue to stay together in the further promotion of this Alliance. Not only these agencies have done so, but also the representatives of the NGOs that have their hub, so to speak, here in Rome have very concretely worked with us for this initiative.

My colleague, Eva Clayton, who is now in charge of these international exchanges, could certainly reply in more detail if you wish to have more explanations.

Finally, still on this whole issue of the Anti-Hunger Programme on the one hand and the Alliance on the other, the distinguished delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran requested that the Secretariat present the final draft of the Anti-Hunger Programme to the next FAO Conference as a programme document. I thought I should mention this in order to have confirmation that I understood the issue correctly.

There were a number of delegations that referred to the importance of trade. They endorsed the analyses being undertaken by the Secretariat on the impact of the Uruguay Round on food security of Member Nations, the impact of certain policies of some groups of countries on food security and, there was also a lot of emphasis on the need for the Secretariat to help countries build capacity. The Secretariat is engaged in this, and feels encouraged to be even more so.



I thought I would use this occasion to report to you that we are preparing for the Cancun Ministerial Conference of the WTO. We will not only be present there with a number of activities but we plan a Symposium on the day before the Ministerial meeting opens. In order to present to you in more detail what we plan to do, we have the intention to invite you to a Permanent Representative briefing in the month of July, at the latest in August, but I hope we can manage to do it in July, if you find it interesting.

I have almost completed my replies. The distinguished delegate of Japan requested, and I believe others did as well, the Secretariat to provide more information about the Field Programme, including the Special Programme, and the monitoring of its contribution to food security. I will convey this to the competent units in the House and will certainly try to more effectively include these field activities in the next assessment report. I recall that the distinguished delegate of Japan also expressed the hope that FAO would be participating at the next TICAD III meeting, and again I will convey this to the competent units.

Finally, a very few remarks on the two sub-items of this overall item. One being the proposal by the United States supported by others on the improvement of the reporting format for the monitoring of the World Food Summit Plan of Action implementation. We have noted the proposal, also under the European Community's recommendations, in particular, for the Secretariat to do three things. Firstly, analyse the difficulties with the reporting format that is currently being established. Secondly, examine and suggest ways of improving the process. Thirdly, suggest and identify indicators including, in particular, those included in the FIVIMS system for use by Member Nations. We discussed this issue also during CFS and, if I may just inform the Council that the percentage of countries that have submitted reports as well as the three cycles that we have already completed has slightly gone down. In 1998, it was at 68 per cent. In 2000, it was at 65 per cent and in 2002, it was at 57 per cent. On average, taking all Member Nations of FAO, only 8 per cent of these reports have reached us on time, in order to be included in the Secretariat's synthesis report. But there is a great variation between regions. Some regions are at the level of 30 or 40 per cent. So, the Council should probably be reminded that there is a need for reconsideration.

Now, the task that you have given the Secretariat and that the United States have suggested, is certainly not easy, because, on the one hand, the suggestion is to be simple and, on the other hand, it is to improve the information contained. I feel this quite a challenge for the Secretariat to meet.

The Secretariat is certainly ready to respond but again, if I may remind you, the proposal by the United States contains two options and I have not heard clear guidance yet. One is for the Secretariat to submit, together with the Bureau, I believe, recommendations to the next Council. The other is to submit these to the next CFS. I think some clarification is needed in this regard.

I believe I do not have to provide any further information on this agenda Item 7.2, which dealt with the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Adequate Food within the context of national food security. More specific questions were raised and I am sure the Bureau present here and the Secretariat have taken note of the mostly positive comments but also of the very specific recommendations.

I only want to recall that Mr. Thibier, Vice-Chairman of the CFS, has informed you already that the next meeting of the IGWG on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Adequate Food will be held from 27 to 29 October.

Finally, several of you have asked the report or material that was made available during last weekend's Symposium of the Jacques Maribain Institute on the Right to Adequate Food and Cost of Hunger to be distributed. We will do our best but I have not been able to ascertain what is available. You certainly have to take it in the language in which it was presented. I do not know whether a final report is available. There were lots of papers presented. I am afraid we cannot reproduce all the papers, but the minimum we can do is provide you with a list of papers and make them available at your request.

I hope I responded to most, if not all the questions that were raised.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je voudrais justement passer la parole à Monsieur Thibier qui souhaiterait fournir quelques précisions.

**Michel THIBIER (Vice-Président du Comité mondial de sécurité alimentaire)**

Mon intervention sera très brève. C'est en raison de l'absence du Dr. Adisak de Thaïlande, retenu à Bangkok, que j'ai eu l'honneur et le privilège de vous présenter ce matin le rapport de la vingt-neuvième session du Comité mondial des Nations Unies de sécurité alimentaire. Je souhaitais simplement partager avec les honorables délégués le fait que, tant le Président que l'ensemble du Bureau, sont tout à fait attentifs à s'associer avec le Secrétariat de notre Organisation pour réussir à améliorer encore l'efficacité du travail fait au sein de ce Comité mondial de sécurité alimentaire. Le Bureau croit, et est persuadé comme vous, que ce Comité mondial de sécurité alimentaire est une structure extrêmement importante de notre Organisation et qu'il faut arriver à le faire vivre de la façon la plus dynamique possible.

Nous avons vu aujourd'hui combien un certain nombre de points ont été levés, ont été évoqués au cours de notre discussion. Soyez persuadés que le Bureau est prêt à vous entendre s'il y avait des remarques particulières et le Secrétariat sait, et je le répète bien volontiers, que l'ensemble du Bureau est prêt à s'associer à ces réflexions, à ces travaux, de façon à ce que nous puissions avoir un organisme aussi efficace que possible.

**Moussa Bocar LY (Observateur de Sénégal)**

Je pense que Monsieur de Haen a répondu de façon exhaustive. Il n'y a qu'un petit point que je voudrais soulever. M. de Haen a dit qu'il ne lui semblait pas avoir entendu une quelconque déclaration sur les deux options proposées par la délégation américaine. Or, je crois avoir dit, au nom de ma délégation, même si mon débit était trop rapide, que je préférerais la deuxième option qui conserve toute la plénitude des compétences du CSA. C'est le seul point que je voulais confirmer.

**Flávio MIRAGAIA PERRI (Brasil)**

Agradezco al señor Subdirector General sus palabras de interpretación de aquello que como delegados hemos dicho en esta reunión. Pero me parece que es importante insistir en un punto, que es la cuestión que tiene relación con la propuesta de la Unión Europea. Para nosotros y para muchas otras delegaciones era muy importante señalar que en términos generales la propuesta parecía estar muy bien pero se olvidaba de la cuestión internacional. Toda ella está centrada en la cuestión nacional y si debemos considerar las experiencias de algunos países en mejorar la seguridad alimentaria y reducir el hambre, deberíamos también saber si las negociaciones internacionales, las medidas tomadas por los países, países desarrollados, en cuanto al comercio internacional están de acuerdo con la idea de combatir el hambre. Allí están incluidos los subsidios, las prácticas proteccionistas, así como otras cuestiones.

Si en el Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria Mundial debemos trabajar sobre situaciones nacionales, es importante también tomar en consideración al mismo tiempo las situaciones internacionales.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Est-ce que quelqu'un souhaiterait prendre à nouveau la parole sur ce point ? Non ? Nous avons donc conclu nos débats sur le point 7 de l'ordre du jour.

**5. Report of the 16th Session of the Committee on Forestry (Rome, 10-14 March 2003)**  
(CL 124/8)

**5. Rapport de la seizième session du Comité des forêts (Rome, 10-14 mars 2003)**  
(CL 124/8)

**5. Informe del 16o período de sesiones del Comité de Montes**  
**(Roma, 10-14 de marzo de 2003)** (CL 124/8)

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous passons donc au point 5 de l'ordre du jour: Rapport de la seizième session du Comité des forêts, qui s'est tenue à Rome du 10 au 14 mars 2003. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/8. Je vais demander à Monsieur El-Lakany, Sous-Directeur général chargé du Département des forêts de présenter le rapport.

**Hosny EL-LAKANY (Assistant Director-General, Forestry Department)**

The Sixteenth Session on the Committee on Forestry was held in Rome from 10 to 14 March 2003 and the Session was attended by nearly 400 delegates from 113 members of the Committee and 19 international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

The objectives of COFO 2003 were mainly to launch the State of the World's Forests 2003, to review and implement the Programme of Work of FAO and Forestry to examine international forestry issues and identify areas of collaboration among Member Nations of FAO and other partners. The organization of this session was quite special. Based on requests from countries and partners, numerous Side and Satellite Meetings were held on the margins of COFO, to promote informal exchange of views and experiences and to inform the discussions in Plenary. All FAO-sponsored Events were interpreted in the five languages and some were hosted by outside organizations.

The main outcome of COFO has been the fact that the Committee commended FAO on the quality and usefulness of SOFO 2003. The Committee fully supported the FAO Programme of Work on Forestry including proposed new entities and the Medium-Term Plan 2004 to 2009 including, forest and water; forest and climate change; forest in relation to food security and poverty alleviation. The Committee also emphasized the importance of the Organization's continued role in providing a neutral forum for policy discussion and technical advice, global information on forest and leadership in intergovernmental forest dialogue.

Specifically the results of COFO included recommendations that may be of interest to the Council.

COFO requested FAO to play an important role in the interface between forest management and watershed management. It stressed the use of national forest programmes to establish partnership and integrate action into broader national development strategies, such as those promoting food security and combating poverty.

COFO also stressed the importance of FAO continuing its effort to help build national capacities through training and education, particularly in forest resource assessment. It welcomed FAO's technical work in forestry and climate change and its technical contribution to the UNFCCC and IPCC. It recommended that FAO and other key partners provide technical support to find countries for the sustainable management of forests and trees outside forests, including the rehabilitation of degraded lands, desertification control and strengthening national planning and institutional framework.

COFO also asked FAO to strengthen the regional forestry commissions and stressed the role national forest programmes should play in implementing the commitments related to the World Food Summit and World Summit on Sustainable Development. This discussion underscored the active role of the National Forest Programme Facility which is hosted by FAO in Rome. COFO recommended that FAO continue its work on criteria indicators for sustainable forest

management, model and demonstration forests, participatory forestry, forest fire control and assistance to countries to prevent and control forest pests and diseases.

Finally, I wish to thank Ambassador Flávio Miragaia Perri, the Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO, for chairing COFO 2003 and for guiding the Committee to a successful conclusion.

**Flávio MIRAGAIA PERRI (Brazil)**

I had the honour to chair the works of the Committee on Forestry this year, with the very helpful and professional assistance of the Secretariat. This was a very productive meeting which confirmed the important role that FAO has to play in the field of forestry. We attach particular importance to the technical support that this Organization can provide to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals, a process in which Brazil is firmly engaged.

Brazil endorses all recommendations by the last session of COFO. We consider fundamental for FAO to focus on its mandated role as a source of global forestry information bearing in mind the need to avoid overlapping and duplication of efforts regarding the work carried out by other intergovernmental agencies. The linkage between forests and fresh water is another issue of paramount importance for Brazil and we are ready to work with FAO in efforts to be developed by the international community in this area.

In conclusion, Brazil would like to reiterate its confidence in the capacity of the FAO Forestry Department in implementing the decisions on recommendations issued by COFO. In accordance with the rules of procedure of COFO, I am eager to work in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee in close collaboration with the Director-General and the Secretariat in the elaboration of the agenda of the next session of this important Committee to be held in 2005. I commit myself to work in consultation with my colleagues of the Bureau in order to ensure that the elaboration of the agenda be done in the most representative way.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

Apoyamos el excelente informe del Comité de Montes y reconocemos la utilidad técnica de los eventos paralelos organizados durante el período de sesiones.

Para mi país es importante avanzar en la elaboración de sistemas de información sobre la utilización de los recursos naturales y el establecimiento de indicadores de sostenibilidad y mecanismos de vigilancia del medio ambiente. Ya esto había sido dialogado en la XXVII Conferencia Regional de la FAO para América Latina y el Caribe celebrada el año pasado en La Habana, Cuba.

Por otra parte, considerando que la investigación sobre el pago de servicios ambientales constituye una prioridad para el Gobierno de México, reitero la solicitud de apoyo y asistencia técnica formulada al Departamento de Montes de la FAO.

Mi país tiene la convicción de que las comisiones forestales regionales constituyen la instancia de cooperación regional más relevante y apropiada, por lo tanto es necesario que estos órganos orienten mayormente sus labores hacia las propuestas de acción del GIB/FIB. La FAO debería en consecuencia reorientar su quehacer hacia temas que los mismos países determinen a nivel regional.

Asimismo mi país apoya la asignación de recursos del presupuesto de la FAO y la inclusión en el Plan a Plazo Medio 2004-2009 del establecimiento de una nueva entidad especializada que promueva las acciones para acrecentar el conocimiento sobre hidrología forestal y fortalecer las capacidades de los países en la formulación de una nueva generación de proyectos de ordenación de cuencas hidrográficas donde se apliquen las buenas lecciones aprendidas. Sería conveniente que la FAO movilice recursos extra-presupuestarios provenientes de otras fuentes para llevar a cabo esta actividad.

Expresamos también nuestro beneplácito por las acciones realizadas por el Departamento de Montes en el período 2000-2001. Reconocemos el esfuerzo efectuado, especialmente al promover

el diseño y aplicación de herramientas útiles para los países en el seguimiento de sus planes nacionales forestales, así como la búsqueda de vínculos con otros temas y polos ambientales como el Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica, el Convenio Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Cambio Climático, el Protocolo de Kyoto y la Convención de las Naciones Unidas de Lucha contra la Desertificación.

Finalmente, esperamos que en breve se avance en un estudio de perspectivas del sector forestal para América Latina y el Caribe, como ya se hizo para África, y que ha sido de gran utilidad.

**Yoshitaka SUMI (Japan)**

Japan endorses the report of the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry contained in document CL 124/8, which we recognize summarizes the results of the discussions at the Committee. Japan appreciates FAO's participation in the Third World Water Forum which took place in Japan in March this year. We would especially like to thank the Director-General of FAO and the Assistant Director-General of the Agriculture Department for actively participating in the Forum as per the Committee's recommendation mentioned in paragraph 23 of the Report.

Our delegation would like to take this opportunity to introduce the Minister's declaration at the Forum. This includes a very important statement for forest conservation stating that, to ensure a sustainable water supply of good quality, we should protect and use in a sustainable manner the eco-systems that naturally capture, filter, store and release water such as rivers, wetlands, forests and soils. It also states that in view of the rapid degradation of watersheds and forests, we should concentrate our efforts to combat deforestation, desertification and land degradation through programmes to promote greening, sustainable forest management, restoration of degraded lands and watersheds, as well as through the conservation of biodiversity. Japan looks forward to the continuous efforts of Member Nations to a better management and conservation of forests. Finally it requests FAO to support them with technical assistance as well as with nominative works.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia supports the forestry work of FAO as outlined in the FAO Committee on Forestry Report. COFO's recommendations should provide important guidance in a range of future work areas for FAO. In particular, we strongly support FAO's key role as the chair of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests under the United Nations Forum on Forests, recognizing that a key element of this is the strengthening of the Regional Forestry Commissions to assist countries in forging effective partnerships to deliver tangible outcomes. We specifically wish to endorse the COFO conclusions which support these important areas of work.

Australia also continues to support FAO's key roles in national forest programmes, data collection and distribution, including work on criteria and indicators, definitions and global forest resource assessment, and again specifically supports recommendations in these areas.

Finally, as we have before, we urge FAO to clearly show the linkages between the Forestry Programme outputs and relevant IPF/IFF proposals for action and, in this regard, we welcome COFO recommendation. This, we believe, will assist FAO to determine priorities, ensure no duplication in effort and in being outcome-focused.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

The Government of India appreciates the Report of the Committee on Forests for Sustainable Forest Management. FAO needs to continue its efforts to build capacity in Member Nations, also through FAO Regional Offices, to effectively support sustainable forest management. The Government of India endorses the recommendations of the Committee on Forests for inclusion of a new entity on water and forests in the FAO Medium-Term Plan 2004-2009. FAO must continue its work on the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, model and demonstration forests, forest fire control, wildlife, forest and climate change, links between forestry and poverty alleviation, trade and sustainable forest management and assistance to countries to prevent and control forest pests and diseases. FAO must also work in close collaboration and coordination with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. We also endorse the proposed increase in the share of the total FAO budget allocation to forestry in the Medium-Term Plan 2004-2009 and Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005.

The Government of India is fully convinced that forestry has a very important role in poverty alleviation and in conserving biological diversity. FAO is urged to provide support for the National Forestry Action Programme formulated by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, of the Government of India. This must be given utmost importance, as national forest programmes being multi-sectoral and participatory in nature, have tremendous potential to contribute towards the sustainable development of forests, in general, and to food security and poverty alleviation strategies in particular. For these reasons we would also urge FAO that all the countries, which have already formulated national forestry action programmes, should be supported by providing funding for the implementation of NAFPs and in developing their action programmes by FAO.

FAO should assist national organizations, which are involved in the forest resource assessment in upgrading their skills and technologies. It must also provide support to develop regional Action Plans for addressing transnational issues. FAO Regional Offices should play an effective role in collaborating with Regional Forestry Commissions and also with other regional institutions such as ASEAN, SARC, etc. in developing an appropriate regional, sub-regional response to the international initiatives.

The Global Forest Survey is an important initiative and should be developed by providing necessary assistance to Members in capacity building and in upgrading technology. The Government of India has constituted a Task Force with the Director of the Indian National Institute of Forest Management as its Chairman. The Task Force has submitted its report and has identified several criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management in the country. It may be necessary to develop criteria and indicators for different regions taking the economic and social parameters into consideration. FAO should support regional consultations among countries within their region to identify common criteria and indicators for sustainable management of forests.

#### **Natigor SIAGIAN (Indonesia)**

Let me start by expressing how delighted our delegation is to see you in the Chair leading this very august body and we promise, in our capacity now as a new Member of the Council, to work closely with you for the successful deliberations of this FAO Council.

My delegation expresses our appreciation to the FAO Secretariat for this document CL 124/8 and the explanation by the FAO Secretariat of the important result of the COFO meeting.

The role of the Regional Forestry Commissions in implementing sustainable forest management through the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action has been discussed in the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry. We have always attached a great importance to the NFCs. The NFCs may help the countries to establish dialogue, avoiding duplication and promoting the best regional practices on resource management and facilitate the interaction between the international and national bodies and private sectors. Furthermore, the NFCs may facilitate the countries in formulating and streamlining the reports recommended by other international commitments such as the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

However, as adopted in the UNFF III held in May to June 2003, the Consultation with Collaborative Partnership on Forests, the CPF members in which FAO acts as chairman, can be conducted by Member Nations if it is appropriately relevant to its work. The implementation of this IFF/IPF proposal for action in Asia is now being conducted based on national policy direction.

In regard to the issues of forest and freshwater, while we take note of the relevant paragraph of these COFO Reports, we express our concern on the forest contribution to the watershed management both in the country and in transboundary regions with bioregional and cross-sectoral

approaches in the form of integrated watershed management. We realize that the National Forest Programme and a similar process can be used as an important means for the implementation of international commitments at national level.

The aforesaid international political commitments were produced during the World Food Summit: *five years later*, the World Summit on Sustainable Development and other international discussions. However, since there are numerous commitments that have to be followed-up by the Member countries, we wish to propose FAO to elaborate further the following: the recommendations formulated in WFS and WSSD regarding development activities which are implementable at national level; the activities of IFF/IPF Proposal for Action and CBDs extended programme of work and other international commitments such as UNFCCC and UNCCD which are relevant to the countries' priorities; international commitments within the framework of National Forest Programmes related to each country's national conditions.

Regarding the agenda of defining work objectives for FAO in key crosscutting areas defined by countries and the FAO Medium-Term planning process, we express our views on the importance of coordination to combat the illegal logging and trade which is presently at an alarming rate. It is hoped that the issues could be accommodated in the FAO Medium-Term Plan. We also stress the importance of non-wood products in forestry development because the products are able to improve people's livelihoods living in the surrounding forest areas. This could also be included in the FAO's Medium-Term planning process.

We wish also to take note of paragraph 57 of this document CL 124/8 and we hope that we can consider this matter during the consideration of Item 12 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005. Again, we support this COFO Report.

**Worwate TAMRONGTANYALAK (Thailand)**

My delegation considers seriously the matters that have attracted the attention of the FAO Council. Thailand strongly supports the recommendations as written in the document CL 124/8. In light of these recommendations, Thailand would like to stress the importance of FAO Regional Forestry Commissions, a mechanism which can support Member Nations in implementing sustainable forest management. In this regard, Thailand calls for the strengthening of the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific to more effectively support the work of Regional Forestry Commissions.

One of the urgent issues of the FAO Regional Forestry Commission is forest fire control. The forest fire is seen throughout South East Asian countries. The implication of forest fire is enormous, both socially and economically. FAO, through its Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, should take urgent action jointly with the Member countries to control forest fires.

Another issue is the linkages between forests and freshwater. I am grateful for the recommendations of the COFO to include a new entity on water and forests in the FAO Medium-Term Plan 2004-2009. The attention should be given to both clean water and agricultural water for those who live in the forest areas. Moreover, I would like to urge the attention particularly to the impact of water management to lowlands, upper river areas, as well as water limited areas.

There are still a number of recommendations that FAO has to identify in order to meet the needs of the region. In closing, I am hopeful that your Secretariat will be able to respond to my indications and suggestions on forest fire control.

**Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

FAO's Forestry Department continues to be at the forefront in responsiveness to Member Nations' and Programme excellence. The United States notes FAO's commitment to Regional Forestry Commissions, innovative approaches to COFO meetings i.e. Side Events and effective progress in dealing with the UN Forestry Forum in New York. The United States also appreciates increased budget transparency and its adherence to the role as a neutral facilitator and convenor on critical topics such as national forest programmes, water rights and watershed management.

We continue to believe that efforts to build national capacities to assess and report on forest resources are vital to sustainability and encourage all FAO Members to provide such data on a timely basis.

We urge FAO to expand forest studies beyond global fibre supply and all forest products coverage. Additional focus should also include studies that reflect the evolution and dynamics of effective governance, participatory decision making, analysis of sustainable production levels and proper management of cross sector impacts on the forest sector and forest communities. We support FAO's emphasis on the concept of national forest programmes as effective policy and process tools while respecting the diverse framework of each country to determine relevant and country specific implementation tools.

The United States endorses the recommendations that national forest programmes be used as a process to advance the practical use of criteria and indicators as part of national planning and resource assessment strategies. The United States highlights the importance of support for the conclusions and recommendations from the International Conference on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management-CICI 2003, as incorporated in the Sixteenth COFO Report and FAO's Medium-Term Plan. On a programmatic level, the Intergovernmental Panel on Forest (IPF) and Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) Proposals for Action should remain among the highest priorities for the Forestry Programme of Work. We also encourage FAO to promote a stepped up engagement of forestry community, particularly non-governmental organizations and civil society and watershed communities in finding solutions to forest and freshwater issues and potential conflicts.

In sum, in addition the United States applauds FAO's success in obtaining voluntary contributions in support of the programme area, forestry policy and institutions. Increased emphasis in this area in the 2004-2005 Programme of Work will support critical efforts to address the problems of illegal logging, good governance and the capacity to monitor forest operations. FAO's community forest unit should continue, as a newly-integrated component of the Forestry Department, to support local community influence on their assets and destiny. The US endorses this Report.

**Alfredo Néstor PUIG PINO (Cuba)**

Mi país concede al sector forestal una importancia estratégica en su desarrollo socio-económico, éste como pocos sectores está vinculado directa o indirectamente a las actividades socioculturales, ecológicas y económicas de toda la sociedad, pero muy especialmente por el impacto positivo que el desarrollo de bosques tiene en la mitigación de la pobreza, en el suministro de agua dulce, en el cambio climático y en la conservación de la diversidad biológica como bien se recoge en este informe. Por todo ello, apoyamos las recomendaciones recogidas en el informe, particularmente las relacionadas con el papel de la FAO para facilitar una mejor coordinación nacional e internacional encaminadas a garantizar que los bosques contribuyan al ordenamiento del agua dulce así como la inclusión de una nueva entidad sobre el agua y los bosques en el Plan a Plazo Medio para el período 2004-2009 de la FAO.

Nuestro país reconoce los esfuerzos que realiza la FAO en apoyo a los programas forestales nacionales, en este sentido se complace en informar que ya tenemos en fase de conclusión nuestro programa forestal nacional. Como parte de todo este proceso surgió una iniciativa que tengo a bien compartir en este plenario, de crear fincas forestales mediante la entrega de tierras en usufructo a los trabajadores de este sector. Esta iniciativa incluye la entrega de viviendas completamente amuebladas y un área para el autoconsumo en la producción de alimentos. Esta iniciativa fue premiada en la pasada Cumbre sobre Desarrollo Sostenible en Johannesburgo por su contribución a mejorar las condiciones de vida del trabajador forestal, por facilitar la incorporación de la mujer en estas labores y por lograr mejorar considerablemente los ingresos familiares así como los magníficos resultados alcanzados en la protección del medio ambiente. Nuestro país está dispuesto a compartir estas experiencias con aquellos países que así lo consideren. Sin embargo en el contexto de todo este proceso hemos notado que se nos presentan algunas limitaciones que pueden ser comunes también a otros países en desarrollo por la falta de capacitación de los diferentes actores en su papel vinculado al fomento y manejo de los bosques



así como de la importancia de su conservación, razón por la cual pensamos que la FAO puede apoyar estas labores de capacitación mediante su inclusión en los programas de cooperación Sur-Sur entre otros.

**Mrs Meglena PLUGCHIEVA (Bulgaria)**

The Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the decisions adopted by the Sixteenth Session of COFO, we recognize the usefulness and the importance of the document "State of the World's Forests 2003", that provides a significant informational basis for the policy focussed on the sustainable forest management. We consider the FAO Regional Forestry Commissions as important bodies for the implementation of sustainable forest management, giving an exceptional benefit for the development of the National Forestry Strategy and Policy.

We recognize the important role of FAO in collecting and disseminating information about the good practices of Member Nations in providing technical support, in enhancing knowledge and partnerships at the national, regional, sub-regional and international levels and in better understanding of the hydrological and environmental services of forests.

Our delegation supports the conclusion of the COFO that sustainable forest management is crucial for watershed management and that more attention needs to be paid to mountains, lowlands, riparian areas and to water limited areas. In our view, FAO has to pay special attention to economic, social and environmental dimensions of issues related to fresh water and forests and should foster intersectoral dialogue and intersectoral cooperation.

Bulgaria welcomes the FAO Council's policies on the intersectoral dimensions of forestry, including those in the context of climate change, desertification, food security, poverty alleviation and environmental protection.

The Bulgarian delegation supports the recommendation that FAO should continue to give high priority to the criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, model and demonstration forests, participatory forests fire control, wild life management, forest biological diversity, forests and climate change, the support to national forest programmes, the links between forest, forestry and poverty alleviation, trade and sustainable forest management and assistance to countries to prevent and control forest pests and diseases.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that there is a good relationship between the resolutions of the Ministerial Conference in Vienna, which was held in April this year, and we think that a good possibility exists for cooperation in this field. Bulgaria expects good results in the development of forest benefits. We believe that this will contribute to the development of a national forest strategy and policy in Bulgaria focussed on the sustainable forest management in the country.

**Noah M. NKAMBULE (Swaziland)**

I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretariat for preparing in such a clear manner the document before us today. In particular I wish to refer to the Introductory Chapter which clearly summarizes the items that require Council's attention.

My delegation supports most, if not all, the recommendations contained in paragraphs (a) to (f), in the Introductory Chapter, starting from pages 3 to 6 of document CL 124/8. On specific items of the document under discussion, my delegation fully supports the Committee's urge for additional donor support to the National Forest Programme facility, as contained in paragraph 33. In respect to positive trends, as suggested in paragraph 39, I wish to report that my country has successfully developed a forest policy after a thorough consultative and participatory process of all stakeholders in our country.

The project to develop this forestry policy was strongly supported financially and technically by the Danish Government through its Development Agency. For this we are most appreciative and wish to assure the Danish Government that difficulties that almost negatively affected the project have since been resolved. Consequently, we would welcome back the Danish Government to complete the development of our Forestry Action Programme and legislation.

We also wish to recognize my Government's recent consultation with FAO Southern-African Sub-Regional Office, in exploring ways in which FAO could support Swaziland's forestry programmes. One of the ways in which FAO could assist would be to have, in developing modalities, the introduction of an Agro-Forestry Curriculum in our local Agricultural University as recommended in paragraph 48 of document CL 124/8.

My delegation also strongly supports the discussion and recommendations relating to the very strong relationship between forests and fresh water, as contained in paragraphs 16 to 25 of document CL 124/8.

**Mme Claire GAUDOT (France)**

Je voudrais vous demander de donner la parole au délégué de la Grèce pour qu'il s'exprime au nom de l'Union européenne.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. The European Union welcomes the report of the Committee on Forestry which had its Sixteenth Session in March of this year. The observations and comments made by the European Community at this Session remain valid and I will not attempt to repeat them here.

I would, however, like to reiterate the importance attached by the European Community to the priorities of the Forestry Department which reflect the role of FAO in facilitating the implementation of internationally agreed actions, as well as priorities emerging from national level experiences. We note the key role FAO was assigned within the Cooperative Partnership on Forests established by ECOSOC, in support of the work of the UN Forum on Forests.

It is important that the relevant programmes are duly funded to allow the Organization to carry out its role fully within the Cooperative Partnership on Forests as well as in other areas, such as those concerning forests and water, biodiversity and climate change.

Finally given the views just stated, the European Community wishes to express its satisfaction about the fact that FAO's Medium-term Plan 2004-2009 indicates a modest increase in the share of resources given to forestry.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

Allow me on behalf of the Africa Group and on behalf of the Zimbabwean delegation, to make a few comments on this topic.

First and foremost we commend your statesmanship and we commend the paper that the Secretariat has produced, for we find it informative and it is strategic in the issues that it covers. Nevertheless, we would like to make a few comments that we think a pertinent to our Group.

Besides playing a strategic role in agricultural production, through environmental protection, we find that forestry provides fuel to the rural communities and above all, employment opportunities, thus ensuring economic growth in food security. We, therefore, urge FAO to increase its participation in forestry programmes and in particular in mountainous areas, which are a major resource for many of our communities.

To our partners in development, we would like to urge you to open up your markets to some of our forestry products, because this is a source of livelihood for some communities. We would like to make some contribution specific to the paper in question, on the future of forestry and on combating desertification. The Group believes that the programme of desertification and deforestation cannot be fully addressed without paying attention to energy requirements of the continent. Most of the population depend on wood for fuel. We therefore see technical assistance in research and development to turn indigenous trees into fast growing varieties as an urgent issue. This would address the needs of the different Member Nations in regenerating the forest that they are slowly losing and, at the same time, in ensuring the sustainability in food security by

transforming some of the wild fruits we have today into fruits that can grow fast and be cultivated on our farms.

In our limited way in Zimbabwe, we have instituted an annual tree planting day on which communities, schools and individuals plant trees. We feel that if we had fast growing varieties this would make a major difference. In addition to this, we realize that trees require regular watering, and we have put in place water catchment councils and village level committees that are there to maintain natural resources. This is to ensure that the village inhabitants become aware that the forest is a natural resource which should be of use to them. We would also require technical assistance in helping us to train many of these communities to understand the value of forestry, even in trade, for example, in tourism and in furniture manufacturing.

Investment in development of other renewable energy such as solar and windmill technology would also be useful as this would certainly help us to save our disappearing forests. Tremendous progress has been made at planning level in solar energy development and major challenges facing the continent now are to replicate the solar energy and the technology that goes with it on a wider scale. We see this as one of the areas in which investment in NEPAD could make a difference for the continent.

Looking at the paper on the whole, we see that it addresses most of the issues that we discussed in the previous session and with that the Africa Group fully endorses the document CL 124/18 and we support the inclusion of the programme into the FAO Medium-Term Plan.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

Mi delegación apoya firmemente la aprobación de este informe y agradece al Embajador de Brasil, al Presidente del Comité y al señor El-Lakany por la información que nos han presentado.

Como país amazónico somos particularmente sensibles al tema forestal, especialmente a los tantos asuntos que se han abordado aquí y sobre los cuales estamos de acuerdo y queremos respaldar, tales como la gestión de agua y el desarrollo de cuencas hidrográficas, el rol de la ordenación forestal sostenible, la degradación forestal y la inserción social y desarrollo de las poblaciones que habitan en los bosques, entre otras. En este sentido valoramos el apoyo que puede seguir dando la FAO.

Sin perjuicio de ello y aunque sabemos que el tema de montañas no fue abordado en profundidad en pasado COFO, a pesar de que siempre fue abordado en el Comité de Montes y por eso no figura en el informe. Quisiéramos aprovechar esta oportunidad para realizar un llamado a no perder este impulso inicial que generó el Año Internacional de las Montañas celebrado en el año 2002. Creemos que el Consejo, como órgano rector, debería apoyar esta gestión e incluir probablemente una recomendación para que la FAO siga cumpliendo el importante rol desempeñado durante el año pasado, y en este marco también reiteramos nuestro apoyo al establecimiento de una unidad financiada, evidentemente con recursos extrapresupuestarios, que pueda permitir apoyar los esfuerzos nacionales e internacionales para desarrollar planes, financiar proyectos, intercambiar información, etc. Conocemos de esfuerzos congruentes y complementarios que vienen desarrollando algunos países y que se insertan claramente en el seguimiento del Año Internacional de las Montañas y especialmente en el seguimiento también de la Alianza del Desarrollo Sostenible en Zonas de Montaña aprobada en Johannesburgo y apoyamos estos esfuerzos.

Mi delegación asigna el tema del desarrollo sostenible en zonas de montaña una particular importancia no solamente porque somos un país de montañas y porque conocemos las ventajas sociales, económicas, culturales y las implicaciones recíprocas que éstas tienen, sino porque allí se encuentra presente prácticamente el 40 por ciento de la población mundial y en ese marco aspiramos a que la FAO siga cumpliendo el rol que le corresponde como coordinadora del capítulo 13 de la Agenda 21 y de los instrumentos complementarios.

**Paul MURPHY (Canada)**

The Canadian Delegation has studied the report of the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry and supports the recommendations that are contained within it. Canada also attaches high priority to the work of the FAO Forestry Department. We urge FAO to protect the increased proportional share allocated to forestry in the 2004-2005 Budget to accurately reflect the importance of forests worldwide, including the critical role they play in alleviating hunger and poverty and in sustaining life.

Canada encourages the dissemination of accurate, timely and comprehensive forestry information and also encourages FAO work in forest resource assessments and in harmonizing forest related definitions. This information will form the basis for improved policy development and decision making and help to streamline reporting to international fora.

**Abdolreza Raeis SHAGHAGHI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

On behalf of my delegation I appreciate the contents of the report of the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry, and we strongly support all the recommendations. There is only one point that I would like to mention, regarding the item number 3 on page 7 it should be mentioned that instead of Mr Noori-Naeini, Mr Samadi, who is the Deputy Minister, participated in the Committee as the Vice-Chairman.

**Mooneshwar RAMTHOUL (Mauritius)**

The Mauritian delegation endorses the recommendations made in the Report of the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry. As you are aware Mauritius is already a signatory of CBD, CITES, UNCCD and is already implementing various programmes for the conservation of both flora and fauna with the support of UNEP.

The importance of forest ecosystem for proper watershed management, erosion control and biodiversity management has already been highlighted in the Report. Despite all these efforts, Mauritius is still seeking FAO technical assistance in reviewing our forest policy. Our land resources are very limited and competition for other uses for our limited forestry is increasing by the day, from the tourism sector, as well as for leisure and other sectors. So by reviewing our forest policy, we hope that we would have a better sustainable development of our forests. We urge the TCP to assist small island developing countries like Mauritius in capacity-building for proper monitoring of our forests resources, for better collection and analysis of information of our forests, socio-economic functions, etc.

**Jirí MUCHKA (Czech Republic)**

The Czech Republic, on behalf of the acceding countries to the European Community represented at the session wishes to put on record that the following acceding countries: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, associate themselves with a statement which has been delivered by Greece on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States to this item of our agenda.

On behalf of my country only, the Czech Republic, I would like to introduce a few brief remarks.

The report from the Sixteenth Session of the Committee on Forestry in paragraphs 26 to 35 refers to the National Forest Programmes as a mechanism to implement the key outcomes of the World Food Summit: *five years later* and the World Summit on Sustainable Development. In this context, our country attaches great importance to the process of preparation and implementation of the National Forest Programmes, and I am pleased to announce that my Government endorsed our National Forest Programme in January this year. At the present time we implement this Programme in the multi-sectoral and participatory nature. It involves seven special ministries and a number of different interest groups.

**Flavio Célio GOLDMAN (Brazil)**

We would like to reiterate our support to the recommendations made by COFO, but we wish to emphasize also the importance that the language agreed in the text of the Report be carefully observed by FAO in implementing those recommendations.

We note that some delegations referred to issues which were not included in the final report of COFO, and we wish to draw the attention of the Council, particularly of its Drafting Committee, on the need to stick to the language agreed in the last session of the Committee on Forestry.

**Souhaib Deen BANGOURA (Observateur de la Guinée)**

La délégation guinéenne est favorable aux recommandations contenues dans le document CL 124/8. Le Programme d'action forestier national de Guinée a défini la stratégie de développement forestier, pour une période de 25 ans, sur la base de plusieurs objectifs prioritaires: la connaissance des ressources existantes, la gestion durable du domaine classé de l'État et de la collectivité, l'aménagement des bassins versants, la mise en œuvre d'opérations ayant pour objectif la production à travers le reboisement, la promotion de technologies appropriées, la conservation de la bio-diversité et la protection des écosystèmes fragiles, le développement de la foresterie communautaire et privée, la mise en place d'un système de recherche forestière. Ainsi, dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de cette politique, le Gouvernement guinéen, avec l'appui de ses partenaires au développement, a entrepris des activités diverses. Concernant le reboisement, la stratégie privilégie la formation d'une centaine de pépiniéristes capables de prendre le relais des projets dans la production des plans, la formation des paysans forestiers et fruitiers, la structuration du monde paysan en groupements. Aujourd'hui, on dénombre, à travers le pays, 65 groupements forestiers.

**Sra. Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOTTI (Guatemala)**

Guatemala agradece el informe del 16º Período de Sesiones del Comité de Montes y lo endosa. Quiere asimismo apoyar la inquietud manifestada por la Delegación de Perú en relación a la Alianza Internacional para el Desarrollo Sostenible de la Montaña.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Plus aucune délégation n'a demandé la parole? Monsieur El-Lakany souhaite-il apporter des éclaircissements?

**Hosny EL-LAKANY (Assistant Director-General, Forestry Department)**

Very briefly I would like to reply to some of the points raised.

Of course, the most important that we heard regards our new entity on forests and water, and I can assure the distinguished representatives and delegates that we are approaching this subject with a lot of attention, mindful of all the sensitivities related to it. Our programme is detailed in the Medium-Term Plan and we would welcome any specific comments.

As for the request of outlook studies for Latin America, this follows our Outlook Study for Asia and Africa. The work is in progress.

Now about our role in the CPF, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. We appreciate your support for our leadership, and I can assure you that we are supporting the United Nations Forum on Forests fully and we are trying to build some linkages between our programme of work and the IFF proposals for action so that we can avoid any duplication but I can assure that this is complementary.

We are trying to work also on the linkages between National Forest Programmes and food security and I will come back to this again later on.

The Global Forest Survey is also important for FAO and part of our work. With the support of some countries' extra-budgetary resources, we'll be able to build the capacity to produce data so that we can have reliable results in our Forest Resources Assessment.

The work on forest fires is also an integral part of our work, and we are looking at it not from the fire control *per se* but from the forest management side, having forest fire control as part of it.

The building of national capacity for forest assessment and reporting, again, is part of our programme and we are putting a lot of resources into it.

The participation of NGOs and the civil society at large in our work is quite visible. I must say that just last week we concluded a major meeting here in Italy with the participation of the private sector.

For some of the recommendations related to the Community Forestry Unit, it is an integral part of the newly-restructured division on Forest Planning and Institutions, and it is kept as an entity for our work.

The call for more work on the relationship between energy or fuel wood, food security and desertification is receiving additional interest in our Medium-Term Plan. We are trying to build these linkages.

There are also some very strong recommendations related to the strengthening of the Regional Forestry Commissions that was called upon by the COFO. We have started this process already, trying to link the Regional Forestry Commissions to the international debate through the strengthening of the Regional Commissions.

I forgot to mention our work on mountains, you are right, it is very important. This is a natural follow-up of the observance of the International Year of the Mountains, and as you know, the Director-General offered, in Johannesburg, that the newly-formed partnership on sustainable development in mountain areas will have its Secretariat here and we appreciate the support that we get from Switzerland and Italy for initiating the Secretariat. As usual, mountain issues remain on the top of our agenda.

The work on definitions and harmonization and streamlining of reporting again was reported to COFO, and the request from Mauritius for review of the forest policies, as you mentioned, could be a good subject for a TCP and we would be happy to entertain it.

With this, very briefly, I have tried to summarize our reply, but I will be very happy to answer any specific questions.

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Il n'y a pas d'autres commentaires. Ceci conclut donc le point 5 de notre première journée de travail. Avant de lever la séance, je voudrais vous annoncer qu'une courte présentation multimédia sera faite demain matin en salle plénière sur le thème "Réforme, budget et personnel" par la Division de l'information de la FAO. Je voudrais vous informer également que Monsieur le Ministre de la Sécurité alimentaire et de la lutte contre la faim du Brésil, son Excellence Monsieur José Graziano da Silva, donnera une Conférence de presse demain à 14 heures dans la salle de l'Iran.

Je voudrais également annoncer qu'il y aura une réunion du GRULAC demain matin à 9 heures dans la Salle des Philippines et une réunion du G-77 demain à 13 h 30 dans la Salle de la Malaisie.

*The meeting rose at 17.50 hours*

*La séance est levée à 17 h 50*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 17.50 horas*

# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 – 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>THIRD PLENARY MEETING TROISIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>24 June 2003</b>

The Third Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.05 hours

Mr Aziz Mekouar,

Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La troisième séance plénière est ouverte à 10 h 05

sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,

Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la tercera sesión plenaria a las 10.05 horas

bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,

Presidente Independiente del Consejo

**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**

**13. Reports of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee (Rome, 5-9 May 2003) (CL 124/4)**

**13. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier (Rome, 5-9 mai 2003) (CL 124/4)**

**13. Informe de la Reunión Conjunta del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas (Roma, 5-9 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/4)**

*13.1 Savings and Efficiencies in Governance*

*13.1 Économies et gains d'efficience en matière de gouvernance*

*13.1 Economías y eficacia en el ejercicio del gobierno*

*13.2 Other Matters Arising out of the Report*

*13.2 Autres questions découlant du rapport*

*13.2 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe*

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je déclare ouverte la troisième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil. Nous allons commencer avec le rapport de la réunion conjointe du Comité de programme et du Comité financier. Il s'agit du point 13 de l'ordre du jour. De cette réunion du Comité de programme et du Comité financier qui s'est tenue à Rome, du 5 au 9 mai 2003, nous verrons le sous-point 13.1: Economies et gains d'efficience en matière de gouvernance, et le sous-point 13.2: Autres questions découlant du Rapport. Ce document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/4.

Je note que le Comité du programme et le Comité financier ont examiné, lors de leur réunion conjointe, le rapport du Corps commun d'inspection des Nations Unies, Examen de la gestion et de l'administration au sein de la FAO, et qu'ils examineront, de nouveau, cette question lors de leur session de septembre 2003. Le Conseil attend avec impatience de prendre connaissance de leurs conclusions à ce sujet.

Monsieur Molina Reyes, Président du Comité financier, qui a présidé la réunion conjointe de mai, et Monsieur Hankey, Vice-Président du Comité du programme exerçant les fonctions de Président, vont introduire ce point.

Je donnerai également la parole à Monsieur Wade, Directeur du Bureau du programme, du budget et de l'évaluation, avant d'ouvrir le débat.

On demande de ne pas présenter le sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005, puisque celui-ci fait l'objet du point 12 de l'ordre du jour que nous examinerons séparément cet après midi.

**Humberto E. MOLINA REYES (Presidente, Comité de Finanzas)**

Permítame en primer lugar expresar mi gran satisfacción por estar ante ustedes y presentar los informes del Comité de Finanzas que ustedes me han confiado en dirigir.

En esa condición me correspondió presidir la reunión conjunta del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas en el pasado mes de mayo. Aprovecho la ocasión para agradecer a los miembros de ambos Comités, su participación, entusiasmo y gran cooperación, que nos permitió abordar eficientemente los temas previstos en las sesiones conjuntas.

Los resultados de nuestros debates han sido muy bien sintetizados en el documento CL 124/4, que ustedes tienen al frente y que guardan relación con cuatro temas principales que ustedes ya conocen y que no voy a volver a repetir.



En cuanto al resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005 ya hemos escuchado la orientación del señor Presidente Independiente del Consejo, que este punto será analizado bajo el ítem 12 de nuestra agenda. Por lo tanto en esa oportunidad haremos los comentarios pertinentes.

Entro de esta manera en el punto 13.1 – Economías y eficacia en el ejercicio del gobierno. Como ustedes recordarán, el Consejo en su 123º período de sesiones había pedido a la Secretaría que siguiera estudiando la opción de celebrar simultáneamente durante los períodos de sesiones de la Conferencia el Debate General y Mesas Redondas Temáticas. Después de haber examinado las implicancias financieras, las restricciones de tiempo, incluyendo aquella de los ministros y otras de carácter práctico, los comités recomiendan al Consejo la opción 1 presentada por la Secretaría. Esta opción, reflejada en el párrafo 19 del informe, considera la celebración de tres Mesas Redondas, del 1 al 3 de diciembre del año 2003, con un número limitado de participantes y que se realicen desde las 17:00 horas hasta las 19:00 horas. Los comités subrayaron la importancia de considerar una balanceada representación regional, flexibilidad en seleccionar los temas de discusión y el número y nivel de los participantes.

En cuanto al punto 13.2, Otros asuntos planteados en el informe. Quisiera en primer lugar referirme a la independencia y emplacamiento del Servicio de Evaluación. Los comités aquí expresaron de manera global que el documento presentado por la Secretaría era una buena base para la discusión, sin embargo no permitía llegar a una conclusión definitiva sobre este tema. Los comités reconocieron que la función de evaluación era una herramienta clave en la gestión de la Organización. Con respecto a la propuesta del Auditor Externo de fusionar la Oficina del Inspector General y el Servicio de Evaluación, la mayoría de los miembros señalaron que no estaban a favor de combinar estas dos dependencias, pero que había una mayor sinergia entre las dos y el nivel de complementariedad de ambas. No obstante lo anterior, se observó que era prematuro adoptar una decisión final sobre los arreglos institucionales para el Servicio de Evaluación. Muchas preguntas surgieron respecto a la independencia de la evaluación, incluyendo lo que significaba el término. Estas inquietudes están muy bien resumidas en el párrafo 15 del informe que estamos analizando.

En resumen, los comités concluyeron que era necesario contar con mayor información específica, como también con escenarios posibles los cuales deberían incluir una completa unidad de evaluación y la alternativa de fortalecer su independencia bajo la actual ubicación organizacional.

Se solicitó que la Secretaría incluyera este tema en la próxima sesión conjunta en septiembre próximo, y además considere la experiencia de otras organizaciones internacionales sobre esta materia.

Con respecto al informe de la Dependencia Común de Inspección (DCI) de las Naciones Unidas: Examen de la gestión y administración en la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación, este fue un tema que ambos comités acogieron con gran satisfacción dada la iniciativa de la Dependencia Común de Inspección de realizar este estudio de la FAO, que era parte de una serie de otros estudios concentrados en distintas organizaciones del sistema de las Naciones Unidas. Apreciaron la calidad y utilidad del informe, así como la plena cooperación de la Secretaría de la FAO con el equipo de la DCI en todos los lugares donde se realizó el estudio. Observaron los comités que el diálogo constructivo había facilitado un amplio acuerdo con las recomendaciones propuestas en el informe final.

La presencia del Presidente de la Dependencia Común de Inspección facilitó las consultas sobre el propósito de este tipo de informes.

Los Comités observaron que muchas de las recomendaciones dirigidas al Consejo estaban siendo estudiadas en el Comité del Programa y de Finanzas y que sería más eficiente estudiarlas separadamente más que en el Comité Conjunto.

Los Comités estuvieron de acuerdo en que los ulteriores debates sobre el informe de la DCI deberían contar con el respaldo de un documento adicional que contuviera un plan de acción detallado con plazos definidos que abarcara las medidas complementarias en curso o previstas. En consecuencia, la sesión conjunta solicitó a la Secretaría que se preparase un documento para sus

próximos Períodos de Sesiones con el objeto de proveer asesoría de manera más completa al Consejo en su período de sesiones de noviembre del 2003, sobre las posibles reacciones de los Órganos Rectores de la FAO ante el informe de la DCI.

Esto es todo lo que puedo informar en esta oportunidad con respecto a este informe. Quedo a su disposición, como asimismo a la de los miembros del Consejo, para responder a consultas adicionales.

**Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)**

We are very pleased to have before us the conclusions of the Joint Session and we fully support the recommendations contained therein. In particular, we note the importance of the JIU Report on administration and management. This Report recommended, among other things, that efforts continue to provide precise performance indicators and targets, and to identify what the Secretariat can be held directly responsible for. The report also recommended that regional representatives participate, at least on a rotational basis, in senior management meetings in order to ensure that regional representatives are current with FAO's policy. The Report recommended that the Director-General urgently undertake a review of the terms of reference of the Regional Offices, as well as the resources and authority granted to them.

The report also stated that FAORs should be provided with adequate human resources and guidance to fulfill their responsibilities. In particular, the Director-General should ensure that the selection of FAO Representatives is an open and fair process. He should develop a standard description of the competencies, skills and experience required of FAO Representatives. We think these are extremely important recommendations and we look forward to further discussion of these.

In particular, I would note that the Joint Session concluded that further discussions should be supported by an additional document which the Secretariat would prepare containing a detailed timebound action plan, with action offices indicated, covering ongoing or planned follow-up activities.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

En primer lugar deseo agradecer a los presidentes e integrantes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas por los trabajos realizados. Si bien este Consejo analizará con mayor profundidad el tema del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005, sí desearía señalar desde ahora que a las recomendaciones de prioridades específicas indicadas en el párrafo 10 de este documento conjunto habría que agregar el tema de la pesca. Mi delegación ha tomado nota que pese a los esfuerzos de los Comités, no fue posible alcanzar un consenso para elaborar una recomendación sobre el nivel del presupuesto. Confiamos que continúe un dialogo constructivo que favorezca los intereses de la comunidad internacional y los altos objetivos de esta noble institución.

El Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005 de la FAO es una oportunidad para que aquellos países que prometieron recursos adicionales a favor del desarrollo durante la Conferencia de Financiación de Monterrey, puedan hacerlo realidad a favor del sector rural mundial que es quizás uno de los más necesitados de recursos.

Mi delegación no ve inconveniente en apoyar la recomendación de los Comités para la celebración de tres mesas redondas durante la próxima Conferencia. Sin embargo, en relación con el párrafo 21, inciso D, será necesario que el tema seleccionado para el debate no sólo tenga una importancia estratégica sino que sea elegido en consulta con los Estados Miembros. Quizás esto podría hacerse en consulta con los presidentes de los grupos regionales.

**Jean Norbert DIRAMBA (Gabon)**

Je tiens d'abord à féliciter le Comité du programme pour la qualité des documents qui nous sont soumis. Mon pays, le Gabon, se réjouit de l'intérêt porté au financement des domaines prioritaires, quelque soit le montant du budget. La délégation gabonaise appuie cette intention et souhaite vivement que le Codex, le Programme de coopération technique, le PSSA et le secteur de

l'élevage et des pêches puissent être considérés comme domaines prioritaires et bénéficier de financements adéquats.

**Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

My very brief comments relate to "The Independence and Location of the Evaluation Service". My delegation is delighted to note that the Secretariat has indicated that the evaluation function is an important tool in service of the management of this Organization. I am glad to note that the matter is being given the necessary attention.

My delegation would like to request that with respect to paragraph 16, the scenarios which are to be presented be made available to the members of Council. I trust that we will not just be provided with a short summary of the scenario as selected by the Secretariat. I hope that there will be an opportunity for the Members of the Council to be able to see what the scenarios are and provide some inputs as to which options should be applied.

With respect to "Savings and Efficiencies in Governance" I totally endorse the briefing in paragraph 17 to 21.

I would, however, like to make a simple observation that timing for the Roundtables mentioned in paragraph 19 may not attract the kind of calibre that is being expected -- 17.00 to 19.00 hours in the evening after the house is already virtually exhausted. It is then, that we are expected to start a roundtable discussion with the participation of our Minister. I am not sure that that is the place and time. I imagine that the Timetable was defined due to the limitations imposed on the system by the nature of the conference itself. I wish these roundtables could be convened a little earlier in the day when we are likely to capture the presence of most delegates from our capitals. If possible, I would appreciate if this could be reviewed.

Finally, a note with respect to the areas to be covered in the Roundtables. At what point will we be informed of the actual topics to be covered? I think it is important for us to know, well ahead of time. Who is going to come up with the final topics to be discussed? This has thematic issues. I fully associate myself with my neighbour in his last comment and would also like to say that I hope there will be an opportunity again for us to know how we are going to decide which topics to cover at these roundtables. There may be some difference in terms of selective importance and it is therefore pertinent that we know well ahead of time the machinery for selecting the topics.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

We would just like to make a very brief comment to express our support for the recommendations agreed by the Committees on the holding of Roundtables during the Conference.

We think this additional feature of the Conference will increase the attractiveness of the forum for Ministers, with the prospects of engagement of Ministers on topical issues being of strategic importance. We place importance on this dimension of the Conference as it will be the turn of the Southwest Pacific region to chair this year's Conference. The confirmation of New Zealand in this role, of course, is to be addressed later in this session. As far as the proposed arrangements, we see them as feasible and practical.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

Just two points. One on "The Independence and location of the Evaluation Service". We endorse paragraph 16 where the Joint Meeting requests the Secretariat to prepare alternative scenarios ranging from a totally independent evaluation unit, as well as possibilities of strengthening independence further under the current organizational location.

The second point is on the JIU Report. We actually support the proposal contained in the Finance Committee's Report document CL 124/16, paragraph 39 under the bullet which reads as follows: "As these recommendations all dealt with various aspects of Human Resource Management (HRM) the Committee requested the Secretariat to include an analysis of these issues among the HRM items for consideration at the September 2003 Session ...".

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

I take the floor just to share my views with the others. First and foremost we would like to thank the Joint Committee for the report that has been presented to us. It gives us pointers as to how the budget in the programme is being viewed by the two Committees and its impact on our programme in the coming two years.

I mainly wanted to underscore the point that the budget gives us an opportunity to clearly demonstrate the commitments we have made in the last World Food Summit: *five years later* and in the other respective conferences in this regard as this is the first budget that we are drawing up. I do hope that when we come to discuss it our commitments will reflect the essence of what our leaders had in mind when they committed themselves to assist the poor in a more targeted manner. I will not deal with the details now as I hope we will discuss it more when the topic comes up.

On the issue of the "Independent Location of the Evaluation Service", I also wish to support the comments that have been made by the others in that being these two very specialized areas, we should look forward a closer working relationship. However, I think merging them is not really the right thing. We would like to associate ourselves with the recommendations in paragraph 16 which calls for a more in-depth analysis and even for a comparative report that draws insight from other organizations that are involved in this.

On the issue of the roundtables, we are in agreement with the suggestion, however, we would like the question of the timetable to be looked at so that it is friendly to the participants. At the same time we would appreciate that the topics be made known to us in due course, so that our delegations can be adequately prepared.

**Abdul Razek AYAZI (Observer for Afghanistan)**

I wish to address one issue that refers to the pros and cons of making the Evaluation Service independent from Management. One thing is, however, clear and that is the notion that evaluation must remain an independent and impartial enquiry and no one, including Management, should try to interfere in the evaluation process. If Management were to steer the findings of evaluation in a direction favourable to it, then the concept of evaluation *per se* loses its credibility and relevance. Thus the issue of evaluation as an independent and impartial enquiry is not an issue; the question posed is whether an evaluation unit, outside the management structure, is preferable to one that is part of the management structure. That is the central issue, undoubtedly a highly controversial issue.

My personal experience has taught me that for its own success the evaluation unit needs to be an engaging partner with managers and actors who are responsible for the normative work of the Organization and its field programmes. It also creates trust between the evaluation unit and the actors and does for an open dialogue. Any evaluator needs this openness because it benefits him or her. Cutting all the umbilical cords has two main disadvantages. One, it disconnects the evaluation unit from providing constant feedback to the programming and implementation process. An evaluation without feedback amounts to throwing good money away. Secondly, the process of separation will gradually turn the evaluation unit into an ivory tower and that would be a setback both for the evaluation unit and for the Organization *per se*. In my opinion, the present practice of evaluation in FAO is on the right track. The use of independent consultants and peer groups is a sound practice and needs to be encouraged and supported. The response of Management to an evaluation enquiry is also a useful practice. One cannot assume that an independent evaluator is immune from making mistakes or coming up with recommendations that are either irrelevant or impractical. Therefore, Management should have every right to agree or disagree with the findings and the recommendations of an independent evaluation.

Finally, the joint session has rightly requested the Secretariat to prepare a new paper on the subject by taking into account the experience of other UN organizations. This request is commendable.

**Yohannes TENSUE (Observer for Eritrea)**

Just some comments regarding the roundtable and the timing. I feel the roundtable is very important and should be given a good time in which the participants can attend. The country statements are often time consuming therefore, instead of being given from 17.00 to 19.00 hours, the Roundtables could be held either in the morning or early afternoon and consequently attendance would increase.

If we reduce the country statements yet equally given by region, say 5 or 10 from each Region, and give more time for the roundtables it would make it more interesting. As Nigeria has indicated, the timing from 17.00 to 19.00 hours for a Roundtable is not the right decision. Rethinking about the timing should be made.

**Carlos Alberto AMARAL (Observateur d'Angola)**

J'en profite pour vous féliciter de votre élection et celle du Vice-Président et du bon travail que le Comité du programme et le Comité financier ont fait.

Je prends surtout la parole pour m'associer à la proposition, faite par le délégué de Mexico, d'inclure, dans le point 10, la pêche comme priorité étant donné son importance et en particulier l'aquaculture.

J'en profite aussi pour m'associer aux délégués du Nigéria et du Zimbabwe sur le choix de l'horaire des tables rondes. Pour une participation plus dynamique, je pense qu'il serait bon de changer l'horaire.

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

In fact, I do not think that there are any questions and we have taken careful note of all the suggestions and comments that have been made by Members. So, I would intend to leave it at that, if that is OK with you, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if Mrs Gardner wants to comment further on the question of Roundtables or whether we just take note of the questions. We just take note.

**14. Report of the 89<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee (Rome, 5-9 May 2003)**

(CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)

**14. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du Programme**

(Rome, 5-9 mai 2003) (CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)

**14. Informe del 89º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa**

(Roma, 5-9 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/14; CL 124/INF/14)

*14.1 Other Matters Arising out of the Report*

*14.1 Autres questions découlant du rapport*

*14.1 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe*

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Ceci conclut le point 13. Passons au point 14 de notre ordre du jour relatif au rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du programme qui s'est tenue à Rome du 5 au 9 mai 2003. Nous examinerons en même temps le sous-point 14.1: Autres questions découlant du rapport. Les documents relatifs à ce point portent la référence CL 124/14 et CL 124/INF/14.

J'aimerais demander à Monsieur Hankey, Vice-Président du Comité du programme, exerçant les fonctions de Président, et Monsieur Wade, Directeur du Bureau du programme, du budget et de l'évaluation, d'introduire le rapport, à l'exception de la partie portant sur le sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005, qui sera examinée cet après-midi au point 12 de l'ordre du jour, comme je l'ai déjà expliqué.

**Blair HANKEY (Chairman, Programme Committee)**

The issues before the Programme Committee, other than the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, is priority-setting in the context of programme planning. Two evaluation reports: one a

joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of the Codex Alimentarius, another FAO/WHO Food Standards work, and an evaluation of Programme 2.2.2 Food and Agricultural Information activities, related to agricultural statistics in the context of FAOSTAT. Then, we had the follow-up of Management's implementation of three earlier evaluation reports: the Semantic Review of FAO's Training Activities, the Evaluation of the Special Programme for Food Security and the Evaluation of FAO's Policy Assistance. I will deal with each of those quickly.

Of these issues, I think the one that has attracted the greatest debate and interest has been priority-setting in the context of programme planning. I think there is a consensus amongst a large part of the Membership, certainly, on the programme. I believe also, regarding the Finance Committees, that our governing procedures, in terms of the involvement of the Membership in establishing the priorities of FAO, are not very effective. What typically happens here is that delegations express matters that are of high priority and sometimes they obtain consensus on these in the Governing Bodies, but really no kind of consensus is ever obtained on matters of low priority.

Therefore, essentially the Membership does not have a very effective role in establishing relative priorities, when, of course, priority setting has to involve some aspects of relativity, otherwise we are not really setting priorities.

Hence, this has been the issue standing before us. The Secretariat has prepared a paper and actually has had a PowerPoint presentation, showing both how the Secretariat sets its priorities internally, drawing on the reports of the Governing Bodies in order to indicate what they understand to be the Membership's priorities, and also giving some demonstrations of how other organizations deal with priority setting.

I would not generally read from the Report but there are two paragraphs which I believe communicate the essence of how the Committee has dealt with this issue. Paragraphs 47 and 48 of document CL 124/14 state: "The Committee felt it pertinent to reiterate that reaching on priorities among the Members was essentially a political process. The sense of greater involvement and influence by Members was predicated unwillingness on their part to engage in meaningful "give and take" negotiations, going beyond just stating and defending priorities of direct interest to them. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to explore further how to foster such increased involvement of the Membership, which it felt included enhancing the capacity of the Programme Committee itself in rendering advice on relative priorities, thereby facilitating the above process.

The Committee agreed that methodological tools such as the application of criteria or weighting methods, were only useful inasmuch as they can facilitate understanding of the implications of possible choices, but should not be seen as substituting for the political process. In general, it was felt that such methods were unlikely to facilitate discussion in Governing Bodies ...". We concluded the work by asking the Secretariat to prepare additional papers for further study of the matter at our next meeting in September.

I now move to the Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of the Codex Alimentarius. The Committee agreed that the Evaluation Report was of high quality and it commended the Secretariat for the quality of the Report. The Committee also agreed with the Evaluation Report in that there were four main areas which needed improvement in FAO and WHO Food Standards work. These were: first, greater speed in Codex and expert scientific advice; second, increased inclusiveness of developing Member Nations in Codex standard development procedures, including risk assessment; third, Codex standards of greater usefulness to Member Nations, in terms of relevance to their needs and timeliness; and fourth, more effective capacity building for development of national food control systems.

Varying views were expressed on several issues, including the priority which should be given to non-health related aspects of standard-setting. There were also differing views on the desirability of Codex developing an agreement on the acceptable levels of protection for health, including the use and setting of its own standards.

The Committee emphasized that FAO and the WHO should give high priority to the allocation of the necessary Regular Programme resources. In other words, the evaluation made clear that the implementation of proactive recommendations would require substantial increased resources to the Commission and to the support of work that is done in FAO and in WHO. It will obviously be impossible to implement those recommendations without the allocation of sufficient resources.

I move next to the Evaluation of Programme 2.2 the Agricultural Statistics in FAOSTAT. I think there were three main points in the discussion of this matter in the Programme Committee. The first was that the entire work of FAO, in some sense, rests on the foundation of its statistical work. The other normative work done by the Organization, and a lot of the development work, depends on the quality of the statistical work of the Organization. So, statistical work really has a fundamental importance for all the work of the Organization.

Secondly, the quality of the statistics depends on the quality of the inputs. Therefore, there is a great need for Member Nations to improve the quality of the inputs they send to FAO and, in developing countries, this requires more effective capacity-building to improve the kind of statistics that they can provide to the Organization.

Thirdly, all of this would require adequate resources. Also, given that I think Member Nations generally take for granted the statistical work of the Organization, and it is rare that Member Nations, in their interventions in the Governing Bodies' Sessions, argue for increased resources for statistical work, there is a tendency to overlook this work. Therefore we need to, as an Organization, take note of the fact that this work has probably been under-resourced in recent years and we need to allocate sufficient resources to allow this work to be done effectively, since this work is of importance to all Members without exception.

Then we had the follow-up reports on three earlier evaluation reports: the FAO's Training Activities, the SPFS and the Evaluation of FAO's Policy Assistance. I will not comment on these separately. I will just say that the Committee noted that in each case Management had taken a proactive approach to the recommendations of the Evaluation Reports. We think that there has been a cultural change in the management of the Organization in recent years. The Management was not defensive with respect to the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee, but it appears, from what we can tell, to have taken these recommendations to heart and to have made a good and energetic attempt to implement the recommendations of the Evaluation Reports. To this extent, the response to these Reports is a very good indication of a positive change in the management culture of the Organization.

#### **Koji YONETANI (Japan)**

I would like to comment on the issue of priority-setting. I would like to make an earnest call to the Members of FAO to share a serious sense of urgency. I make this comment because I believe that FAO is facing a real challenge at this junction. While FAO is now expected to address increasingly acute and complex needs, it still remains unable to set clearly focused priorities among its various programmes.

The situation would not be so serious, if we could expect unconditional support from major contributing countries. However, it is now time for selectivity and for concentration; that is to say that our people are not ready to continuously support any international organization that lacks focus and prioritization. In making this very frank comment, I hope that honourable delegates of this Council do not think that I am attacking FAO. On the contrary, I am seriously trying to set conditions for our people to consolidate their support to FAO.

It is regrettable to see that the Programme Committee is not succeeding in setting focused priority. The Report of the Committee, in fact, makes reference to many programmes and entities, all of which are evaluated as important and essential, irrespective of the overall budget level.

It is to some extent reassuring that the Committee is examining methodological tools for priority setting. In particular, it seems that paragraph 49 of the Programme Committee Report is a good starting point. However, there is not much time left for us. FAO is in urgent need for more

focused priority in order to develop an appropriate Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 2004-2005. I would, therefore, like to propose that the Council request the Programme Committee to come up with a clearer focus on the priorities and, thus, to give a meaningful guidance to the Secretariat for the preparation of the full Programme of Work and Budget, to be submitted to the Council in its November Session. My delegation would also like to propose that the Council request the Secretariat to assist the Programme Committee in every possible way by collecting written comments, for example, from Members about relative priorities among programmes and by presenting a document that compiles those comments received.

**Ms Heidi PIHLATIE (Finland)**

I would like to ask you to give the floor to Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its fifteen Member States.

**Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its fifteen Member States. The European Community and its Member States have considered with great interest the Report of the Programme Committee, which met from 5 to 9 May 2003. The most important item on its agenda was the Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005. We have noted that the Summary Programme of Work and Budget was, by and large, an adequate reflection of the Medium-Term Plan, the substance of which was endorsed by the Council last year.

We expect that in the full Programme of Work and Budget, to be considered by the Programme Committee in its next Session, the priorities expressed by the membership during the meetings of FAO's Technical Committees with regard to, for instance, Codex, IPPC, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, will be properly taken into account. This will render the advice of the Programme Committee on the matter more meaningful in the next Council meeting.

We have understood that the deliberations of the Programme Committee on its Summary Programme of Work and Budget have been a good illustration of the difficulties of setting priorities in an intergovernmental organization. The increasing demand for FAO services creates, indeed, a need for prioritization of programmes.

We therefore want the Programme Committee to continue its discussion on how to improve the current practice, recognizing that the process of priority-setting within FAO is primarily political in nature and this process should be undertaken irrespective of available budget resources. In our opinion, the co-challenge of priority-setting in its context is the need to foster Membership information in programme planning.

Another challenge in this process is for the Secretariat to play a more active role, as called for by the COAG. This relates primarily to making the process more transparent and presenting clearer alternatives to priorities, based on suggestions by the membership.

The European Community wants to express its appreciation for the joint FAO/WHO evaluation of the Codex Alimentarius and other FAO and WHO Food Standards work. As the evaluation process has been thorough, independent and consultative, the recommendations require careful consideration, as pointed out by the Programme Committee. We therefore welcome the in-depth discussion held by the Codex Alimentarius Commission at its special session in February and we are looking forward to the continuation thereof in the Codex Alimentarius Committee June Session. Given the importance of its work, Codex needs to be adequately resourced so as to be able to increase the participation of developing countries in it, and accelerate the process of standards-setting to protect consumer health and safety and ensure the promotion of fair practices in the food trade.

The public image of an Organization, be it private, public, national or international, needs from time to time refocusing and renewal. We therefore endorse fully the priority given by the Programme Committee to carrying out the evaluation of the cross-organizational strategy on communicating FAO's messages, during the next biennium.



**Ms Sharon KOTOK (United States of America)**

The United States welcomes the report of the Programme Committee. We appreciate the Committee's efforts to grapple with prioritization. It is not easy but it must be undertaken and we note that work on this important topic will continue at the next session.

We welcome the intention to review FAO's Priority Areas for Inter-disciplinary Action, (PAIA) and in particular support the establishment of a new PAIA on HIV/AIDS.

We have been told that FAO intends to look at all activities through a HIV/AIDS lens and PAIA is the most appropriate institutional mechanism for doing so. Since resources are few, we suggest that PAIA on ethics and the associated programme, which has been in operation for three years now, be a candidate for elimination. FAO ethics' publications do not contribute to FAO's science-based work and advice but undermine it by endorsing the so-called precautionary principle.

We particularly support the Programme Committee's recommendation to fund the International Plant Protection Convention at the level of its biennial budget business plan under any budget scenario. The work of the IPPC is important to all countries, whatever their level of development. We note, in this regard, the importance that we attach to capacity-building and to ensure that IPPC standards can be put into place. We also strongly support the Committee's conclusions concerning follow-up to the Codex Alimentarius evaluation and the importance of FAO and WHO providing their share of additional resources, required for these recommendations.

We note that the Programme Committee requested additional information on FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme, which is FAO's third largest programme. This is very timely; Members need to know how and where these funds are being spent and, while we have heard calls to increase the TCP allocation, we question whether this makes sense, given the difficulties FAO has in implementing current allocation levels.

In the context of Zero Nominal Growth budget and, given the clearly articulated priorities of membership, we question FAO's decision to allocate new resources to activities which have not commanded full membership support. A good example is the food chain activities. We welcome the Secretariat's assurance that the proposed entity in the budget is not related to the draft strategy document on a food chain approach to food safety and quality, discussed at the Seventeenth Session of COAG.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

I am speaking on behalf of the countries acceding the European Union and represented at this meeting; those being Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. We wish to associate ourselves with the statement delivered by Greece speaking on behalf of the European Community and its fifteen Member States.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

We wish to make a few brief comments on the Report and the outcomes of the Programme Committee which we consider agreed on a number of issues of key importance for FAO Members.

First, and this would come as no surprise, we wish to endorse the Committee's conclusions on regular budget funding for the IPPC and Codex. Specifically, the Committee endorsed the funding of the IPPC at the level of its biennial business plan under any budget scenario. It also endorsed the COAG recommendation that FAO should provide its share of additional resources, required for the recommendations of the joint FAO/WHO evaluation of Codex to be implemented in full. We can only underline that these are important conclusions which reinforce the overwhelming endorsement also provided to these programmes through rather recent Committee meetings such as the CCP and COAG and the previous FAO Council.

We also welcome the Committee's conclusions on other areas of work, including in relation to the food chain approach and we would endorse in that regard the comments just made by the United

States in relation to bio-security, ethics as well as the important programme areas including funding in relation to fisheries and forestry.

The Committee's agreement to review the operation of the PAIAs in the coming biennium is also an important step in ensuring that these potentially important cross-organizational mechanisms are operating effectively.

We would also wish to support the conclusions of the Committee on the evaluation of the Codex Alimentarius and in supporting the four main areas of improvement and the overall thrust of the evaluation. We consider the conclusions to be balanced and appropriate and we look forward to the further discussion on this important issue in the Codex Alimentarius Commission. We would also emphasize, in relation to the Codex evaluation, the Programme Committee's conclusions, which give high priority to the allocation of the necessary resources to the Regular Programme. As we said earlier we see this as a crucial conclusion.

Finally, but by no means least, we would also wish to emphasize the important discussion and conclusions on priority setting in FAO programme planning, that took place during the Programme Committee meeting, and the conclusions that derived from that. This has been highlighted by Japan and the United States. I think that this remains a key area of reform that the Organization and Membership need to tackle. Also, the conclusions of the Committee to further address this issue with a focus on greater Membership involvement, which we see as a key aspect in improving the priority-setting process within FAO; the priority improvement in internal planning processes within the Secretariat being the other important dimension. We think that these are important conclusions from the Committee and we look forward to taking this issue forward in a meaningful way.

**Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

I join the other delegates in endorsing the Report. My comment relates to only one item, paragraph 49, regarding priority setting.

During my little contact with this Organization in the last two years or so, this issue has come up several times. Just as the Report itself has identified, the question of priority setting is both scientific and political. FAO conceptually is expected to be a Centre of Excellence in all facets of agricultural development and, therefore, one does appreciate the emphasis that it placed on the normative role of the Organization.

Certainly, issues pertaining to Codex in relation to food safety quality and standards, are issues that cannot be comprised whatsoever. It is in the interest of both the producers and consumers. However, in bringing this matter into discussion at the level indicated in this document, I want to put forward a plea to the Committee; that is, that the time has long gone when FAO would restrict itself to a very large percentage of normative work at the expense of field exposure. The dynamic changes in society have exposed FAO to such a magnitude of problems that we have to accept the reality: the field exposure of this Organization to some regions has become a *sine qua non* for the support that the Organization would need, just as much as the support that it would also need for the normative work.

Summarizing, I would like to point out that whilst this matter is being discussed, cognizance must be taken with these two roles and conscience efforts made to balance these in the field of exposure and in the normative work.

**Adnan BASHIR KHAN (Pakistan)**

Allow me to thank Mr Hankey for presenting this Report. Just like my colleague from Nigeria, I wish to address only one item here, and this is the priority setting issue.

The first point I wish to make is that, as paragraph 44 also illustrates, there is an existing priority-setting mechanism here in the Organization. We believe that this existing priority-setting mechanism is quite an efficient and appropriate management response to the projection of the membership's articulation of its interests.

The second point I wish to make is that, paragraph 47 rightly points out the political nature of the priority-setting process. Moreover, if this political nature of the priority setting process has to be enhanced further or refined further, as seems to be the demand of many Members here, I think there is a need for the Committee which is mandated to look into such matters, and this is the Programme Committee, to appropriately build capacity. Without an appropriate capacity enhancement, we do not think that this political process can be carried forward to make it a meaningful priority-setting forum.

The third, and final, point is that paragraph 49 is perhaps a good way forward. It indicates a good methodology to proceed in the matter and we encourage the Programme Committee to continue in that.

**Arnaldo DE BAENA FERNANDES (Brazil)**

I will be very brief. In the broad context of FAO activities, the Brazilian delegation emphasized that the role played by Codex Alimentarius and IPPC is a central one in establishing standards to ensure food safety and plant health. These institutions must be supported with adequate resources in order to establish science-based standards which may guarantee a fair trade system.

We are fully convinced that FAO has an important role to play in assisting developing countries in their efforts to combat poverty and fight hunger. Those activities should include: (a) capacity building programmes aimed at enabling developing countries to participate in multilateral trade negotiations on agriculture as well as in the meetings of Codex and the International Plant Protection Convention; (b) capacity-building in developing countries to establish appropriate sanitary and phytosanitary programmes relating to food and agriculture; (c) technical assistance for programmes dedicated to small-scale farmers in the context of food security.

Finally, we would like to support the proposal of the Programme Committee, mentioned in paragraph 19, regarding the reallocation of resources for the proposed new entity, Food Quality and Safety, throughout the Food Chain to the Codex programme activities.

**Mrs Meglena PLUGCHIEVA (Bulgaria)**

I am speaking on behalf of the Bulgarian Delegation. The Republic of Bulgaria, as an acceding country, aligns itself with the statement made by Greece, on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States, and supported by the Czech Republic, on behalf of the 10 new Members.

**Mohammad Saeid NOORI-NAEINI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

Allow me to start by welcoming Mr Hankey to the Chair of the Programme Committee and the podium today. I will comment only on priority-setting.

It has been mentioned time and again that resources in FAO have been very seemly distributed among too many activities, and, if this is true, then according to the law of diminishing returns, we will get less and less for each dollar that we spend on different activities. Therefore, the relevance of priority-setting is very obvious. In this case, if this assumption is true, any priority that we set would increase efficiency and productivity of the Organization.

We must remember that priority setting and resource availability are interlinked. Suppose that we set priorities and then we decide on a minimum level of the priorities which should be

implemented. We then have to decide on the level of budget which is needed for that, or alternatively, we fix the level of budget and then we decide how many of these priorities could be done. So, if there is any study to be done, it should take into consideration both accounts, which are very important and very political.

Then another issue which might be important in this consideration is the relativeness of the variable and fixed assets, for example, the level of resources and the number of experts which are in FAO. How many resources are available per person to do their job in FAO? It is very important. If the level of this resource is too thin, then we are not taking advantage of the very good experts that we have, and we have to increase the resources available to them, or vice versa. So this is another point that has to be considered.

Another element is the priority in different regions. We have different priorities in different regions. We cannot just limit priority setting to a global level. We have different regions with different priorities and, therefore, the priority-setting should take these regional priorities into account.

One mechanism which is used right now in FAO for regional priority-setting is regional conferences and, as I remember, we have mentioned priorities, for example, in the Near East for years and years, and most of them have never been taken into account because they said we do not have enough resources. So the priority exist, but the resources are lacking, and this again explains the relationship between resources and priorities.

Finally, I associate myself strongly with the statement made by both Nigeria and Pakistan, relating to normative and field activities and all other issues that these two delegations mentioned.

**Natigor SIAGIAN (Indonesia)**

Expressing my statement after the statement of my brothers in Pakistan and Nigeria always makes me very happy, so I am very happy to support in general their statements.

I have some comments to make here and there in the report, but let me first express my appreciation to the Chairman of the Programme Committee for the excellent preparation of the CL 124/14 for the Secretariat.

As many speakers have already expressed, we also would like to strongly support the importance of the work of Codex Alimentarius, and how FAO, and the expertise of human resources has, strengthened the activities of Codex Alimentarius. I would like to stress paragraph 21 of the Report of the Committee, the need for us to help the developing countries to strengthen capacity building, to enable them to fully participate in the WTO agricultural trade negotiations and trade facilitations, including standard-setting. This is very important for developing countries in situations of difficult negotiations of the WTO, especially with regard to the agricultural negotiations where we have seen now the difficulties in having the finalization of these negotiations.

In the field of forestry, the Indonesian delegation also supports paragraph 28, especially the strengthening of national efforts and the field activities of FAO.

With regard to the SPFS, I refer now to paragraphs 35 and 36. We would like to mention especially the need for us to have the strongest cooperation with FAO on the implementation of the SPFS, especially with the big problems of food security.

One of the important roles of FAO is communication and consultation with Member Nations. I fully understand the feeling here when we see paragraph 39 and we hope that action be taken to strengthen FAO Representative roles in the Member countries.

With regard to TCP, let me also reiterate again my delegation's support to the strengthening of the role of FAO in this TCP.

As my previous colleague has already expressed, we have also taken into consideration, with full attention, paragraph 49.

Again with relation to Codex Alimentarius, we would like to support the Report of the Committee under paragraph 52, and also under paragraphs 54 and 55.

My last comment regards the evaluation of FAO policy assistance, and let me just say here that we support the statement under paragraph 67.

**Ackah Pierre ANGNIMAN (Côte d'Ivoire)**

Ma délégation appuie le rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du programme, tenue du 5 au 9 mai 2003, et voudrait aborder des questions découlant de ce rapport.

Je soutiens la déclaration du Nigéria et du Pakistan sur la nécessité de rechercher un équilibre dynamique entre les activités normatives et les activités opérationnelles qui devra, à mon avis, se traduire dans les affectations des ressources de la FAO.

En second lieu, je voudrais faire un commentaire sur le paragraphe 58, qui concerne l'évaluation du programme 2.2.2: Information en matière d'alimentation et d'agriculture. Il est reconnu dans ce paragraphe la nécessité de contribuer au renforcement des capacités nationales pour l'élaboration, en temps voulu, de données statistiques fiables et disponibles. Il est également reconnu la nécessité de dégager des ressources adéquates à l'appui des travaux statistiques de la FAO. Mon pays bénéficie de l'expertise de la FAO pour la reconstruction de son appareil de statistiques agricoles, avec un financement de l'Union européenne. Je tiens à remercier la FAO pour son expertise et l'Union européenne pour son concours financier.

Je me permets d'insister sur la nécessité de doter la FAO de ressources adéquates pour les statistiques agricoles. Beaucoup de nos pays en développement en ont énormément besoin.

**Worwate TAMRONGTANYALAK (Thailand)**

I will be very brief and precise on certain issues. In general, we welcome the constructive information in CL 124/14. Thailand has no objection to support the report of the Programme Committee at its Eighty-ninth Session. I thank the Chairman and the Members of the Committee.

My comment is on paragraph 19 related to paragraphs 50 to 57 on the " Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of Codex Alimentarius and other FAO and WHO Food Standards Work". My country is very pleased that resources from the Regular Programme will be allocated to this priority. I believe that the Codex Alimentarius Commission will seriously consider the comments in paragraphs 50 to 57.

**Jean Norbert DIRAMBA (Gabon)**

Nous remercions le Comité du programme pour le travail accompli et le rapport qui nous est soumis. Nous apprécions, avec le Comité du programme, les propositions faites dans le sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005 qui visent à donner suite aux grands événements internationaux, tout en respectant les orientations du Cadre stratégique et du Plan à moyen terme.

Nous notons avec préoccupation que la FAO, si nous ne lui donnons pas les moyens nécessaires, verra certains de ces domaines, hautement prioritaires, gravement affectés. Nous voudrions souligner notre attachement aux activités opérationnelles et aux activités de terrain telles que le PCT et le PSSA. Nous appuyons les activités prévues au titre de la lutte contre le VIH/SIDA, de façon interdisciplinaire. Nous nous félicitons aussi de la prise en compte d'autres maladies affectant les populations rurales comme le paludisme. Tout en reconnaissant l'importance d'un équilibre au sein des activités de la FAO, nous tenons à réaffirmer l'importance des activités de terrain dans les pays en développement, pour le renforcement des activités nationales, comme l'ont reconnu le Comité du programme et le Comité financier. Nous appuyons enfin les activités de la FAO visant à renforcer les capacités des pays en développement pour l'accès aux négociations commerciales et aux marchés internationaux, y compris dans la mise en place de la sécurité sanitaire.

**Antonio Arturo PLAZA JIMÉNEZ (Chile)**

Quisiéramos agradecer a la Secretaría por el informe y fundamentalmente apoyar la iniciativa del incremento del presupuesto IPPC y todo aquello que está vinculado con el Codex Alimentarius. Para nosotros esta materia es muy importante ya que la hemos venido respaldando durante mucho tiempo así como todo lo vinculado con la mejora de la parte del Codex Alimentarius haciendo más actividades vinculativas. Indudablemente nuestro país siempre va a estar dispuesto a apoyar y reforzar este tipo de actividades.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

I wish to lend to my support to the Report just like the other speakers have in the past. It gives us a clear picture of the issues that we are tackling. But, from the onset, I wish to associate myself with statements that have been made by some of my colleagues from the G-77 namely Iraq, Pakistan, Nigeria, Indonesia, Côte d'Ivoire and Gabon. I share the same views on the topics they have articulated.

I will make a few comments on the following. On the PAIAs, in paragraph 12, we endorse the idea of reviewing the work in course of its implementation. We do hope however that this will also give room for necessary adjustments if required, in the respective PAIAs. From our region, we have a few that are underway. We know the problems relative to HIV, to drought, and that there are some conflicts which have been covered under this, and we do hope that when the reviews are made, the necessary considerations are taken into account.

Paragraph 17 deals with priority setting. We feel that this should not be seen as a way of substituting programmes which seek to achieve the objective of tackling the root cause of poverty. Priority systems are already in place and we would like to imagine that perhaps the Committee should use these as the starting point, making improvements on the formula presently in use rather than embarking on a new programme altogether. Consequently, our suggestion is to use the existing programme as a benchmark. We feel that the Committee can increase its consultations with the region in order to improve the prioritization using the current model. As has been indicated by the Islamic Republic of Iran, many regions do have priorities but these are not seeing daylight in the programme.

We would like to make an appeal with regards to the fact that, when prioritization does not take into account the interest of the Member Nations or of the regions, it is directing resources away from those priority programmes that member states are looking to see implemented through FAO. In Africa, our priorities are the EMPRES programme, the SPFS programme, the TCP field operations and the Umbrella II. They tackle most of the causes of hunger that we have in our region and, as indicated in the report, the element of training in capacity-building touches the core of everything in our programmes.

The Chairman of the Programme Committee has admitted that, in many of the developing countries, this support is needed in preparing our statistics, and in preparing for our negotiations and we would appreciate capacity-building taken seriously in the programmes.

In most cases, we find that the subregions already have data, but implementation is the reason for which we are appealing to the Programme Committee, because we can't keep mounting data without implementing some of it. We have heard from the report of the Chair and, by all standards, the Committee is satisfied that the Secretariat is working hard to respond to the challenges arising from the review of the projects. This we hope should be used to make the thematic programmes forecast, so that they address the specific objectives they were set for.

On the issue of the Zero National Growth proposal, we feel that this will be very detrimental to the programmes that are tackling hunger. In some cases, when we looked at the budget, we found that the provisions being proposed are even lower than the current ones. This is not even taking into consideration what will be the effect of the escalation cost. So, we would like to appeal that this be given due consideration when we will be discussing the financing issue.

Concluding, we would like to associate ourselves with the sentiments that are outlined in paragraph 49 and paragraph 58. We wish to thank the Committee for the work they have put before us and we accept their recommendations.

**Mohamed Mahmoud El Hanan EL HASSAN (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)**

As you know, Sudan is a member of the Programme Committee, representing the Near East Group. Therefore, we accept what has been presented by Mr. Hankey. I would like to repeat what we have already said in the Programme Committee: that we have reservations in the reductions in the budget for some important programmes, for example, the Special Programme for Food Security and the country programmes EMPRES and other programmes that have seen some reductions in their budgets. We hope that the reservations will be taken into account because they refer to very important programmes which lie at the core of the activities undertaken by FAO.

So despite what I have said, I would like to say that we do accept and we do agree with the Report of the Programme Committee and I would like to thank Mr. Hankey, its Vice-Chairman. We hope that they will be doing such excellent work in the future.

**Percy Walhata MISIKA (Observer for Namibia)**

Namibia would like to add its voice to those that have spoken before us in thanking the Chairperson of this Committee for a well-prepared document. We find it very enlightening and also informative and we wish to contribute to the discussions on this document.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that FAO needs to strike a balance between financial prudence and the same time, respond to the multi-faceted, complex, urgent and divergent needs of Member Nations. This requires FAO to set priorities that we agree with. However, priority setting must be based on criteria that will ensure that FAO effectively fulfills its mandate in the global arena. Such a criteria needs to be determined in a transparent manner that is fair and just.

The priority setting itself is a process that is, on the one hand, political by nature but on the other, to some extent, technical. It is in this regard that we see the contributions of the technical committees of FAO and the Regional Conferences playing a role.

The process of Regional Conferences setting priorities ensures that the diverse and complex needs of FAO's membership are taken into account and should thus be respected. At the same time, the process of the technical committees deliberating on crucial issues and coming up with technical guidance on issues should take precedence. The fact that these issues should be considered by this Organization helps to ensure that this Institution handles them in a technical and professional manner and must be respected.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the request of this Institution for financial prudence must not blind us from the multi-faceted priorities bearing on this Organization by its very own Membership and hands, that need to ensure that these needs are adequately provided for. In this regard, Namibia fully supports and endorses the statements of Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Zimbabwe, Indonesia and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

**Blair HANKEY (Chairman, Programme Committee)**

The only issue I would like to comment on presently is that of priority-setting as we will come back to the Programme of Work and Budget this afternoon.

On priority setting, we have heard a lot of interesting comments. I believe there is a general opinion that the membership should be more actively involved in priority-setting and that the Organization would benefit from more focused priority-setting. There is a recognition that priority setting has to involve a "give and take" negotiation and this, I believe, is quite clear in our report. I do not know if this was agreed, but perhaps the Programme Committee is the most appropriate body for such a "give and take" negotiation to be conducted. Certainly, it has to be conducted in a relatively small group. You cannot conduct such a negotiation in Council or at the Conference.

The comment made by the colleague from Pakistan is true. In order for the Programme Committee to meaningfully engage in such a negotiation, it would require greater capacity simply, if in no other way, in terms of time, as now the Committee has two weeks a year to conduct its business. Given the other responsibilities of the Committee, at each Session roughly one day is devoted to the Programme of Work and Budget. This could perhaps be expanded to a day and a half. Such a negotiation obviously cannot be conducted in a day and a half, as it requires a lot of consultation between the Members of the Committee and regional groups. Negotiation cannot be done at once, it would have to be done in stages. To enable the Committee to engage meaningfully in negotiation, it would have to meet more often. As there are costs associated with the meeting of the Committee, one would have to see whether the Organization would see fit to appropriate the funds for this. I believe it is unrealistic to think that such a negotiation can be carried out in two meetings a year, devoting only a day and a half to the subject.

Presently due to time constraints, Members can only identify the items of high priority without identifying items of low priority; virtually every Programme has some constituency in the Organization. Members will not be prepared to sacrifice those interests without getting something in return. Consequently, it is a fact that we would have to give the Programme Committee more capacity, particularly in terms of time, for such a negotiation to take place.

Political will would also be required on the part of Members to give off things of value to them. It is not realistic to think that any member or group of Members, would prevail with their priorities over the interests and priorities of any other group of Members. I am aware that many delegations here call for maintaining an appropriate balance between the normative and operational work of the Organization. Personally, I am not speaking as the Chairman of the Committee or as a delegate from Canada, I believe this is certainly an accurate observation of the political realities of the Organization.

The OECD Development Assistance Committee now states that roughly just over 50 percent of the core budget of the Organization is considered, by donor countries, to be development work. This is an indicator that right now the balance between normative and development work is somewhat over 50 percent of the work of the Organization. My own observation would be that, to enter into such a negotiation, one would have to assume that the balance would be roughly maintained. I do not believe it would be realistic to think that this balance could be overturned, finding consensus in the Organization.

If there were to be a reordering of priorities, presumably some programmes of a development nature and some of a normative nature would have to be weakened or dropped in order to strengthen others. I believe that this is a political reality and, unless members were willing to undertake such a negotiation, it would not be very productive to start on it.

The current situation, which many delegations, including my own, see as politically undesirable, is so far due to the inability of the membership to establish procedures that allow it to engage in such a negotiation effectively. Presently priorities are set by the Secretariat by default. Although when I have said this to the Director-General, he replied: "Well really, in the current situation, we are not setting priority, we, the Secretariat, are basically surviving. We are keeping things going, but we also do not have the capacity to really reorder priorities".

If we are to engage in a more realistic priority setting arrangement, you would have to give somebody of this Organization, probably the Programme Committee, the resources to do it. You would have to, I think, have the political will to "give and take". That is, to say, to give up certain things that you value in order to strengthen others.

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

This has been a very interesting debate, particularly on the issue of priority-setting. As you know there is an internal process in place, but we believe it can be improved and one of the papers will be specifically looking at how we can do that, in particular, to make the judgements more comparable across the Organization. We will do further work on that.



We recognize that there is also a general feeling that the external process, in the sense of external from the Secretariat but among the Membership, needs to have some mechanism which allows greater participation of the Membership in the process. As you know, we do take guidance directly from the membership, through their statements in the reports and in the Verbatims of Conference and Council, to develop a view of the priorities for the institution. We then transfer those into the Programme of Work and Budget. However, one has to recognize that reports and Verbatims are not necessarily comprehensive. I can not remember who made the statement, but it is true that very rarely do Members come forward and say we should put more money into statistics despite the fact it is clearly the core work of the Organization and certainly not something that anyone would claim as having low priority. So, there is a difficulty in getting a comprehensive response from the Membership.

I think Japan made an interesting suggestion regarding consultation at regional level which was, I think, taken up by other members. When we developed the Strategic Framework, we did in fact issue a questionnaire to all Member Nations about priorities and tried to get a feeling of those areas where there is greater interest in the work of FAO and those areas where there is lesser interest. I think it was a useful process but one has to be very careful with it. For example, it depends on which Ministry receives the questionnaire— "Agriculture" does not tend to favour forestry projects very much if there is a separate Ministry for Forestry.

How much understanding is there of the words used in the questionnaire, where there is a limited amount of space to describe something? What is understood by the person who reads it and what is the authority of the person who replies? Is it being replied to by the Minister or is it being replied to by a clerk? One must be very careful with its interpretation and then finally, of course, a great deal of time is needed to carry out such surveys. I think the comprehensive report on that survey took about seven months, which may be something we need to consider.

A comment was made that we should build on existing mechanisms. I think that this is also the view of the Programme Committee. It did not welcome some of the more radical suggestions which were put up, including sophisticated scoring mechanisms. It wanted instead to explore more the idea of participation of the membership and, I think, that is what we will be concentrating on.

On the substantive priorities concerning the budget itself, I know we will cover these this afternoon, but I note the strong endorsement of the expression of priorities by the Programme Committees and the Technical Committees. I think it was the delegate of Japan who felt that the Programme Committee had not done a wonderful job in identifying priorities but I have to say that this report was quite useful to the Secretariat in the sense that it was very clear what the priorities were and what the limits were about where we could take the money from. I mean, for example, you made it clear that you did not want us to diminish Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry or Programme 2.2 Food and Agriculture Policy and Development and, therefore, gave us an effective guidance about what we should be doing. We will be applying this guidance in the full Programme of Work and Budget.

Of course, there was little or no specific agreement about reductions, so that remains the problem. I think the only reduction which was agreed was the one for the food chain approach, but that was about US\$100 000 versus the Technical Committee requirements of about US\$70 million - so you can see we've got a long way to go to find the balance between those two.

So we will now address the Council's request on those priorities as well as we can, perhaps dealing with some of the one-time resource requirements, through the use of arrears in accordance with that Resolution and I hope we will be able to respond well to your requests.

One other area in which there were quite a lot of comments, both in support of TCP and, by the US, concerning increasing the resources for TCP, if we have difficulty in delivering. This, of course, has been a problem but I would like to reassure the Membership that considerable progress has been made there. In one of the reports you will be looking at later this morning you will see that delivery for the first year of the biennium was the highest it has ever been. I can

report that the delivery to date, in the current year 2003, has risen by 25 percent over the previous year. We believe we have solved this problem, although we will have to persist with it over some time to correct the under-deliveries of the past. I think that is all I have to reply to. If there are any questions which I missed, I would be happy to answer them.

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Merci M. Hankey et M. Wade pour les éclaircissements.

### **15. Report of the 102nd and 103rd Sessions of the Finance Committee (Rome, 5-9 May and 19-20 May 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)**

### **15. Rapport de la cent deuxième et cent troisième session du Comité financier (Rome, 5-9 mai et 19-20 mai 2003) (CL 124/16 ; CL 124/20 )**

### **15. Informe del 102º y 103º períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, 5-9 de mayo y 19-20 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)**

*15.1 Status of Contributions and Arrears (CL 124/LIM/1)*

*15.1 Situation en ce qui concerne les contributions et les arriérés (CL 124/LIM/1)*

*15.1 Estado de las cuotas y de los atrasos (CL 124/LIM/1)*

*15.2 Budgetary Performance 2002*

*15.2 Exécution du budget 2002*

*15.2 Ejecución del presupuesto de 2002*

*15.3 Split Assessments*

*15.3 Système de recouvrement des contributions fondé sur l'utilisation de deux monnaies*

*15.3 Asignación de cuotas en dos monedas*

*15.4 Scale of Contributions 2004-2005*

*15.4 Barème des contributions 2004-2005*

*15.4 Escala de cuotas para 2004-2005*

*15.5 Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographic Distribution  
(CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)*

*15.5 Représentation géographique équitable (CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)*

*15.5 Metodología para la determinación de una distribución geográfica equitativa  
(CL 124/15; CL 124/15-Add.1)*

*15.6 Other Matters Arising out of the Report*

*15.6 Autres questions découlant du rapport*

*15.6 Otras cuestiones planteadas en el informe*

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Nous en avons donc fini avec le point 14 de notre Ordre du jour et nous allons maintenant passer au point 15: Rapports des cent deuxième et cent troisième sessions du Comité financier qui se sont tenues à Rome respectivement du 5 au 9 mai 2003 et du 19 au 20 mai 2003.

Ces rapports figurent aux documents CL 124/16 et CL 124/20. J'aimerais souligner que les questions qui requièrent l'attention du Conseil sont présentées dans le tableau qui se trouve au début du rapport de la cent deuxième session du Comité. Le point 15 de l'ordre du jour comporte six sous-points qui sont les suivants:

- le sous-point 15.1 est intitulé: "Situation en ce qui concerne les contributions et les arriérés". Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/LIM/1.

- le sous-point 15.2 concerne l'exécution du budget 2002;

- le sous-point 15.3 a trait au système de recouvrement des contributions fondé sur l'utilisation des deux monnaies;

- le sous-point 15.4 concerne le barème des contributions 2004 et 2005;
- le sous-point 15.5 est intitulé: Représentation géographique équitable. Les documents pertinents portent la référence CL 124/15 et CL 124/15-Add.1;
- enfin, le sous-point 15.6 porte sur les autres questions découlant du rapport.

Permettez-moi d'introduire certains de ces sous-points avant de laisser la parole au Président du Comité financier et au Directeur du Bureau du programme, du budget et de l'évaluation.

Le sous-point 15.1 sur la situation des contributions et des arriérés est illustré par le document CL 124/LIM/1. Ce document a été préparé par le Secrétariat et présenté au Conseil pour information afin de mettre à jour les informations fournies dans le rapport de la cent deuxième session du Comité financier. Au 23 juin 2003, l'Organisation a reçu plus de 102 millions de dollars au titre des contributions de l'année 2003, ce qui représente 31,59 pour cent des contributions dues pour l'année et est inférieur aux contributions reçues ces cinq dernières années à la même époque de l'année. Ainsi, 99 États Membres, soit 54 pour cent des Membres de l'Organisation n'ont pas encore versé leurs contributions pour l'année 2003 et 74 États présentent encore des arriérés de contributions pour 2002 et les années précédentes. Le montant des arriérés de 45 États est tel qu'il ne leur permettrait pas de participer au scrutin de la prochaine session de la Conférence, conformément à l'article 3.4 de l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation.

En ce qui concerne le point 15.4 de l'Ordre du jour, relatif au barème des contributions 2004-2005, j'attire votre attention sur les paragraphes 78 à 82 du Rapport de la cent deuxième session du Comité financier qui figurent au document CL 124/16. Le projet de barème se trouve à l'annexe 2 de ce document. Comme par le passé, le barème proposé dérive directement du barème des quotes-parts des Nations Unies en vigueur en 2003. Le Conseil est appelé à formuler des recommandations à la Conférence et je vous prie de noter qu'un projet de résolution se trouve au paragraphe 78 du rapport du Comité financier. J'aimerais également attirer votre attention sur la demande effectuée par le Gouvernement argentin d'obtenir une réduction de sa contribution au budget de la FAO pour 2003.

Monsieur Molina Reyes, Président du Comité financier va introduire le point 15 et ses différents sous-points.

Monsieur Mehboob, Sous-Directeur général chargé du Département de l'administration et des finances et Monsieur Wade, Directeur du Bureau du programme, du budget et de l'évaluation vont également présenter le point 15 et ses sous-points. Comme précédemment, je demande à Monsieur Molina Reyes, à Monsieur Mehboob et à Monsieur Wade de ne pas introduire le sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005 qui sera examiné au point 12 de notre ordre du jour cet après-midi.

**Humberto E. MOLINA REYES (Presidente, Comité de Finanzas)**

Me complace presentar los informes de los dos períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas que se han celebrado hasta la fecha en el presente año. Dichos informes se presentaban al Consejo en los documentos CL 124/16 y CL 124/20.

En nuestro 102º Período de Sesiones celebrado en mayo, el Comité eligió por unanimidad al señor Anthony Beattie, representante del Reino Unido, como Vicepresidente para este año.

Es de señalar que nuestro 103º período de sesiones se convocó con carácter extraordinario para examinar exclusivamente cuestiones relativas al Programa Mundial de Alimentos. Nuestro informe sobre el particular se ha sometido al examen de la Junta Ejecutiva del Programa Mundial de Alimentos. El programa de nuestro período ordinario de sesiones incluía una amplia gama de cuestiones presupuestarias, financieras y administrativas que hacían referencia y afectaban a la organización. El Comité también examinó cuestiones de supervisión, incluido el informe anual del Inspector General, el informe de la Dependencia Común de Inspección (DCI) de las Naciones Unidas sobre la administración y gestión de la FAO. Como es habitual, en dicho período de sesiones también se incluyó una reunión conjunta con el Comité del Programa que ya he

informado a ustedes. En la presente introducción desearía destacar algunos aspectos sustantivos para el Consejo y que requieren la acción de medidas por parte de éste.

Respecto al estado de las cuentas y los atrasos: el Comité observó que a raíz de la recepción del pago de atrasos del principal contribuyente en 2002, la situación de liquidez de la Organización había mejorado considerablemente. También habían aumentado los saldos tanto del Fondo de Operaciones como de la Cuenta Especial de Reserva y, en esta última, se reflejaban las variaciones monetarias netas favorables registradas durante el bienio en curso. La recepción de atrasos originó un excedente neto en el año 2002 que redujo el déficit del Fondo General, pero dicho déficit se mantuvo y se acrecentaría al continuar la amortización del pasivo sin financiar correspondiente a la asistencia médica después del cese en el servicio. Varios otros factores influirían en dicho déficit en el curso del bienio, entre ellos los ingresos o las pérdidas netos derivados de las inversiones y todos los gastos efectivos realizados en el marco de la utilización autorizada de los atrasos.

Lamentablemente, el importe de las cuotas recaudadas antes del 2 de mayo de 2003 fue inferior al que se recibió durante el mismo período en 2002 y, en general, los atrasos continuaron minando la salud financiera de la Organización.

Las deliberaciones pormenorizadas del Comité sobre la situación financiera de la Organización se consignan con el documento CL 124/16, párrafos 14-17. Además ya el Presidente Independiente del Consejo ha entregado a usted una actualización sobre el estado actual de las cuotas y atrasos.

En cuanto a la ejecución del presupuesto para el 2002, de conformidad con el artículo 4.6 del Reglamento Financiero, el Comité examinó el 36º Informe Anual del Director General sobre la ejecución del presupuesto y las transferencias en el programa y el presupuesto, sobre la base de las cuentas por comprobar para 2002. Dicho informe se adjunta como Anexo I al documento CL 124/16.

El Comité examinó la escala probable de transferencias entre capítulos presupuestarios y las explicaciones detalladas presentadas por la Secretaría. Observó que la solicitud oficial de transferencias se presentaría en el período de sesiones de septiembre de 2003 del Comité de Finanzas.

El Comité reconoció que la principal variación con respecto al presupuesto se refería al déficit previsto, en los ingresos en concepto de gastos de apoyo. El Comité instó a la Secretaría a que preparase un plan adecuado para el riesgo de reducción de los ingresos.

El Comité tomó nota de los resultados presupuestarios globales del Programa Ordinario para 2002 y refrendó el informe para su transmisión a este Consejo.

Las consideraciones del Comité se exponen en forma detallada en el documento CL 124/16, párrafos 5-11.

Cuotas en dos monedas. Se recordó al Comité las ventajas e inconvenientes del método vigente para reducir al mínimo los riesgos relacionados con los tipos de cambio durante el bienio y entre bienios. El Comité también examinó las consecuencias de la fijación de las cuotas en dos monedas para la presentación del presupuesto y otros aspectos prácticos de dicho método.

El Comité reconoció que se habían realizado progresos importantes a este respecto. La mayor parte de los Miembros coincidieron ampliamente en que el sistema de cuotas en dos monedas representaba una vía eficaz para proteger al PLP de las fluctuaciones de los tipos de cambio. No obstante, se manifestó la opinión de que el método de fijación de las cuotas en dos monedas era gravoso para los Miembros y carecía de transparencia.

El Comité consideró que necesitaba más tiempo para evaluar plenamente las repercusiones de este método y consultar a los gobiernos respectivos. El Comité pidió a la Secretaría que preparase una metodología adicional que protegiera al PLP frente a las fluctuaciones de los tipos de cambio durante el bienio, pero que no ocultara a los Estados Miembros la información sobre los efectos de las fluctuaciones de los tipos de cambio entre los bienios.

El Comité convino en la importancia de alcanzar una posición consensuada, para su transmisión al Consejo, y que se esforzaría para alcanzar este consenso en los debates de su período de sesiones de septiembre.

El Comité dedicó un tiempo considerable a este tema y sus consideraciones se exponen de forma detallada en el documento CL 124/16, párrafos 69-77.

Escala de cuotas para 2004-2005. El Comité examinó y aceptó la escala de cuotas propuesta para el bienio 2004-2005 que figura en el Anexo II del documento CL 124/16 y ratificó el proyecto de resolución del párrafo 78 para que se transmitiera al Consejo y a la Conferencia.

Asimismo el Comité examinó una petición del Gobierno de Argentina de que se redujera su contribución para el año civil del 2003, de manera semejante a una reducción análoga aprobada por la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas. El Comité observó que sólo la Conferencia de la FAO estaba autorizada para adoptar las decisiones sobre las cuotas que deben pagarse a la Organización.

El Comité reconoció que el efecto de una aprobada reducción de la cuota de Argentina para 2003 en las Naciones Unidas se compensaba con los ajustes necesarios que se habían hecho para admitir a los nuevos miembros de las Naciones Unidas. En el caso de la FAO, sería necesario distribuir la reducción para Argentina en 2003 entre los miembros de la FAO con carácter retroactivo y a prorrata.

Algunos miembros señalaron que otras opciones eran quizás posibles en esta situación, como por ejemplo aplazar los pagos de Argentina, lo cual constituía quizás una opción más sencilla que solicitar un ajuste de las cuotas. El Comité decidió tomar nota de estos asuntos para información del Consejo.

Metodología para la determinación de la distribución geográfica equitativa. El Comité de Finanzas recordó que el Consejo había decidido que debía revisarse la fórmula vigente. El Comité tomó nota de las opciones presentadas, pero convino en que no podía formular una recomendación en esta fase. Pidió a la Secretaría que prosiguiera el estudio de la cuestión, incluyendo la clarificación de la metodología utilizada por las Naciones Unidas y el resultado de las deliberaciones de la Asamblea Mundial de la Salud sobre dicha cuestión.

El Comité pidió a la Secretaría que presentara una propuesta revisada para su próxima sesión en el mes de septiembre, en la que indicara tanto las ventajas como los inconvenientes de cada opción. El informe también debería contener un cuadro que mostrara las repercusiones de cada opción sobre la representación de todos los Estados Miembros.

El Comité informó al Consejo de que se debería realizar otro examen de las opciones relativas a la metodología antes de presentar una recomendación al Consejo.

Es necesario señalar que la Secretaría, con mucha eficiencia, ha presentado a este Consejo un documento Addendum, que es el CL 124/15-Add.1, al documento principal al cual me refiero, en el que se abordan las cuestiones planteadas por el Comité de Finanzas.

Otras cuestiones planteadas en el informe. Informe de la Dependencia Común de Inspección de las Naciones Unidas: Gastos de apoyo a las actividades extrapresupuestarias de las Organizaciones del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas. El Comité de Finanzas señaló que el informe había sido fruto de amplias consultas con Organizaciones del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas y que la FAO había participado activamente en dicho proceso. Los miembros de la Junta de Coordinación de los Jefes Ejecutivos del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas habían aceptado generalmente las conclusiones y recomendaciones; por su parte, la FAO había refrendado 10 de las 12 recomendaciones y estaba de acuerdo con las líneas maestras de las otras dos.

Con respecto a una recomendación sobre la cual la FAO había expresado una reserva, el Comité acogió con satisfacción la garantía de la FAO de que solamente deberían aceptarse recursos extrapresupuestarios compatibles con las políticas, objetivos y actividades de la Organización.

El Comité refrendó el informe y las observaciones del Director General al respecto para que se transmitieran a este Consejo.

Informe de la Dependencia Común de Inspección de las Naciones Unidas: Examen de la gestión y administración en la FAO. El Comité de Finanzas examinó las seis recomendaciones relativas a asuntos de su competencia y que yo se las había anticipado a ustedes cuando les informé sobre la Sesión Conjunta.

El Comité observó que una recomendación se refería a la presupuestación de capital y que se abordaría cuando examinara este tema en el presente y los futuros períodos de sesiones del Comité.

Cuatro recomendaciones se referían a diversos aspectos de la gestión de los recursos humanos, entre los que figuraban la selección de representantes de la FAO, una propuesta de establecimiento de un grupo de acción en materia de gestión de recursos humanos, el proceso de contratación de personal y la mejora del equilibrio entre géneros. El Comité, sobre este particular, pidió a la Secretaría que incluyera un análisis de dichas cuestiones entre los temas relativos a la gestión de los recursos humanos para examinarlo en el período de sesiones de septiembre de 2003.

El Comité pidió que se elaborase para su siguiente período de sesiones un documento amplio sobre las ventajas e inconvenientes de la recomendación de limitar el mandato del Auditor Externo.

El Comité de Finanzas estuvo de acuerdo en que el informe de la DCI contenía recomendaciones valiosas para mejorar la gestión y la administración de la FAO.

Presupuestación de capital. El Comité de Finanzas examinó una propuesta relativa al establecimiento de un mecanismo que permitiera a la Organización mejorar las actividades que entrañaban gastos de capital. El Comité tomó nota del mecanismo de financiación propuesto y de los procedimientos que lo acompañaban.

Sin embargo, el Comité no estaba en condiciones de ratificar las modalidades exactas del mecanismo tal como se habían propuesto. Pidió a la Secretaría que elaborase propuestas revisadas, teniendo en cuenta sus observaciones.

Modelos innovadores para incrementar los efectos de los recursos en apoyo al Programa de Campo. El Comité examinó dos propuestas separadas relativas a la ejecución nacional de proyectos de asistencia técnica: las modificaciones propuestas al Artículo 6.7 del Reglamento Financiero, y las nuevas disposiciones para garantizar la auditoria de los proyectos del Banco Mundial.

Todos los miembros recibieron con satisfacción y ratificaron la propuesta relativa a la ejecución nacional. El Comité ratificó la propuesta de enmienda del Artículo 6.7 del Reglamento Financiero e indicó que sería examinada por el Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos y presentada al Consejo, a fin de que la transmitiera a la Conferencia para su aprobación.

El Comité también tomó nota de la propuesta relativa al régimen de auditoria aplicado en el marco de los proyectos financiados por el Banco Mundial. El Auditor Externo señaló que dicha propuesta suponía un trabajo adicional y que se necesitarían más detalles. El Comité acordó que se prosiguieran los debates sobre este tema entre el Auditor Externo, la Secretaría y el Banco, y convino en que se facilitaría al Comité una nota informativa sobre los resultados de tales consultas.

Nueva política de la FAO sobre seguridad en los países. El Comité examinó la nueva política de la FAO sobre seguridad en los países recientemente promulgada por el Director General. Asimismo, tomó nota del marco del Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas para la rendición de cuentas sobre el sistema de gestión de la seguridad, que se señalaba a la atención de los órganos rectores de la FAO a petición de la Asamblea General. Se informó al Comité de que las repercusiones financieras de esta nueva política se reflejarían en el PLP.

En conclusión, en términos generales puedo decir que los períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas fueron muy fructíferos y, en particular, considero que fue posible abordar una serie de importantes cuestiones financieras y presupuestarias a las que se enfrenta la Organización. En nombre de los Miembros del Comité de Finanzas, desearía expresar nuestro aprecio a la Secretaría por la asistencia prestada a nuestras deliberaciones y también el agradecimiento a los Estados Miembros de la FAO por brindarnos la oportunidad de contribuir a la importante labor de esta Organización.

Perdóneme si he sido muy largo en la presentación de este informe pero son tantas las materias que están incorporadas en él que no podía ser más breve. Quedo a disposición de ustedes para proporcionarles cualquier otra explicación que deseen al respecto.

**Khalid MEHBOOB (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department)**

I do not have anything to add other than the fact that the Committee has requested further documentation on several issues for its consultation in September and that these documents are under preparation and will be submitted to the Committee at the September Session.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

Quisiera manifestar nuestro aprecio y reconocimiento al trabajo del Sr. Molina Reyes y de los integrantes del Comité de Finanzas.

En una reunión del GRULAC previa a este Consejo, se evidenció que los representantes no habíamos tenido acceso al 36º Informe anual del Director General sobre la Ejecución del Presupuesto al que se refiere el párrafo 5 del documento CL 124/16. Quizás sería útil que este texto fuera repartido a los miembros del Consejo antes del período de sesiones o también analizar la conveniencia de que la Secretaría organizara en el futuro sesiones informativas para todos los Estados, con el fin de conocer directamente la forma en que se realiza el gasto en la Organización. Ambas opciones, desde luego, sin perjuicio de las labores y de las responsabilidades del Comité de Finanzas.

En el párrafo 35 se indica que el Comité de Finanzas tomó nota del nombre y de los antecedentes profesionales del candidato elegido para ser nombrado por el Director General como Inspector General. Me preguntaba si el Consejo puede conocer ese nombre y antecedentes personales. Sería útil, también, que el informe fuera más claro sobre este aspecto.

Mi delegación no tiene inconveniente en la creación de un fondo especial para actividades de emergencia y rehabilitación. Si bien el objetivo es que se alcance una cifra de dos millones de dólares al finalizar el 2003, me preguntaba si podría informar la Secretaría el monto actual de dicho fondo. La segunda pregunta: ¿qué diferencia existe entre este fondo para las actividades de emergencia y las que ya realiza -con muchos más recursos- el PMA?

En relación con la posibilidad de establecer un sistema de pago de cuotas en dos monedas, mi delegación, en principio, no tiene inconveniente en su adopción. Sin embargo, aún se requiere contar con cálculos precisos y claros de los gastos que deban ser cubiertos con una u otra moneda. Una eventual adopción del sistema no debe crear nuevos cargos de gastos y pago de personal adicionales por parte de la FAO. En consecuencia y, dado que se requieren mayores explicaciones, sería conveniente atender la sugerencia que hace el Comité de Finanzas en su párrafo 76. Es decir, el Comité pide que la Secretaría prepare un nuevo documento que sea analizado por el mismo en septiembre próximo.

Mi delegación ha examinado y acepta la escala de cuotas propuesta para el bienio 2004-2005. En relación con la petición sobre Argentina, mi delegación hace un llamado a la solidaridad internacional; la posibilidad de explorar en el reglamento financiero de la Organización la utilización de recursos para cubrir el déficit del país mencionado, en calidad de reembolso futuro.

Por otra parte, mi delegación es de la opinión de que debe respetarse escrupulosamente el principio de distribución geográfica equitativa en la creación de una metodología para la

contratación de nacionales de los Estados Miembros. Principio que debe observarse en todas las áreas de la Organización.

Con el propósito de contar con más y mejores elementos, México apoya la recomendación del Comité de Finanzas señalada en el párrafo 92, es decir que la propuesta revisada muestre también las repercusiones de cada opción sobre la representación que corresponde a todos los Estados Miembros y sea analizada por el Comité en septiembre próximo. No fue posible enviar a mis autoridades, en esta ocasión, el *Adendum* 1 del CL 124/15 ya que ha sido distribuido recientemente. Reconocemos y agradecemos el esfuerzo de la Secretaría para proporcionarnos este documento.

**Ms Heidi PIHLATIE (Finland)**

We would like to ask that the floor be given to Greece to speak on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. We are grateful to the Finance Committee for its lucid and informative report; we endorse this and have the following comments. These comments do not cover the Summary Programme of Work and Budget on which we will be making a separate statement.

We note with satisfaction that the Organization's liquidity position has significantly improved following the receipt of arrears from the major contributor. We are however concerned with the statement in paragraph 15 that, I quote: "Arrears continue to undermine the financial health of the Organization" unquote. As in previous years, we asked Member States, whose assessed contributions are in arrears, to take urgent action to pay what they owe. It is also a source of concern to us that the deficit of the general fund, though less than previously, will increase again during the biennium as a result of the amortization of unfunded after service medical care liabilities. We believe that these liabilities should be properly funded as they have been in IFAD and WFP. We therefore support, in principle, the proposal noted in paragraph 66 of the Finance Committee Report, but funds should be regularly set aside for this proposed starting in the 2004-05 biennium. We note that the Finance Committee has asked for further work to be done on this subject and we look forward to the Committee's recommendations following its Session in September.

We are following closely the Committee's monitoring of oversight issues. It is against the background of the External Auditors' Report for the 2000-01 biennium, which made extensive criticism of the internal control regime in FAO. We are glad to see that an Audit Committee has been established with two external members. We note with interest that the External Auditors planned a programme of work and we support the proposal that the results of value for money audits be reported to the Finance Committee as they are completed, rather than be held back for inclusion in the long-term report of the biennium's accounts.

As we have made clear previously, we attach great importance to issues of human resources' policy and management in FAO. We are therefore pleased that the Finance Committee has given more attention to this subject in the last few years, we await with keen interest the Report of the Committee on its consideration on human resource matters in September. We note that its review will include the recommendations on the subject made by the Joint Inspection Unit in its Report on Management and Administration in FAO. We support the introduction of capital budgeting in FAO, this will enable the Organization to plan, manage and account for investment extending beyond a biennium in a more effective and transparent way. We note that further work is being done on the modalities of a capital budgeting scheme and we trust that the Finance Committee will be able to agree on a recommendation to be proposed to the Council at its September Session, but will allow such a scheme to be endorsed in the 2004-05 biennium.

The question of FAO's functional currency, that is the currency in which the Organization maintains its accounts, was brought under review in 2002. The conclusion then, though not



formally ratified, was that there were no grounds at that stage for changing the functional currency. Since then a great deal of detailed work on the currency pattern of income and expenditure has been done in connection with the proposals and for introducing split assessment. Could the Secretariat please tell us what the implications of that further work for the functional currency are, and how they would propose to keep the matter under review?

We have read with interest the comments of the Finance Committee on the proposal to introduce split assessments. It is clear that split assessments are a workable option for FAO and they need to be seriously considered. Basing the contributions, payable to FAO, on two currencies will not, as it may seem at first glance, double the exchange rate risk for non-Euro and non-dollar currencies. In fact, the opposite is true as a weak US dollar means that the Euro is relatively strong and vice versa. Split assessment would compensate the effects of a strong currency against the weakness of the other. Thus, split assessment would actually reduce the exchange rate risk to which most Members are exposed, within as well as between biennia. Correspondingly, the budget's exposure to the exchange rate risk would be limited in a similar way. Adjustments between biennia will therefore be rather reduced. We look forward to further work on this issue as noted in paragraph 76 of the Finance Committee Report.

Finally, we suggest a draft resolution on the scale of contribution 2004-05 set out in paragraph 78 of the Finance Committee Report.

**Antonio Arturo PLAZA JIMÉNEZ (Chile)**

Seré muy breve, tres temas solamente. Primero: quisiéramos apoyar lo manifestado por México relativo a que la Secretaría y el Comité de Finanzas traten de buscar alternativas con respecto a la situación de Argentina. Indudablemente y como todos sabemos, y no ponemos en duda, Argentina está en una situación bastante particular en la cual se necesita reevaluar cuáles son los indicadores que se le están aplicando para el pago de su cuota. Creemos que es importante en términos de justicia, en términos técnicos, que se haga una revaluación económica como corresponda de tal manera que le permita pagar la cuota que a ella se le deba asignar.

El segundo tema, también planteado por la Representación de México, está vinculado con la representación geográfica. Estamos de acuerdo con lo dicho por la Secretaría y pedimos que se sigan haciendo los análisis y las revisiones del documento, de tal manera que la representación en la Organización, sea equitativa profesional y geográficamente.

Por último quisiéramos felicitar a lo manifestado en el documento CL 124/16 punto 6, en el cual se habla sobre el avance y la ejecución del presupuesto y donde nos manifiesta que en el presupuesto 2002-2003 a la fecha, se ha ido ejecutando un gasto de aproximadamente 50.1 por ciento. Esperamos que la ejecución total del presupuesto siga y al final del período sean llevados a cabo todos los programas que han sido establecidos, para evitar el problema que aparentemente existió en el presupuesto anterior, donde en el informe 2000-2001 quedaron sin cumplirse programas por un monto aproximado de 20 millones de dólares. Recientemente tuvimos la oportunidad de tener una reunión con el Director General, en el contexto del grupo del GRULAC, en la cual se nos manifestó que este tipo de desviaciones pueden ocurrir debido a problemas, a veces, de estimaciones no adecuadas y donde los proyectos no son ejecutados debido a ello. De ser así, nos interesaría que la Secretaría hiciera hincapié en las estimaciones ya que creemos que una Organización de esta naturaleza con el nivel técnico que tiene, con los datos históricos en su poder, podrá perfectamente ajustar sus cálculos para evitar que algunos proyectos no sean ejecutados ya que nos afectan a todos.

**Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)**

We endorse the conclusions of the Finance Committee, but I wanted to speak on a couple of points that I would like to highlight.

The first has to do with the proposal for a split currency assessment. We actually do not support the Secretariat's proposal for a split currency assessment. We believe it presents a major challenge for Member Nations, and it is not clear to us that the benefits outweigh the costs. We believe,

concerning the methodology by which a split currency assessment would be applied, that Member Nations still need to be able to look at each item's impact on the budget on an individual basis. This includes exchange rate fluctuations, salaries, cost increases and programme increases. We do not believe that we should have a special waiver for exchange rate fluctuations, which is essentially what the split currency assessment proposal is.

We would note that FAO already has other mechanisms for addressing exchange rate fluctuations. It has utilized these in the past with great success; these include forward purchases of currency and a Special Reserve Account. The proposal shifts the burden of exchange rate fluctuations to Member Nations and it is not cost free. There are administrative costs associated with the proposal, we would like more information on these costs and would like to understand how these costs would be financed.

Let me turn to a couple of other items. On the question of geographical distribution, I must say that I am a little surprised to see this as a full blown agenda item here before Council, since it was my understanding that the Finance Committee, being unable to have a full discussion of this item, had actually requested that discussion be postponed until after our September Finance Committee had had a chance to really review it in depth. Therefore, we had assumed that it was premature to have a full discussion of it in Council. That being said, since it is being presented as an item for discussion and possibly decision in Council, we feel that any system of geographic representation is only viable if an effort is made by the Secretariat to actually enforce that system. We would have to see in place some kind of system that ensures, for example, that under-represented countries be given a fair shot at posts. This could include, for example, not accepting applications from over-represented countries; adding special points in the short-list to countries that are under-represented. There are a whole host of measures that could be implemented and we would have to see these and we would have to feel confident that they had been agreed to and would be implemented before looking at any proposal to change the system of equitable geographical distribution.

I would also just like to raise a note on the question of the Scale of Assessments and underscore that we support the Finance Committee's decision which is to adopt the scale of assessments as proposed without any special compensation for countries suffering from adverse economic conditions. We believe that there are existing mechanisms, which countries can and do take advantage of in those situations, and that the proposal which would affect us, that which asks other countries to take up the burden, presents difficulties.

**Ms Rahma MSHANGAMA (Tanzania, United Republic of)**

Tanzania has examined the Report before us and has noted various comments and recommendations made by the Committee on the proposed Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, with particular attention to cost increases, a motivation of accrued liability for after service medical care and risk assessment, as presented in paragraph 66 of the document.

Recognizing that investment income, which has been used to partially fund the accrued liability for after service medical care in the past, was not likely to be sufficient to eliminate the future liability as expressed in paragraph 64, the United Republic of Tanzania invites other Members of this Council to approve the inclusion of the biennium estimate of US\$14.1million in the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005.

We have also noted that there is a general agreement that the approved Programme of Work should be protected to the maximum extent possible from the effect of exchange fluctuation. However, noting that in the past contributions were all made in one currency, that is US dollars, then protection was also for one currency. With the introduction of the Euro in FAO expenditure, the protection of the work programme in the traditional way becomes more expensive, as presented in paragraph 74.

Our delegation has not yet decided on the proposed mechanism to protect the Programme of Work and Budget by split assessment in Members' contributions. If this is the best protection alternative, the Tanzania Delegation is ready to support it.

It also supports the Draft Resolution concerning the Scale of Contributions for 2004-2005. We have not yet the needs to establish an item on capital budgeting. We look forward to additional information on how this addition could be implemented.

**TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The Chinese delegation has carefully studied the report of the Finance Committee. We would especially like to thank the Secretariat for having prepared the two documents, namely CL 124/15 and CL 124/15-Add.1.

With regard to the equitable distribution of FAO posts, this is a matter to which all Member Nations attach great importance and it will have important implications on the effective implementation of conduct of FAO's future work. We should seek a better scenario which will allow all countries to be represented in FAO, so that all countries can be equally or fairly represented in the FAO Secretariat.

We are very pleased to see that FAO, in accordance with recommendations of the Council and the Finance Committee, came up with three scenarios or three options and these three scenarios have their merits and demerits. However, they reflect the representation of Member Nations in FAO staff based on different factors.

We believe option two has taken into account various factors. That is, it takes into account Membership, population and the year Assessed Contributions; such option has already been discussed in the United Nations and has already been adopted by the United Nations.

There are some components within this option that can be revised, or can be optimized, and I now have some questions to ask the Secretariat for clarification. One is concerned with the statistics or data within this document. In paragraph 20, the last bullet for instance, the phrase, "but not less than 2.0 posts up and down", it is not quite clear. According to my understanding, there are 1,362 posts to be divided by 183 Members, times 40 percent, which gives a figure of 2.98.

In order to ensure that each country can be represented in FAO, they should at least have one staff member, so that the formula may be three minus two so that, once again, each country could have one staff member. I do not understand the figure 7.4 posts. What does it refer to?

If a Member Nations should have 10.4 posts, that is within a reasonable extent, that is 7.4 plus 3. I think that among the three options, each option should give the final figure so as to help us compare all the different options.

I still have another proposal; that is, in order to fully reflect every country represented within the FAO Secretariat, FAO should not only have such a formula, but should also have a principle and, more importantly, should have concrete measures and adopt actions in order to encourage the under-represented Member Nations to fill the posts within the FAO Secretariat.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous allons devoir lever la séance parce qu'il est pratiquement une heure et nous reprendrons la séance cet après-midi. Mais avant de suspendre la séance, je voudrais vous dire que le Secrétariat vient de m'informer qu'il est proposé que Monsieur Samuel Cherunge Yegon du Kenya, soit élu Président du Comité de rédaction. Y-a-t-il des objections? Non. Il en est donc ainsi décidé.

Madame Gardner voudrait faire une brève annonce au sujet du Comité de rédaction.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

Today, at one o'clock in the Mexico Room, there will be a briefing for the Members of the Drafting Committee. Briefing for the Members of the Drafting Committee at one o'clock in the Mexico Room, which is in Room D-211.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Avant de vous quitter, je vous informe que la séance de cet après-midi sera présidée par Monsieur l'Ambassadeur de la République islamique d'Iran.

*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 Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>FOURTH PLENARY MEETING QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE CUARTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>24 June 2003</b>

The Fourth Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.55 hours  
Mr Mohammed Saied Noori-Naeini,  
Vice Chairman of the Council, presiding

La quatrième séance plénière est ouverte à 14 h 55  
sous la présidence de M. Mohammed Saied Noori-Naeini,  
Vice-président du Conseil

Se abre la cuarta sesión plenaria a las 14.55 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Mohammed Saied Noori-Naeini,  
Vicepresidente del Consejo

## CHAIRMAN

I have the honour to Chair this meeting this afternoon.

We are continuing with the Report of the Hundred and second and Hundred and third Sessions of the Finance Committee. We will continue our debate where we left off this morning, and the first speaker on my list is Cameroun.

**15. Report of the 102nd and 103rd Sessions of the Finance Committee  
(Rome, 5-9 May and 19-20 May 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)**

**15. Rapport de la cent deuxième et cent troisième session du Comité financier  
(Rome, 5-9 mai et 19-20 mai 2003) (CL 124/16 ; CL 124/20 )**

**15. Informe del 102º y 103º períodos de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas  
(Roma, 5-9 de mayo y 19-20 de mayo de 2003) (CL 124/16; CL 124/20)**

**Abdoulaye ABOUBAKARY (Cameroun)**

Ma délégation a pris connaissance du rapport de la cent deuxième session du Comité financier et l'approuve dans sa globalité. Je félicite le Comité financier pour le travail accompli pendant la cent deuxième session. Je voudrais cependant revenir sur deux points précis: le système de recouvrement des contributions fondé sur l'utilisation des deux monnaies et la méthodologie proposée pour assurer une représentation géographique équitable.

S'agissant du premier point, nous devons considérer favorablement cette option car depuis deux ans, le contexte dans lequel opère la FAO en matière de programmation et d'exécution budgétaire est totalement différent. Nous devons regarder la réalité en face et prendre la décision tout de suite pour ne pas pénaliser la FAO et l'entraîner dans un cercle vicieux de déficit budgétaire dû uniquement au phénomène du taux de change. Ma délégation admet qu'il est nécessaire de mettre en place le système proposé de recouvrement de contributions fondé sur l'utilisation des deux monnaies. Cela tient également aux facilités qui seraient reconnues aux États comme le Cameroun qui, appartenant à la Zone franc, auraient ainsi la latitude de verser leurs contributions dans les deux monnaies.

Pour ce qui est du deuxième point, nous félicitons le Secrétariat de nous présenter la situation actuelle et de faire des propositions pour changer le système actuel. Nous y souscrivons totalement et convions le Secrétariat à s'y atteler ardemment.

**Michael CONSTANTINIDES (Cyprus)**

The delegation of Cyprus, speaking on behalf of the countries acceding to the European Community and represented at this session of the Council, namely Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, wish to associate themselves with the statement presented by Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

Speaking now on behalf of my delegation only, I would first like to express my appreciation and my congratulations to the Chairman and the members of the Finance Committee, as well as the Secretariat, for the documents before us.

The financial position of the Organization, especially its liquidity position, has significantly improved in the year 2002, thanks to the receipt of arrears from the Major Contributor. We welcome this receipt of arrears and we hope that all Members will make every possible effort to fulfil their obligations to the Organization.

Looking at the receipts of current assessments, the situation is not satisfactory. As it is noted in paragraph 15 of the Report, contributions received until 2 May 2003 were lower than those received during the same period of 2002, and in general continued to undermine the financial health of the Organization. The situation does not seem to have improved since 2 May, as indicated in document CL 124/LIM/1 covering receipts up to 23 June 2003.

There is no attempt in the Report to explain this drop in the receipt of contributions. My question is whether either the Secretariat or the Finance Committee considers this drop to be, in any way, connected with the suspension of the Incentive Scheme for Prompt Payment of Contributions. We understand that Assessed Contributions are obligations to Member Nations which have to be met, but delays in fulfilling these obligations by any Member creates an additional burden on the Organization.

Knowing the fragile financial situation of the Organization, due to the problem of arrears and the payment of current assessments, we believe that the introduction of a penalty to unjustifiable arrears from Members cannot be excluded.

With regard to split assessments, we note that the majority of members of the Committee share the view that this methodology represents an effective way forward to protect the Programme of Work and Budget from exchange rate fluctuations. We believe that this methodology will be beneficial both for the Organization and for many members.

We hope that the Secretariat will prepare the requested Report to enable the Finance Committee to elaborate the matter further and transmit this issue to the future session of the Council for decision.

Finally, my delegation is in agreement with the proposed scale of contributions for the biennium 2004-2005 and endorses the relevant resolutions.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

I will confine my comments essentially to Item 15.5, Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographic Distribution.

India endorses the position long-established in the UN System, and advocated in the Agenda paper, that, subject to the paramount considerations of technical and professional competence and probity, inter-country distribution of personnel should be reflective of the wide variety of the global system.

We find it disconcerting, however, that despite advocacy of composite criteria of distribution of posts by the UN General Assembly as far back as in 1962, wherein financial contribution was but one of the many constituents of distribution of posts, FAO has a dispensation wherein the financial clout of Members is virtually the sole determinant of *inter se* distribution. Leaving aside the iniquitous nature of this dispensation, it also needs to be ascertained through empirical methods if this arrangement has proved commensurate with the overarching system of concern for technical and professional excellence.

We are of the view that Option 1, which seeks to continue the *status quo*, with certain modifications in the weighing of grades and posts, would not make any material change in the present situation and should therefore be rejected outright.

As for Option 2, we wish to record that it seeks to bring in an arrangement which is already in place in organizations like WHO and UNIDO. Also noting that WHO is in the process of further revising this method to bridge the gap which evidently still exists between the developing and the developed countries in that Organization.

Having made this point, we strongly endorse that a weightage to population is an indispensable tool to achieving a degree of variety in representation.

We strongly feel that the proposed weightage to financial contribution at 55 percent is unconscionably high and injurious to consideration of equity and professional excellence.

With specific reference to our own country, we cannot help placing on record our deep concern at the steady erosion of Indian personnel, particularly at the senior level in FAO. Without going into detail, it will suffice to mention that from 88 Indians at the Professional level in 1988, the number has declined to 8 at present. This is reflective of the iniquitous working of the current criteria, which completely overlooks our achievements and competency in the field of agriculture

research, development and management. India, with its 110 million working farmers, a large body of trained scientific manpower and experience in transforming a subsistence agriculture into a science-based, vibrant, production system, ensuring food security at home and generating surpluses for exports, deserves greater participation in the global dispensation.

We support the position implicitly taken in the Agenda paper that regional considerations in apportioning top posts can be addressed through qualitative approaches instead of introducing straight-jacketed methodologies solely dependent on the financial might of FAO Members.

We agree with the Finance Committee that the Secretariat be requested to study the matter further in light of methodologies adopted in other UN Agencies, achieving the outcome of the World Health Assembly Resolution. If necessary, a working group could be established to assist the process, leading to a recommendation at the next Session of the Council and to decision at the Conference in November.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

First of all I would like to comment on the Report that has been submitted to us and I wish to make a contribution on two issues.

One refers to the split assessments. This is a major departure from what we have been using, and naturally when we move into a new system we need to take stock of all the implications so that we do not move from one into another in a way that will be detrimental to our operations.

I think it will be good if all the pros and cons are weighed up for all of us to fully appreciate, particularly, the elements of exchange rates which were mentioned earlier on by one of the delegations. We need to know how all of these things are going to be handled. It is good to look ahead and to respond to realities of the situation. Be that as it may, we should try to study the matter closely and move ahead only when we know that we have taken care of all the eventualities. Otherwise, if everything is assessed rightly and the Member Nations find this is a justifiable proposal, my delegation will have no difficulty in going along with it, but as things stand, we do feel that we need to do all the necessary homework in order to move forward with all clarity.

The second area I wish to contribute to is that of representation. We think it is fair to talk about representation. The Council has already talked about this in the past and we see that the Secretariat has made some proposals, which they have tabled for our consideration.

Looking at a glance, my delegation would say that Option 2 would be worth considering, but, again, these are new proposals that we are talking about. Maybe they need to be explained to the Member Nations in some briefings, so that we are aware of some of the systems that we are trying to change to. It is not good just to say that we are going for better representation, without clearly evaluating the system we are going into. This is a system we are operating and we would like to maintain the efficiency of our system. So I do agree with the idea of revisiting geographical representation, but as I say, let us look at it closely and work on the draft document that the Secretariat has now drawn to our attention, in order to come up with something that would be more responsive to our needs.

**Koji YONETANI (Japan)**

I would like to make comments on three of the sub-items under this Item 15: firstly, on Split Assessments; secondly, on Scale of Contributions; and thirdly, on Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographic Distribution.

Firstly, concerning the Split Assessments, we still feel the need for further examination of all the implications brought about by their introduction. So, we would like to see the requested inputs from the Secretariat to be presented to the next Session of the Finance Committee.

Secondly, I will touch upon the Scale of Contributions. First of all, I would like to have technical clarification on the Scale of Contributions proposed in the Annex of the Report of the Finance Committee. In fact, in the Draft Resolution of the Conference, it is stated that "the FAO scale of



contribution for 2004-05 should be derived directly from the United Nations Scale of Assessments in force during 2003".

However, the Scale of Contributions annexed is derived from the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 55/5B of 20 December 2002, and not from the General Assembly Resolution 57/4B, which made an amendment to the Scale of Contributions to be applied in the United Nations for the year 2003.

I fully appreciate the explanation given in paragraph 81 of the Report of the Committee, that a reduction in 2003 for Argentina would need to be distributed to the Membership on pro-rata basis retroactively, so that would not be feasible. But as to the Scale of Contributions for 2004-2005, it would not be a retroactive revision of the Scale of Contributions. If the basic principle that we have been adopting in the past is to apply to the latest available Scale of Contributions to be applied in the United Nations, it seems to me that it would be rather the scale adopted in the General Assembly Resolution 57/4B, rather than 55/4B.

I would appreciate some clarification being given on that point. After that technical clarification it is my duty to state that in this Session of the Council, the delegation of Japan is not in a position to endorse the proposed Scale of Contributions for 2004-2005, because given the financial impact expected from the proposed Summary Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium, because the Assessed Contributions require that the Members pay for the next biennium will be increased substantially in both of the proposed scenarios, either that of Real Growth or that of Zero Real Growth. Given that financial impact of the substantial increase of assessed contributions, my delegation needs to put their reservations on the adoption of the Scale of Contributions for the same biennium.

Lastly, let me state our position relating to the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographic Distribution. My delegation highly appreciates and congratulates the FAO Secretariat for its preparation of the excellent documents CL 124/15 and CL 124/15-Add.1, which provide us with useful information for further consideration of this important issue.

On behalf of the Japanese delegation, I would like to strongly urge the Finance Committee to further energetically pursue considerations on this matter, and arrive at a conclusion as soon as possible.

Among the three options elaborated by the Secretariat, Japan supports Option 2 for the following reasons:

Firstly, the Government of Japan believes that the uniformity in regulations and systems within the UN System is important, and in this regard it supports the idea of introducing the three factors, namely, Membership, population and the Assessed Contributions, all of which have been already adopted by the UN and most of the UN Agencies.

Secondly, introducing the grade weighting system is reasonable and appropriate. Although there is no apparent basis for the relative growth of each grade level, in reality higher-grade posts naturally have a stronger influence on policy-making than lower posts, and therefore some differentiation system should be introduced. My delegation also understands that the grade weighting system has been adopted in other UN Agencies, and this system could be incorporated in the FAO System, from the viewpoint of uniformity in the UN System. Having said that, let me point out two other important aspects which have to be positively rectified for securing fair and equitable geographical distribution.

a) In the case in which the current System or the proposed Option 1, instead of Option 2, will be preferred by many Members of the Organization, my delegation strongly proposes, and argues for, the amendment of the System used for measuring desirability ranges. The current measuring system is stipulated in paragraph 15 of the document CL 124/15. In this system, desirability ranges of Member Nations are fixed in accordance with their Assessed Contributions and all the Member Nations are classified into three categories. My delegation supports the introduction of

such classifications, so that Member Nations with small Assessed Contributions can send staff to FAO and thus avoiding staff from countries with a large amount of contribution to be dominant.

However, my delegation believes that the current classification is quite inappropriate. The current System has three categories in accordance with the Assessed Contributions rate, namely, first category – 10 percent or less, second category – over 10 percent, but less than 20 percent, and third category – over 20 percent. In this framework, only Japan is classified in the second category and under the third category only the United States of America is classified. This means that only Japan and the United States of America are separated while the other 182 countries stand on the same footing. Therefore, in order to make the System more balanced and fair, my delegation strongly suggests the amendment of the system, if we decide to maintain the current system or to adopt Option 1. In this regard, it might be worth considering having two categories with the dividing line of 1 percent Assessed Contribution rate, instead of the current unrealistic three categories classified with the 10 percent and 20 percent borders.

b) I wish to recall the debates held at the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the Council on the same issue of unfair regional distribution. Many Members from the Asia Group pointed out the least distribution of staff in the Asia Region and requested a solution for this unfair regional distribution. The Asia Region has the largest population in the world, and the Region provides the second largest Assessed Contributions to FAO. However, the rate of the number of staff from the Asia Region against its contribution is the smallest. Therefore, my delegation would like to request the Secretariat to prepare and submit the necessary information and analysis which could contribute to further and meaningful discussion of the issue by the Governing Bodies, in order to actively and vigorously rectify the situation.

**Paul MURPHY (Canada)**

I will make only a short statement on the issue of Split Assessments. Canada strongly supports the work of FAO. Thus, we are open to the Secretariat's proposal for Split Assessments to protect the Organization against adverse currency fluctuations. We see the proposal, also, as a means to avoid calls for substantial budget increases or recourse to internal or external borrowing. At the same time, we would like the Secretariat to provide an assessment of the cost of administering such a system for the consideration of the Finance Committee in September, in order to have a full appreciation of the relative costs and benefits of a Split Assessment approach.

**Mrs Josephine GICHUHI (Kenya)**

My delegation wishes to thank the Chairman and the members of the Finance Committee for the high quality of the documents. My delegation has reviewed the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, and we support it. However, we would like to mention that programmes that support the poor, the hungry and the malnourished, that is, programmes like the Special Programme for Food Security, the Technical Cooperation Programme and the Programme for South to South Cooperation should be given high priority and additional resources should be allocated to these programmes. My delegation, therefore, supports the Real Growth Scenario as proposed.

On the issue of the Split Assessments, my delegation would support a scenario which cushions FAO against exchange fluctuations with minimum losses. If the Split Assessment is felt to be the best option, my delegation would have no problem in supporting the proposal. I, therefore, support the position taken by the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

**Worwate TAMRONGTANYALAK (Thailand)**

First of all, let me express my appreciation for the work of the Finance Committee, particularly that of the Chairman of the Finance Committee. My delegation would like to comment on three issues.

Firstly, Thailand asked some members to request the Secretariat to prepare a Zero Nominal Growth scenario as practised in previous years.

Secondly, the issue of Split Assessments is suggested by the Secretariat because of the fluctuation in exchange rates. My concern is that if this suggestion is applied by the Members, it should not create a burden for them. The Secretariat may consider preparing a paper on the implications of Split Assessments to members of both developed and developing countries.

Thirdly, I refer to the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution.

Thailand is convinced that this issue must be dealt with seriously. My delegation has considered the three options as suggested in document CL 124/5. We understand that the Secretariat would rewrite the proposal which would indicate the advantages and disadvantages of each option by September 2003. My country will comment when we have studied the paper.

I wish you to recall that at the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the FAO Council my delegation put forward the concern on the barrier to Thai citizens to work at the FAO Regional Office in Asia and Pacific under the equitable geographical distribution. Since then, my Government has not received any explanation. In this connection, I would therefore once again request an explanation of this issue. I am certain that the barrier to Thai citizens to work in the Regional Offices is not practised by other UN Organizations. I refer particularly to the international recruitment of professional staff, not supporting staff. My Government urges the Secretariat to make a survey on the application of this rule.

My last point is on the proposed Scale of Contributions 2004-2005. My delegation would like to put on record that Thailand also is facing the difficulty to comply with this Scale, namely 0.29565 percent for the next biennium.

**Segfredo R. SERRANO (Philippines)**

We would like to thank and commend the Finance Committee for the excellent work in the documents. We would like to confine our comments to two points.

One is on Split Assessments. While we recognize that this could be one resourceful and innovative way of solving some of the financial problems of the Organization, the Philippines remains to be convinced about the propriety of this particular proposal. We therefore urge the Committee to do further work on this particular proposal. In particular, the Philippines would like to see if there would be further mutual benefits rather than increased costs to the Organization as well as to the members, particularly to the developing country Members.

On the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution, we would not add much to what has been said in some of the earlier interventions. We would associate ourselves with those that support Option 2. In particular, we are grateful to our distinguished colleague from Japan for his intervention on this particular point. We feel that Option 2, if particularly further refined, would make FAO not only a truly participative Organization, within the United Nations organization, but also it would be more efficient in serving its clientele rather than just catering the bureaucratic interests of its main contributors.

**Mooneshwar RAMTHOHUL (Mauritius)**

The Mauritian delegation would like to join its fellow delegates in the support of the Report of the Finance Committee. Regarding the Scale of Contributions, we fully support the proposed Scale for 2004-2005 as suggested by the Finance Committee in the document.

It is a bit premature for us to comment on the issue of Split Assessments right now as we understand that the Secretariat has been entrusted to prepare an additional methodology for discussion during the next session of the Council. I am sure, in light of additional information, that the right decision will be made.

So far as the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution is concerned, it would be appropriate, as suggested, that the Secretariat prepare a paper on the impact of various scenarios for a decision by the Council in September 2003.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Observador de Argentina)**

En primer lugar le saludo por verle presidir esta reunión. En segundo lugar nuestro aprecio por el trabajo realizado por los miembros del Comité de Finanzas y en especial a su Presidente.

Nos permitimos intervenir en relación a lo contenido en los párrafos 79-82 del informe, que se refieren específicamente a una petición argentina.

Asimismo agradecemos las expresiones de solidaridad por los Representantes de Chile y México sobre la delicada coyuntura de nuestro país y los efectos que tiene en sus obligaciones para con todo el sistema de Naciones Unidas. Tal vez muchos lo sepan y otros lo desconozcan, pero quisiera dejar reflejado que en la situación actual los indicadores de nuestro país han cambiado. El año pasado se registró una caída del producto interno de más del 16 por ciento y el efecto combinado de los indicadores de pobreza e indigencia alcanzan alrededor del 60 por ciento de la población argentina. Obviamente es necesario a nuestro juicio comparar lo que es una situación presente y las metodologías de adopción de indicadores para determinar una contribución. Ciertamente y todos ustedes aquí saben que los indicadores por los cuales se compone una contribución muchas veces no corresponden a las situaciones presentes. Quizás nadie en su sano juicio podría pensar que hoy mi país es la 15<sup>a</sup> potencia del mundo, pues en los listados de contribuciones a la Organización, Argentina figura como el 15<sup>a</sup> contribuyente. Insisto, eso tiene mucho que ver con la horquilla y los rangos y los indicadores que se utilizan para implementar una contribución. Debo decir también que hay un tema remanido en esta Organización, pero tal vez en algún momento tengamos que ver con mayor nivel de detalle y es el desacople temporal que existe entre las decisiones que adopta soberanamente la Conferencia y las decisiones que adopta la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas. Normalmente la cuota de FAO se fija con anterioridad a las decisiones de la Asamblea General.

Debo recordar asimismo que la Asamblea General, en su momento adoptó una serie de elementos para fijar sus últimas contribuciones, alguno de estos elementos todavía se encuentran pendientes de proceso y podrían dar lugar a algún tipo de efecto derivado de las contribuciones de los Miembros, tanto de Naciones Unidas como eventualmente de otras agencias hermanas del sistema. Como bien dice el informe del Comité de Finanzas no todas las resoluciones de Naciones Unidas tienen un efecto directo sobre FAO, pero la evidencia histórica muestra que hay algunas resoluciones de Naciones Unidas que sí han tenido un efecto directo en FAO y eso remite obviamente a la voluntad política respecto a la solidaridad y respecto a los equilibrios que hay en otras agencias.

Nuestra delegación continuará trabajando en un mejoramiento de la propuesta que originalmente se hizo a la FAO, aportaremos más y precisa información para aportar a los canales institucionales de la Organización, Comité de Finanzas y seguramente el próximo Consejo. Asimismo aportaremos información sobre cómo han reaccionado otras agencias del sistema ante una petición similar que efectuó nuestro país y que insisto, está vinculada no a su deseo de no pagar sino a un ejercicio de comprensión por parte de todos los Estados Miembros de la FAO, de que hay situaciones que se modifican sustantivamente y no podemos trasladar los indicadores de hace siete años y extrapolarlos al próximo bienio. Nuestro país considera que con todo respeto tiene el derecho de hacer la petición y buscar una fórmula que pueda resultar satisfactoria para nuestra aspiración y que no genere ningún tipo de efecto financiero contrario ni a la Organización ni a sus Estados Miembros. Recordamos que es y será necesario establecer un diálogo más constructivo, de tal modo que la composición de los índices se ajuste mucho más a la realidad de los países.

**Kim EUNG-BON (Korea, Republic of)**

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation to the Secretariat for their excellent work. I would like to mention that it is very meaningful to have an opportunity in this document to review agenda item 15.5 on the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution. My delegation would like to take this chance to make comments on a couple of points.

Firstly, regarding paragraph 15, a System of Desirable Ranges,.Currently FAO decides about each country's equitable geographical distribution after evaluating the representation percentage and the contribution percentage. I think the scope of the Assessed Contribution to determine the Desirable Range is not reasonable. The Assessed Contribution is classified into three categories. However, as mentioned by the Japanese and the Chinese delegates, there are only two countries included in the second and third categories, one for each. This means that the rest of the Members are all included in the first category, 10 percent or less. My delegation thinks that the existing scope of Assessed Contribution categories needs to be revised and I strongly support the Japanese position regarding this point.

In addition, I would like to mention that Option 1 and Option 2, which were suggested in Chapter 4 of this Report, are not desirable to apply as they are.

Secondly, regarding the number of posts in Chapter 3, "Considerations for a Revised Methodology". From the objective point of view, there is no direct relation between the number of posts and the methodology of the equitable geographical distribution. Yet, if we include staff in the Programme of Work and Budget, it may stabilize the determination of equitable geographical distribution.

Nevertheless, I would like to point out that an increase in the number of posts does not mean the improvement of the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution.

Thirdly, regarding Option 2 of Chapter 4, the latter half of the sentence in the last bullet of paragraph 29 is hard to understand. I think it is better to use real examples when explaining such an important point. I would also like to request the Secretariat to explain the reference for not less than 2.4 posts up and down as well as not less than 7.4 posts that were specially identified in this Report.

Fourth, I agree that FAO's opinion on the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution is more objective and reasonable than that of the existing one. However, as my delegation pointed out before, revising the System of Desirable Ranges in paragraph 15 must be carried out first. Then, I would ask the Secretariat to report more advanced objectives and understandable methodologies to the next Council by benchmarking the geographical distribution methodologies of the UN General Assembly and WHO mentioned in Chapter 4 on Recent Development.

Lastly, there is also a need for establishing the methodology of determining equitable geographical distribution regarding employment. The strong will of FAO to improve the current under-represented problem, especially in the case of the Asia Group, which includes the Republic of Korea, is very important.

**Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

I want to congratulate the Committee for reducing an otherwise complex subject into a reader-friendly document.

There are three issues that I want to comment on. One is the issue of split Assessment. I have read quite a number of documents in the last few days on this subject. As the Report itself indicates, the Committee intends to follow-up on this.

I would like to associate myself with the statement made by Kenya which endorsed, as I understand, the statement made by the Africa Group. I also want to endorse the statement made by Canada. We are totally in support of anything that can be done to minimize the question of FAO having to borrow on account of the fluctuation in exchange rates. Therefore, any procedure that comes up that would have a very minimum impact on the Membership will be welcome. My delegation, therefore, fully endorses the proposal with the rider that we are waiting for a fuller write-up in September. I would only plead with the Committee that in September they should also go a little further to tell us how the scheme will be administered.

With the respect to the overall level of the budget, this is a subject that I have listened to for the last two, three years that I have been here. We have come some way because it was Zero Nominal before; now, I think, we are operating at Zero Real. Logically we would expect that whatever were the reasons for introducing those strict measures in 1994, almost a decade ago, must have been by now taken care of. One would, therefore, wish to place before this distinguished audience the view of my Government that we will fully support a Real Growth budget - not a Real Zero - a Real Growth. If the documents that I have been able to read have not mislead me, and they have no reason to, the 5.5 percent the review suggested is far below the 8 percent that was envisaged, as I understand, in the biennium. They also take cognisance of the concerns of the Members in a proactive manner. We have no reason not to support that proposal and therefore want to submit that position to the distinguished audience.

Finally, on the scale of contribution, all I need to say here is that the Nigerian Government fully endorses the proposal in the document.

#### **Kwaku Owusu BAAH (Ghana)**

My delegation wishes to add his voice to what other delegates have already said by commending the Chairperson and his team, the Finance Committee, on the good job done regarding the documents CL 124/15 and 124/16.

Our first point concerns the issue of the Methodology for the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution. We take note of the equations on pages 6 and 7 of the document CL 124/15 and we are amazed at how the equations changes significantly, when issues like Membership and population are also considered along side contribution. We realized that by applying the Option 2, you had members who are now equitably represented moving from a position of 31.7 percent in the first to 71 percent. We find this quite significant. We also realize that with the adoption of Option 2 you have data showing under-representation moving from position of about 12.6 percent to 8.2 percent in the Option 1. This is a significant change and we think this enhances the equitable nature of FAO.

We strongly feel that an international body like FAO must stand for equity and in that regard we think that the Option 2 is a better formula for determining the equity issue, than the other options. We therefore wish to associate ourselves with delegates from other countries that have actually come out clearly in support of Option 2.

Our second point concerns an issue raised by the delegate from the United Republic of Tanzania. We support that delegate completely. I am referring to the plea made by the delegate to make more resources available for the SPFS and TCP, considering the Report from the work and budget rather than facing some budget cuts. Maybe we need to put more resources in to SPFS and TCP.

Yesterday, we discussed how critical food security issues are to FAO, as an international body, and to its Member Nations. It is when we make resources available for programmes like the SPFS and the TCP that we make the necessary impact in many countries. This is one of the major ways in which we can fight food insecurity across the world as a body.

Our third and final point is related to the concerns raised by Thailand. Specifically, the delegate mentioned implementing Regional Offices and made an appeal that FAO should consider, as much as possible, employing local people as Professionals in Regional Offices. We think there is some wisdom in this proposal, and we urge the Organization to consider it, look at it critically, analyse it and see the possibilities of such a proposal for the future.

#### **Natigor SIAGIAN (Indonesia)**

Let me express my position first to the Finance Committee and then to the Secretariat for the document presented to us CL 124/16 and CL 124/15, especially CL 124/15-Add.1. We appreciate the efforts of the Committee on Finance to present us the possibility of having a more effective work organization in the sector of agriculture. However, my delegation still needs to see the further impact of all of these proposals. I especially refer to paragraph 62 under the document

CL 124/16 on the possibility of the Real Growth or the Zero Real Growth for the next budget of FAO.

I would like to put on record my support to the statement of the Philippines. In addition, we would like to very briefly express our view on Split Assessments. We feel that we need more clarification from the Committee and I hope by the Committee session of September 2003 we will have more explanations and information on this matter. We would also like to refer to paragraph 76 as to what the Committee has expressed to us.

With regard to the Scale of Contributions, I see paragraph 82 of this document and I think this is also one of the reasons we should give consideration to this matter.

On the Methodology on the Determination of Equitable Geographical Distribution, my delegation followed with great attention the statement of the delegation of Japan. On this issue, we hope that the Committee can provide more information on the impact of these three options to the Member Countries in its next session. We consider this is a very important issue. We also feel that equitable distribution of FAO staff in Asia is an important issue.

I would also like to request your consideration on the statement of my neighbouring country Thailand with regard to the FAO Regionale Office in Thailand.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

We would like to briefly mention two issues: Split Assessments and Equitable Geographical Distribution.

With regard to Split Assessments, Australia believes changes to protect FAO from the effects of fluctuating exchange rates is potentially an important financial management reform, and we are therefore at this stage favourably disposed towards the proposal. We would also say that we agree, however, with the conclusions of the Finance Committee on this matter, that the proposal needs to be further considered before being submitted to the Council, so that we can more fully understand its implications.

In relation to Equitable Geographical Distribution, we would simply wish to support the Finance Committee's conclusions that a revised proposal be submitted for further review before being put to Council, as we are not yet in a position to make decisions on this issue.

**Anthony BEATTIE (United Kingdom)**

Since you have now reached the end of your original list of speakers, I wondered if I could ask you to give the floor to Greece, speaking again on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and its 15 Member States, with regard to the request that the Government of Argentina should be exempted from its Assessed contribution to the FAO budget for the calendar year 2003. We wish to express our full sympathy with the current problems that the economy of Argentina is undergoing. However, we are very much concerned not only by the additional burden that such redistribution would involve, not only for the Membership of the Organization but also for the precedent that such a proposal would create. FAO has well established machinery for dealing with the delayed payment of Assessed Contributions from Members facing temporary economic difficulties. As we said in our earlier statement on this agenda item, we support the Scale of Contributions recommended by the Finance Committee in Paragraph 78 of this Report.

**Percy Walhata MISIKA (Observer for Namibia)**

Namibia is open to the idea of Split Assessments, where the guide needs to be an innovative suggestion, most particularly so if this approach will effectively cushion FAO from losses due to currency fluctuations. Might I also add that it is our hope that the benefit of this approach will not

be absorbed by the administrative costs, for if it does so the fact that there will be little, if no value at all from such an approach is clear.

On the issue of the Scale of Contributions, Namibia has consistently been paying its Assessed Contribution to FAO and will continue to do so as long as it can afford to. While supporting the current proposed Scale of Contributions, we would like to mention that, being a developing country faced with numerous pressing needs that compete for the same meagre fiscal cake, perpetual biennial increases of the Assessed Contributions should be avoided at all costs. Of course, if one looks at the proposed increment for Namibia it seems to be very little and very meagre. However, for a country like Namibia, where we are being faced with numerous problems that are indeed pressing and that require the attention of the Government, every penny is valuable and therefore means a lot to our nation.

On the issue of the representation status, Namibia is unfortunate to be one of the countries that fall in the category of those not represented. We have been so since independence. At one stage for a period of two years we were represented and now we are not represented once again. This is despite the fact that we pay our Assessed Contributions, though they are meagre to this institution, timely. We can only hope that there will be a System that will address the not represented category.

From my own assessment of the proposals that are in the revised documents CL 124/15-Add.1, it seems that all the three options that are being put there failed to address the issues of not-represented Members. In fact they all keep that figure at 26. None of them seems to reduce that number. It is our hope that, as the Secretariat and the Finance Committee address this issue, they will also look at reducing that number. As they have been proposing to reduce the number of those that are over-represented and those that are under-represented, we feel that we also need to be looked at as a group that also needs to be represented in this institution.

**Ariel FERNÁNDEZ (Observador de Argentina)**

Seré breve y solicito las disculpas del caso por tener que intervenir como observador una segunda vez.

Simplemente a modo de clarificación, Argentina no está solicitando estar exente de su obligación total del 2003, está solicitando la adaptación de una regla similar adoptada por la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas que le eximía parcialmente del pago de su cuota total. Se redujo el porcentaje de contribución en un determinado rango. Insisto, Argentina no está solicitando la exención total de su cuota para 2003.

Esto es a efectos de clarificar la propuesta de nuestro país y como firmamos en nuestra declaración original, no estamos buscando una carga adicional para ninguno de los Estados Miembros de esta Organización. Estamos solamente tratando de buscar una fórmula que de ningún modo afecte la situación de cuotas.

**Mrs Stefania MARCONE (International Cooperative Alliance)**

The International Cooperative Alliance would like to express its concern on the proposed cuts to the 2004-2005 budgets for the major programme, in particular, those that will negatively impact the work of the Rural Development Division with cooperatives and farmer organizations. These proposed cuts will lead to the end of specific technical expertise in cooperatives by the end of 2004 due to the freezing, if not cancellation, of professional posts in the cooperatives and farmers' organization group that would otherwise require to be filled in 2004.

ICA, as the representative organization of the cooperatives serving over 660 million individuals through its 230 member organizations in over 90 countries, is concerned that FAO, an organization that has effectively reiterated its commitment to reduce poverty and hunger and building links with the civil society, will reduce its capacity to work with farmers' organizations and cooperatives. This is even more worrying since Member Nation have reiterated their conviction that cooperatives are a means for people around the world to fight poverty and hunger,



create and maintain decent employment especially in rural areas, and enable civil society organizations to prosper to enable people to help themselves.

This support has been expressed with policy documents and official statements issued in such fora as the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, the World Bank, the European Community, the Pan African Conference and, most recently, the Mercosur Presidential Summit, not to mention the specific reference found in FAO's own World Food Summit Plan of Action. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that Brazil will launch an ambitious programme to combat hunger through cooperative development on July 4 of this year, on the occasion of the International Day of Cooperatives.

May I take this opportunity to remind the distinguished delegates here today of the significant continuing contribution of cooperatives in building economic and social development around the world. Agricultural cooperatives are primary actors in many economies responsible for food production and processing, creating and maintaining rural employment and income, and making rural development a reality in many countries of the world.

The United Nations estimated in 1994 that the livelihood of nearly three billion people or half of the world's population was made secure by cooperative enterprises. Nearly 800 million individuals are members of cooperatives today, compared with about 184 million in 1960. They account for an estimated 100 million jobs around the world, more than that of multinational enterprises, and are economically significant in a large number of countries providing foodstuffs, housing, financial- and a wide variety of consumer services.

The macroeconomic significance of cooperatives may be seen by the market shares they hold. In Burkina Faso agricultural cooperatives are the largest producers of fruit and vegetables for the national market and in Côte d'Ivoire they are responsible for 77 percent of cotton production. Cooperatives in Kenya cut across all sectors of the economy including finance, agriculture, livestock, manufacturing and distribution of trade.

In Uruguay cooperatives produce 90 percent of national milk production and export 70 percent of the surplus wheat production. In the United States, in 1998, 33 percent of the agricultural market was comprised of cooperatives, and rural electricity cooperatives operate more than half of the electrical lines providing power to more than 25 million people in 46 countries.

We understand that FAO is in the difficult position that it requires prioritization of how to use its limited resources. However, the ICA urges Member Nations to find alternate proposals that will enable FAO to retain a specific technical focus on cooperatives and farmers' organizations. We note, in particular, FAO's long-standing assistance to many Member Nations in the area of capacity building and assistance to cooperatives in restructuring and enhancing the entrepreneurial skills to increase incomes, engaging in dialogue with decision-makers on policy, including that related to food production and food security. Without an FAO focal point much of the work currently undertaken will no longer be completed. We note, in particular, that FAO's expertise in promoting rural peoples' organization participation in support of World Bank financed process and community driven development initiatives, as well as FAO's participation in the inter-agency coordinating body, the COPAC, will be seriously compromised.

Finally, may I take this opportunity to reiterate ICA's continued support to FAO and ICA's commitment to ensure cooperation between FAO and ICA, as stated in the Memorandum of Understanding signed with FAO in 1999. We hope that the cooperative movement and FAO can work together to address poverty eradication and hunger and find effective solutions.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you distinguished representative of ICA. This brings me to the end of the speakers list. Since I do not see any other requests for the floor, I thank you ladies and gentlemen for your very rich contributions to the debate and I would like to see if Mr Reyes, Mr Mehboob or Mr Wade would like to respond to any of the questions and points which have been raised.

**Humberto E. MOLINA REYES (Presidente, Comité de Finanzas)**

Quisiera más que responder a algunas preguntas, rescatar las coincidencias que han existido en las distintas intervenciones de los distinguidos representantes de este Consejo. Para tener claridad en la instrucción al Comité de Finanzas y poder seguir avanzando en el estudio de varias iniciativas que ustedes han analizado en el día de hoy, me refiero por ejemplo al seguimiento del Informe del DCI, que precisamente vamos a continuar estudiando de acuerdo a las orientaciones que hemos recibido por parte de ustedes. Otro punto que considero importante es destacar, a pesar que lo veremos más tarde bajo el tema 12, la cuestión del pasivo acumulado por la asistencia médica al personal después del cese del servicio. Como ustedes saben existe una responsabilidad jurídica por parte de la Organización por este pasivo y ciertamente es necesario abordarlo, son 14,1 millones que deben ser incorporados a cada bienio, de modo tal de dar cumplimiento a esta situación. Vamos a conversar más detalladamente bajo el tema 12 sobre este punto.

Con respeto a la posibilidad de aplicar las contribuciones en dos monedas, creo que el sentir mayoritario es que efectivamente el Comité de Finanzas puede seguir trabajando en esta materia para presentar un estudio más detallado con una propuesta firme en la próxima sesión del Consejo.

En cuanto al estudio de la Distribución Geográfica Más Equitativa, el Comité de Finanzas abordará este tema de acuerdo a las orientaciones que ustedes han dado y también intentaremos entregar una propuesta que de alguna forma el Comité de Finanzas pueda encontrar más equilibrada y satisfaga en mejor medida las aspiraciones de los distintos Estados Miembros.

Hay un aspecto que se planteó con respeto a la Reducción de las Contribuciones de los Estados Miembros, es el que si éstas se deben más bien a la falta de un plan distintivo o a alguna otra razón. En realidad el motivo es más que simple, lamentablemente los Estados Miembros nos están cancelando sus contribuciones de acuerdo a lo que debe ser el compromiso con esta Organización y eso acarrea problemas serios. El Comité de Finanzas, en algún momento incluso estudió si el Plan de Incentivos tenía algún efecto inmediato en adelantar el pago de las contribuciones, en acelerar el pago de las contribuciones por parte de los Estados Miembros. En realidad no existe una relación directa, más bien los Estados que pagan anticipadamente sus contribuciones obedecen más que nada al período financiero como lo tienen definido. Hay países que tienen definido el período financiero público de manera anual, hay otros que consideran un año con otro, por lo tanto no necesariamente hay una relación directa sobre el sistema de incentivos.

Aprovecho la ocasión para hacer un llamado a los distintos Estados Miembros a realizar su aporte, puesto que si no recibimos las contribuciones a tiempo es imposible que la Organización pueda cumplir el mandato y en consecuencia satisfacer las necesidades de cada uno de los Estados Miembros aquí mismo expresadas. Sin entrar a pronunciarme sobre la cuestión de fondo de la solicitud de Argentina, creo que ha quedado claro que Argentina continuará estudiando una propuesta al respecto y por cierto tiene el derecho de presentarla. Estimo que es precisamente Argentina quien tiene que buscar el mejor método para que los Estados Miembros no sientan afectadas sus Contribuciones por la consideración de la rebaja en la contribución.

Con esto creo que he citado gran parte de las orientaciones que creo entender he recibido como Presidente del Comité de Finanzas y continuaremos trabajando en esta línea.

Hay algunas preguntas específicas, más bien de carácter técnico, que quizás la Secretaría podría responder y estoy disponible para profundizar estos temas y otros que estime conveniente el Consejo.

**Khalid MEHBOOB (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department)**

It has been a very full and interesting debate and there have been a number of questions. As you can see from the Finance Committee Report, the Report deals with a wide variety of issues and, together with my colleagues, I will take some of the questions individually. I will start off and

then will pass on, with your permission, to my colleagues to deal with some of the details of the questions asked.

The distinguished representative of Mexico commented on the appointment of the Inspector-General. Here, Mr Chairman, as you will note, the Finance Committee noted the name of the chosen candidate, but the appointment has to be made on 1 September 2003, once the current incumbent Inspector-General retires.

The procedure for senior appointments in FAO is that once the Director-General makes the appointment, a Director-General's Bulletin is issued, which also goes to the Permanent Representatives accredited to the Organization, and the Bulletin gives a summarized CV of the selected candidate. In addition, the profiles of senior managers are also on the Organization's Intranet. Since the appointment is going to be made on 1 September 2003, the information in the bulletin, which will be issued for general release, will be available only once the appointment is made. It is not the practice of the Organization to release such information before the appointment is made.

The distinguished representative of the United States raised the question of why the document on Geographical Distribution is before the Council. As the Council may recall, this request for the topic of Geographical Distribution was initiated at a Council in the past and the original document prepared was a Council document. Therefore, we felt any supplementary information should be in the form of an addendum and should be a Council document. Since we had the information requested by the Finance Committee, we thought we could submit this addendum to the Council for any guidance it may wish to give on this subject. This was the reason for the document coming before the Council.

There were some other comments made by the distinguished representative of the United States in connection with the question of under-representation, etc. These questions are being dealt with in the reform process which FAO is going through, so far as it concerns human resources' management. In fact, the Finance Committee will be considering a document in September, which will deal with issues such as under-representation, gender issues, recruitment process, the matters mentioned by the JIU Report on Administration and Management and Human Resources Planning. This is a document which will be going to the Finance Committee, and it will deal with all these issues. The document on geographical distribution deals specifically with the methodology.

There was a question on slow receipt of contributions by the distinguished representative of Cyprus. He felt the receipts in 2003 were slower than in previous years and wanted to know the reason for this. It is simply that some large contributors paid earlier in the previous two years and they still have to pay for 2003. This is the reason for the discrepancy.

There were some comments on Split Assessments and there was a question on the annual report of the budgetary performance. Mr Wade will handle these two issues. Mrs Mayanja, the Director of Human Resources, will deal with some questions of a detailed nature *via-à-vis* Geographical Distribution. There were a couple of questions on accounting matters, which Mr Nelson will deal with.

With your permission, Mr Chairman, I would ask Mr Wade to deal with the Split Assessments, Geographical Distribution and accounting matters.

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

The first one is rather a simple one, but I may have misheard Mexico, who thought that it would be useful if they could have the Report referred to paragraph 5 of CL 124/16, and I apologize if I have got the wrong reference. That is actually Annex 1 to that document, so the Annual Report of Budgetary Performances is normally annexed to the Finance Committee Report. If I have misunderstood, let me know.

Just in passing, I have had a couple of requests from Council Members for Finance Committee documents. These are public documents and are available on FAO's Website to all Members and,

in fact, to anyone outside the Organization as well. If you go on to FAO's Website click on "What is FAO" and then click on "Governing Bodies", then click on "See FAO Governing Bodies' Page" and then click on "Council Committees", you will get all the Committees of the Council, including the previous meetings. You can look up any document. I have recorded that for the purpose of the Verbatim Records so you can get the information if you need it.

Also on the Annual Report of Budgetary Performance, the distinguished delegate of Brazil commented on the expenditure pattern and, in particular, on the surplus for 2000-2001 in the hope, of course, that it would not be repeated in this biennium. I thought I heard him use a figure of US\$ 25 million for the last biennium. The surplus last biennium was US\$ 11.6 million, of which US\$ 8 million was an amount intentionally set aside by the Director-General to cover the advance from the Working Capital Fund for separation and redeployment costs. Therefore, the real performance was a surplus of US\$ 3.6 million which went towards reducing the accumulated deficit. We will be working to try and get a bit closer to the appropriation this biennium, but if we get too much closer, then we incur the risk of over-expenditure.

There was a very considerable debate on the issue of Split Assessments. Mexico asked that precise information be given about the figures. Of course, we will provide it in the paper that eventually comes to the Council. Whether it be as part of the budget document or as a separate paper with the Finance Committee Report, we will provide details of that process. I would mention for your information that 44 percent of our expenditure currently is in Euros. That calculation is worked from the bottom up, effectively looking at every transaction. Our system has the advantage of recording, for each transaction, the currency of the commitment that was originally made.

The distinguished delegate for Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Union, made a point with which I wanted to agree, which is to question the proposition that Split Assessment doubles the risk and which is, in fact, not correct. In actual fact, it reduces the risk, because what it does is reduce the range of the variation of the amount paid in your national currency to meet the assessments. Therefore it reduces the risk to you, as a Member Nation, from one biennium to the next. Of course, there is an exception to that, which is that any country paying in US dollars alone or that has a currency which is entirely linked to the US dollar, currently sees no risk in the present system, and therefore stands to lose with the introduction of this Scheme.

The United States did raise some points, and we certainly will try to address their other concerns. We will try to make sure that the currency effect is reported in a fully transparent manner, and we will also provide an indication of the cost and the benefits of the proposal, as requested by the United States and Namibia and others. I imagine that the benefits, given the range that we see now in terms of cost to the programme is so large - for example the current rate of exchange, we are talking of US\$ 70 million and next biennium we will be talking of a similar amount, but as a gain - I imagine that the comparison of cost to that size of figure will be fairly insignificant.

On the question of shifting the burden to Member Nations, I would like to make three points. Firstly, nearly all Member Nations already carry the burden when they convert their national currency to pay the current assessment in US dollars, so most of you are already facing a burden in terms of exchange risk. Secondly, the burden will in all likelihood be reduced for nearly all Member Nations because of the introduction of Split Assessment, in that they will have to convert or pay their contributions in two currencies, which is an inconvenience, one in dollars and one in Euro, but because a gain on the US dollar would normally be matched by a loss on the Euro, or vice versa, then they would have an offsetting effect for most members. In other words, as already mentioned above in relation to the comment of Greece, the risk from one biennium to the next should be reduced.

The third comment with regard to the burden, is in relation to the principle and this was mentioned by the United Republic of Tanzania. Specifically the Council at its Hundred and Twenty-third Session, stated in paragraph 92 of its Report that "the Council recognized that there was a general agreement that the approved Programme of Work should be protected to the maximum extent possible from the effects of fluctuating exchange rates". So, yes, we are

proposing a move of the burden of exchange rate risk from the Programme of Work to Member Nations, because that was what we had understood that you wanted us to do.

Finally on this point, in terms of the remarks made by the distinguished delegate for the United States of America, it has been suggested that the SRA and forward purchase provides sufficient protection under the current regime. This really is not the case, for the movement from one biennium to the next, where forward purchase is simply not possible. Forward purchases worked very well within the biennium, for example at the moment, we are paying 88 cents for each Euro instead of paying US\$ 1.16 or whatever the rate is today, because we did a forward purchase. However that contract finishes on the 31<sup>st</sup> of December 2003, and we will have to pay the full amount of US\$ 1.16 for each Euro we need to buy for our General Service and Professional salaries in Rome, for example.

A no-forward purchase arrangement would protect us from that, through to the end of time. Forward purchase is a limited contract. I would also add that the SRA level is not sufficient to cover the magnitude of swings we see in these exchange rates today. Mr. Nelson may wish to expand on that comment.

I would like to emphasize that the Secretariat is looking for technical solutions which are workable and which meet the Council's stated desires. We do not want to lose and we do not want to gain on this; we just want to get on with the job of implementing the Programme of Work and Budget.

There were requests for many more clarifications, but I assure you that the process and documents that will go through the Finance Committee will respond to all of the questions that have been raised, and I hope that we will be able to satisfy the Membership that this is the right direction to go.

**Nicholas NELSON (Director, Finance Division)**

I would like to respond to the query posed by the European Community regarding the functional currency of the Organization. They noted that the issue had been reviewed in detail last year, 2002, and the conclusion, at that time, was that there were no grounds for change from the US dollar as a functional currency. However, they pointed out that a significant amount of work has been done in the meantime, nearly a full year of work on this issue. The question was: what might be some implications for the functional currency? A secondary question was: how does the Organization keep monitoring the functional currency issues?

It may be worthwhile to recall that last year, when this item was looked at, the confirmation of the US dollar as functional currency was based on external expert advice in reference to generally-accepted accounting principles. The analysis was done on, it is important to remember, inflows and outflows of funds for the Organization. Inflows were 100 percent in US dollars, while expenditure contained a significant component, 42 percent, in Euros. In any case, these two elements together still represent well below the 50 percent threshold referred to by the external advice, as where one would need to re-examine a possible change in the functional currency.

It is interesting to note that a major sister Agency, Unesco, in 1999 also did an in-depth evaluation of whether to switch to the Euro. It is interesting because the percentage of their expenses was well over 60 percent, yet they rejected the change to make the Euro the functional currency, because of the costs associated with the change. They also referred to a JIU Report published in 1989, which set the threshold for such a change at 85 percent. Therefore, I am just mentioning that there are other views also, *vis-à-vis* the threshold, to be examined.

How are we monitoring the extent of expenditures in Euro and other currencies? We have been doing in-depth work on this issue in the last several months. We examined and re-examined the expenditure, resulting in the financial systems, in a detailed manner and in fact the descriptions of what we have done and how we are doing it are in the Finance Committee document FC 102/18 paragraphs 11, 12 and 13. I think that summarizes the issue on functional currency.

Mr. Wade asked me to possibly mention the impact of using the forward contract as a means of protection within the biennium. I can, in fact, illustrate a little bit better that using a forward contract is not necessarily a guarantee that it would be neutral in terms of cost. In fact, one only needs to look at our Audit Accounts for the previous biennium 2000-2001 in note 20 to the Accounts. One can visualize that the Organization sustained a net loss of US\$23 million on its currency exchange, and therefore, nearly depleted the Special Reserve Account within one biennium - that was compared to the previous 1998-99 biennium. Therefore, the point to be made is that yes, a forward contract is an instrument available to us, but it is not a guarantee and its use does not mean that there will not be a significant cost.

**Ms Rachel MAYANJA (Director, Human Resources Management Division)**

I will briefly say a few words about the Report on the Methodology for Determining Equitable Geographical Distribution. I would like to stress that as Mr Mehboob said, this is just a document on the methodology itself. It does not address actions that we take to ensure that Member Nations are all equitably represented.

This would bring me to the comment of the distinguished Representative of Namibia, who stated that in all these three options, the non-represented countries remain the same. Indeed, because it is looking at the different calculations that could be used, but the status of the non-represented Member Nations as of the time when making these different calculations is the same. It remains at 26 Member Nations.

The Representative of China, supported by the Representative of Korea, expressed their frustration, which I fully share, over the statistics. Indeed very complex methodologies are involved. I think I would accept the proposal which has been put forward by the distinguished Ambassador from Zimbabwe, that we provide the Member Nations with a briefing, because, of course, we cannot explain the details of these calculations in this room. However, we would be prepared to give briefings on the details of the various options that have been included in this document and in the addendum.

We will certainly make the additional information available to the Finance Committee in September, as has been suggested and as was requested. We are looking forward to the lively discussion in the Finance Committee.

**Khalid MEHBOOB (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance Department)**

We have here Mrs Anne Bauer, the Director of the Division, concerning the question raised by Mexico on the emergency fund. Mrs Bauer would be the one to answer that.

**Ms Anne BAUER (Director, Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division)**

There were two questions I understand. One was on what is the present level of this emergency response fund. The answer is simply zero, because at this stage we are in the process of technically establishing the fund, and soliciting the support of donors to contribute to the fund. But, we hope that later this year we will have a more precise idea on how much money we will be able to put into the fund. It has an upper limit of US\$2 million. That is the target.

The second question was regarding what is the difference between similar funds in WFP and FAO. Now, I am not familiar with the technicalities of such funds in WFP, but the obvious difference is clearly that WFP's emergency response is with regard to food aid, while this fund will provide the basis to have a rapid response to agricultural assistance and not food aid. Farmers who are hit by natural catastrophes or civil war, or in any other way, require support to jumpstart agricultural production or the fishery and the livestock sectors.

**CHAIRMAN**

I would like to congratulate those of you who understood what would be the impact of Split Assessment, because I am an economist and I do not. Are there any other questions? If not we consider this Item 15 concluded and move to the next item which is Item 12, Summary Programme of Work and Budget for 2004-2005, which we hope will be more entertaining.

**12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)

**12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)

**12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20)

**CHAIRMAN**

We will now move to Item 12, Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005. Please ensure that you have documents CL 124/3 and CL 124/3-Corr.1 before you, as well as the documents from this morning's debate and the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee because they also refer to the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005.

The Council is called upon to consider the Summary Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium in order to provide guidance for the formulation of the full Programme of Work and Budget to be submitted to the Conference. As Mr Mekouar, the Independent Chairman mentioned this morning, before we consider the Report of the Joint Meeting, the Chairs of Programme and Finance Committees, Mr Molina Reyes and Mr Hankey, will now make their remarks on Item 12.

**Humberto E. MOLINA REYES (Presidente, Comité de Finanzas)**

Como bien se había señalado en la mañana habíamos desplazado el análisis de este punto específico al tema 12 que se refiere al Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005. Antes de analizar lo que el Comité de Finanzas determinó, quisiera ante todo hacer una breve mención a la Reunión Conjunta del Comité del Programa y de Finanzas. En esta Reunión Conjunta los Comités acogieron positivamente la forma de presentación mejorada del documento que ponía más de manifiesto los progresos realizados en la aplicación de la presupuestación basada en los resultados de la FAO. Los Comités observaron que en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto habría que tener en cuenta las recomendaciones de los Períodos de Sesiones de los Comités Técnicos celebrados en este mismo año. Los Comités reconocieron que el Resumen de Labores y Presupuesto presentaban dos hipótesis: una correspondiente al crecimiento real propuesta por el Director General que es un aumento sobre el PLP aprobado por el 2002-2003 y una segunda hipótesis de Crecimiento Real Cero. Algunos Miembros reiteraron su solicitud de la hipótesis de Crecimiento Nominal Cero. Los comités no pudieron expresar una recomendación de consenso al Consejo en esta fase. Eso es en términos generales el resumen de lo que ocurrió en la Sesión Conjunta del Comité de Programas y Finanzas.

En cuanto a la Sesión del Comité de Finanzas, examinamos el Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el 2004-2005 en el Período 102 de Sesiones en mayo de 2003 y el Informe detallado de nuestras deliberaciones figura el documento CL 124/16, párrafos 61 al 68. El Comité centró su examen en las líneas generales del presupuesto y las propuestas relativas al Capítulo 5 "Servicio de apoyo y capítulo 6 Servicios comunes". Con respeto a las líneas generales, se prestó particular atención a los aumentos de los costos, la amortización del pasivo acumulado por la asistencia médica después del cese del servicio y la evaluación de los riesgos. El Comité tomó nota que en el Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuestos para el 2004-2005 se formulaban las dos hipótesis que ya he mencionado. Algunos Miembros mencionaron que preferían la hipótesis de Crecimiento Real Cero.

El Comité observó que no se había introducido ningún cambio importante en la metodología utilizada para calcular los aumentos de los costos, tomó nota que los aumentos de los costos para 2004-2005 se estimaba en un 3,4 por ciento anual, es decir 33,6 millones de dólares EE.UU. Había que recabar además 14,1 millones de dólares EE.UU. para hacer frente a la amortización necesaria del pasivo acumulado por la asistencia médica después del cese del servicio. En consecuencia el aumento total de los costos sería de 47,7 millones de dólares EE.UU. sin prejuzgar el acuerdo sobre la cantidad total del presupuesto, el Comité consideraba que los cálculos de los aumentos de los costos eran coherentes con la metodología acordada. El Comité

señaló que la cifra 47,7 millones de dólares EE.UU. se elevaría a unos 104 millones de dólares EE.UU. al tipo de cambio actual, es decir a un Euro que era equivalente a 1,10 dólares EE.UU.

Observo que la Secretaría proponía un sistema de cuotas en dos monedas como medio para hacer frente a la fluctuación de los tipos de cambio tanto en cada bienio como de uno a otro.

El Comité hizo hincapié en la importancia de resolver la cuestión del pasivo acumulado por la asistencia médica después del cese del servicio. Acordó volver a examinar el asunto en su Período de Sesiones de septiembre con el objeto de formular una recomendación definitiva al Consejo.

El Comité acordó que a efectos de la preparación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005 se incluyeran los 14,1 millones de dólares EE.UU. con la reserva de que el asunto seguía estando bajo examen.

El Comité se mostró complacido por el programa de las consignaciones presupuestarias para los Capítulos 5 y 6. Apreció que las propuestas quedaran reflejadas a los niveles personales recomendados por los consultores externos de gestión que habían examinado las necesidades de personal de la Dirección de Finanzas y la Dirección del Sistema y Tecnología de la Información.

Esto es todo lo que puedo informar en este momento, quedo a disposición de ustedes y del Consejo para responder a cualquier otra consulta.

**Blair HANKEY (Chairman, Programme Committee)**

The Programme Committee focussed on the substance of the proposals rather than on the overall budget level, forecasting the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, although some Members of the Committee did refer to their Government's views or preferences as to budget levels for the next biennium.

The Committee noted that the reduced levels of resources in the Zero Real Growth (ZRG) scenario *vis-à-vis* the Real Growth (RG) scenario tended to affect negatively some areas, identified by the Committee as being of high priority. Many Members considered this undesirable situation as a justification for supporting an RG budget, so that the Organization could meet the expectations and needs of the Membership. However, other Members considered that areas of highest priority should, and could, be adequately resourced irrespective of budget levels.

The Committee welcomed the intended continuation of active inter-departmental cooperation under the Priority Areas for Inter-disciplinary Action, or PAIAs, in the next biennium. However, it agreed that the PAIAs were not cast in stone, and that they could evolve flexibly depending on context and needs, which might require adjusting work under established ones, or adding new ones.

The Committee then went through the budget chapter by chapter, and I will now give a summary of comments on the various chapters.

So, for Chapter 2, "Technical and Economic Programmes", first Major Programme 2.1 Agricultural Production and Support Systems. The Committee broadly endorsed the relevant priorities as set out in the Real Growth scenario for this Major Programme. In particular, the Committee appreciated the special emphasis given to important international regulatory instruments, including the International Plant Protection Convention, the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides and the Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent, as well as the Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture Convention.

The Committee requested that the scope and funding of some entities and PAIAs be adjusted in the full Programme of Work and Budget, based on guidance received from the Seventeenth Session of COAG, particularly for work on Biotechnology, Biosecurity, Ethics, and Good Agricultural Practices.

While the Committee expressed concern that enhanced work on important priority areas could not be accommodated under the ZRG scenario, it did not identify any activities of this Major Programme that could be reduced. However, the Committee reaffirmed its call, as endorsed by



Council and reiterated by COAG, to fund IPPC at the level of its biennial business plan under any budget scenario.

Now I turn to Major Programme 2.2, "Food and Agriculture Policy and Development". The Committee recalled the key contribution of this Major Programme to analysing progress towards achievement of the goals of the World Food Summit.

The Committee reaffirmed the recommendation of the Seventeenth Session of COAG that FAO provide its share of the additional resources required for implementation of the recommendations of the Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of Codex, noting that this should normally apply irrespective of the budget level. In view of the request of COAG that the draft strategy document on the food chain approach be revised and resubmitted for consideration at its Eighteenth Session, the Committee agreed that the resources allocated to the proposed new entity, "221P8 Food Quality and Safety throughout the Food Chain", be reduced as the Secretariat undertook, and that the corresponding savings be reallocated to Codex and Codex-related work.

The Committee noted that the planned work on HIV/AIDS, within Programme 2.2.1 Nutrition, Food Quality and Safety, and felt that HIV/AIDS was a particularly suitable subject for a PAIA involving all relevant Major Programmes.

Finally, the Committee underlined the importance of capacity-building in developing countries for WTO agricultural trade negotiations and trade facilitation, including standard-setting.

I turn now to Major Programme 2.3, "Fisheries". The Committee appreciated the continued major focus on the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the International Plans of Action, together with other international fisheries' instruments to support national efforts for long-term sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture. It noted that few changes had been introduced in the programme structure, and that the budget allocations among programmes had been generally preserved in relative terms.

The Committee stressed the desirability of providing increased resources for this Major Programme, irrespective of the budget level.

Major Programme 2.4, "Forestry". The Committee commended FAO for its leadership in international cooperation on forestry and broadly endorsed the programme priorities in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

The Committee welcomed the proposed budget for Major Programme 2.4 in the RG scenario, and recommended that the budget under the ZRG scenario should be restored to at least the same level as in the current PWB for 2002-03.

Major Programme 2.5, "Contribution to Sustainable Development and Special Programme Thrusts". The Committee noted the relevance of issues addressed by the sustainable Development Department, particularly the cross-sectoral issues, for which Major Programme 2.5 catalysed interdisciplinary action throughout the Organization.

Some Members considered that it might be timely to carry out evaluations of the effectiveness of Major Programme 2.5, in supporting important cross-sectoral actions. Other Members felt, however, that in view of Major Programme 2.5's short period of existence, such evaluations would be premature.

With respect to Programme 2.5.6, "the Special Programme for Food Security", after having considered the Report on Follow-up Action to the SPFS Evaluation which it had considered last year, the Committee expressed general satisfaction with the Organization's progress in implementing the recommendations of the evaluation report.

Most Members of the Committee indicated that they would not support a reduction to the SPFS appropriation in the next PWB.

Now I turn to Chapter 3, "Cooperation and Partnerships". The Committee expressed wide support for the programmes included under this chapter, which are geared to support FAO action in the field.

In particular, the Committee recognized the importance of providing sound policy advice to countries and regional groupings, as well as further development of the field programme in support of sustainable agricultural- and rural development and food security.

In recalling the expanded responsibilities entrusted to FAO Representatives and changing circumstances at the country level, including the increased delegation of decision-making of major bilateral assistance programmes to the local level, the Committee reiterated the importance of appointing fully qualified FAO Representatives and of their performance appraisals. It received assurances from management that effective mechanisms were in place to ensure this.

Finally, Chapter 4, "Technical Cooperation Programme". While recognizing the demand-driven unprogrammed nature of TCP, the Committee regretted that the information included in the SPWB on this key programme had been too succinct, and looked forward to more comprehensive information being provided in future documents.

Many Members reiterated the importance they attached to the TCP and to seeing adequate resources being provided under this chapter in the next PWB.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Thank you, Blair, for your comprehensive report and, as usual, when we are talking about work and budget all the ways lead to Tony, and I would like to ask Mr Wade, Director of Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation to introduce the Item.

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

With the introduction of performance indicators in FAO for just about everything, I am getting worried that the success in acquiring additional funds for the Organization will be the major indicator of my performance, in which case, my failure will become patently obvious. However, this time perhaps it will be better.

You have already heard from the Chairs of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee. I will, therefore, limit myself to an overview of the key issues, if I may.

First of all, I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that, as is usually the case, the Programme proposals in this document are presented in constant dollars, before accounting for cost increases or inflation, if you like, and before we adjust the cost increases for any difference in exchange rates. The exchange rate you adopted in the last budget was 1 Euro=US\$0.88 and, of course, you would need to adopt a different exchange rate for the next biennium.

Real Growth, I think, was summarized quite neatly by the Chairperson of the Finance Committee, but if I may just repeat it: the Medium-Term Plan, which the Director-General had presented to the last Session of the Council, proposed US\$54.5 million for the first biennium of the six-year period, that is 8.4 percent. However, given that the Council could not reach consensus on the level of the budget for that period, the Director-General, in seeking consensus, proposes a reduced Real Growth budget in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget which, in real terms, is US\$36 million or 5.5 percent. He does this despite the tremendous demands for increased allocations to the programmes with which you are very familiar, IPPC, Codex or TCP or capacity-building in developing countries.

In fact, the Technical Committees had not completed their deliberations when this document was prepared and, hence, it does not include the impact of their conclusions, except to the extent that they were anticipated by the relevant Departments, when they prepared their Summary Programme of Work and Budget submissions.

I would draw your attention to the additional document CL 120/INF/20 which, in fact, provides the Secretariat's estimates of the impact of the Technical Committees' recommendations. These

total US\$70 million, whether they are to be funded from the Regular Programme or from extra-budgetary sources. So, in addition to what we have here, there is approximately a further US\$70 million required. Of course, we hope that much of it would come from extra-budgetary sources, but we should be aware of the large gap that we are facing. In fact, it is, therefore, questionable whether the majority of the membership really does want to limit growth in the way that has been proposed even by the Director-General.

The Zero Real Growth level: the Director-General also provides a Zero Real Growth Scenario. This is to demonstrate the effect of not allocating the additional resources to the budget. This is US\$36 million less than the Real Growth. Now, as was in fact just mentioned by the Chairperson of the Programme Committee, the Programme Committee itself had commented on the fact that these reductions tended to negatively affect many of the areas which it deemed to be of high priority. However, that is a fact, it does - because this is a reflection of the fact that it is essential and desirable that any increases allocated from the US\$36 million increase in resources be allocated to the highest priority programmes. Obviously, if you reverse out the US\$36 million from the Real Growth proposal, it will hit or damage those programmes which are considered to have the highest priority.

Turning to programme priorities, having said what I said, I would like to emphasize that high-priority programmes do not only gain when there are net additional resources. Even under the ZRG proposals which you have before you, significant shifts in resources have occurred to programmes like IPPC, although, it has to be said, not to the extent that some Members would have liked.

Now, since we prepared the document, the Programme Committee and the Technical Committee have given valuable advice on priorities and, subject to the Council's endorsement of their Reports, I can confirm that further progress will be made in addressing them in both the ZRG and RG proposals for the full Programme of Work and Budget.

Turning now to the question of being able to maintain the purchasing power of the existing budget, cost increases have been mentioned by the Chairman of the Finance Committee. They total US\$33.6 million, or 3.4 percent per biennium. They were considered by the Finance Committee in some detail, but I should say that the assumptions and the detailed calculations for these figures are currently being reviewed and, based on the latest available data, will be revised for the full Programme of Work and Budget, as you would expect.

Turning to after-service medical care, as you know the document also proposes an additional amount under cost-increases, which is intended to resolve the long-standing under-funding of the accrued liability for after-service medical care. Now, the liability for payments under the Council-approved medical scheme has grown over the years, as funding was limited to the Organization's share of the premiums, which in themselves are set to match the claims made - the so-called "pay-as-you-go" principle. In reality, the bulk of medical expenses tend to be paid out later in life, that is when staff have retired, and it is the increasing cost of supporting these entitlements that we are trying to address.

Just for your information, the total accrued liability in the accounts as at 31 December 2001 was US\$201.7 million. The amount of investments we have to support that is US\$77.6 million, so we are basically short of US\$124.1 million. The US\$14.1 million would allow us to build a fund up to the required level, but over a period of 12 biennia. So 12 biennia of US\$14.1 million to reach this level.

The situation, in fact, is very similar to what many Governments with ageing populations are facing for their Pension Plans, so many of you are probably familiar with it.

Now, you may ask what happens if we do nothing. The inevitable consequence will be that as the population of FAO staff ages, and as the number of retirees grow, the cost of claims each year will grow exponentially to levels, which the budget cannot support without severe damage to the Programme of Work. Obviously, if that US\$124 million, which will grow in itself if we do not

fund it, is not looked after, by the time we get to paying out those claims, we will have a massive charge against the budget.

Now, I should point out that the Finance Committee has sought additional information on this proposal and, therefore, has not yet made a recommendation to the Council. In other words, the Council is not required to make a decision at this Session, but as it is mentioned in the document, I thought I should go through it.

The only other area I would like to address, is the impact of exchange rates. As already mentioned, the figures for cost increases have been, as usual, calculated at the budget rate for the previous biennium and, that, as I said before, was where 1 Euro was costing us 88 cents.

This rate will be adjusted at the Conference, or would normally be adjusted at the Conference to reflect the actual rate, which, as you know, is US\$1.16. The same adjustment would normally affect both the appropriation and the assessed contributions payable. Now, as you will notice from paragraph 135 of the document, the impact is potentially considerable. At the current rate of US\$1.16 to the Euro, the upward adjustment of cost increases would be a bit more than US\$70 million. So that is the size of the problem we have to face.

How does this happen? It is simply that we have a very high proportion of our expenditure in Euro. As I mentioned before, 44 percent - mostly for Rome-based salaries. However, because we currently receive all of our Assessed Contributions in US dollars, we inevitably face a problem, which is that we can make a loss or a gain when we buy the required Euro. When we go out on the market to buy the Euro to pay General Service salaries, for example, we face a difference between the budget rate, for example, 88 cents, and the actual rate, for example, US\$1.16. At the moment, we would have to use a lot more dollars, so it would cost us a great deal more, and the only way we can manage that is by reducing programmes or saving money in other ways.

So, what we need to do is to match our Euro expenditure with Euro income. If we have Euro in the first place to pay for General Service salaries in Rome, for example, then there is no question of buying Euro to pay for them, and that is what split assessment is all about. It eliminates any loss or gain to the Programme of Work.

Now with regard to split assessment, the Secretariat and the Finance Committee have, since the year 2000, been working together to examine ways in which the Programme of Work can be protected from these very significant exchange rate variations. The work has proceeded on the principle that was endorsed by the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the Council, which I read out to you before in an answer to a question from a previous item. In effect, that the Council wanted to protect the Programme of Work and Budget from exchange rate fluctuations.

Since then, specific proposals, involving an approach where each Member would receive its assessments in two currencies, part in US dollars and part in Euro, have been made to the Finance Committee. The advantage is that, in this way, the Organization can match its Euro expenditure with Euro income, thus largely avoiding the need to enter into exchange transactions in order to pay its bills.

This approach has been recommended by a major international accounting firm KPMG and also by the previous External Auditor, *le Court des Comptes*. However, the Finance Committee has not yet completed its deliberations and, hence, a decision is not sought on this issue at the Council's present Session, but I did feel that, given the amount of discussion there has been on the topic and the reference to it in the budget document, this additional explanation might be desirable.

In conclusion, we look forward to an interesting debate and the Council's advice on the Programme of Work and Budget and we are, of course, available for any further clarifications or questions you may have for us.

**CHAIRMAN**

The floor is open for your debate, contributions, questions and I would like to mention that we will continue today up to six o'clock and then we will start again tomorrow morning, if necessary, the debate on this Item. I now establish the list of the speakers. I start with the distinguished Representative of India.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

At the very outset, let me complement the Secretariat in compiling a fairly comprehensive and transparent Programme of Work and Budget. We note, with satisfaction, that the depth and breadth of these documents have steadily improved over the years. We, in India, and arguably in many other Member Nations, look at FAO as a Specialized Agency, which should primarily concern itself with providing normative guidance in the frontier and emerging areas of relevant disciplines.

We would stress the basic issue is not so much the availability of resources, crucially important as this aspect is, but how the available resources are deployed. With a well-developed research, extension and delivery system, we need little elaboration in this well-informed forum. Our expectation from FAO is to have the benefit of the Organization's interface with the best in agricultural sciences, to enable us to access state-of-the-art technologies in various disciplines. Concomitantly, a highly-experienced and trained scientific and technical manpower has also, in the past, played a crucial role in furthering FAO admission all over the world.

We, however, note with dismay a significant decline in the number of Technical Cooperation projects (TCPs in short) in recent years. Shrinkage of TCPs, to the extent that no TCP was sanctioned to India during the year 2002, is something that I wish to underline today. For the country of our sized population, and overall diverse climatic zones, the current number of ongoing TCP projects is woefully inadequate.

Our efforts, in the recent past, to have the matter reviewed have not been fructified. Given our size and the importance of agriculture in our economy and to global well-being, I trust that the august Membership will endorse a position that some of FAO's twelve blazers in the frontier areas of agriculture and allied sciences must find their testing place in India's fields and laboratories.

We also regret the proposed withdrawal of funding to the cooperative sector. Indeed, the proposal to close the Cooperation Unit in FAO is a matter of great concern to us. This would convey a wrong signal regarding FAO's commitment to this sector which, without a doubt, has a crucial role to play in agricultural development and poverty alleviation.

I must, however, avail of this opportunity to complement the Organization for achieving significant economies in the matter of administrative expenses and overheads. It is also gratifying to note that economies are being affected, while taking care that this does not impede on technical and managerial excellence. We also agree that the Zero Real Growth scenario, as we said in the proposed Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, is a cause for concern. I trust the present deliberations and the discussions in the ensuing Conference will throw innovative ideas for generating recurring resources to augment budgetary support from Member Nations.

I must also appreciate the Organization for announcing allocations, despite evident resource constraints for such crucial concerns, such as international fund-protection convention and PGRFA. Funding these core concerns from extra-budgetary resources, however, is fraught with potentially disturbing developments given the possibility of causing bilateralisms, which these events carry.

It is gratifying to note that there is a rigorous and continuing process of programme evaluation and assessment. The UN Inspection Teams' staff reviews have also contributed to keeping the personnel policies on the right track. My delegation is, however, of the view that there is now an imperative need for a comprehensive organizational review to access the extent to which the

mandate of FAO has remained compatible with emerging needs and scenarios. Strategic goals and perspective may warrant clear appraisal in light of such a review.

**Oswaldo DEL ÁGUILA RAMÍREZ (Perú)**

Uno de los temas que mayor interés concita en los Miembros del Consejo de la FAO es la propuesta del Director General para el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el próximo período 2004-2005.

La delegación del Perú desea acompañar la propuesta para la aprobación de un presupuesto de crecimiento real. Todos somos conscientes que la FAO tiene cada vez mayores compromisos. Hemos asistido durante el presente año a los diferentes comités técnicos y de ahí han surgido áreas a las cuales hay que prestar atención así como mayores requerimientos por parte de los Países Miembros, en especial de países en desarrollo como el Perú.

Es cada vez más relevante brindar el financiamiento adecuado a áreas tan importantes como la Comisión Interina de Recursos Fitosanitarios y el Tratado Internacional para los Recursos Fitogenéticos recientemente ratificado por el Perú. De no existir recursos suficientes, la FAO pondría en peligro el cumplimiento de los objetivos para los cuales fue creada, es decir luchar contra el hambre y la pobreza.

Queremos destacar con satisfacción que el escenario de Crecimiento Real dota al Programa de Cooperación Técnica y a las actividades de campo con mayores recursos que en el período anterior. Lo mismo se observa en los Programas de Pesca y Montes. Estos programas cuentan con un impacto directo en la lucha contra el hambre a nivel mundial, sin embargo nos gustaría conocer cómo se distribuirían estos montos a nivel regional.

Sabemos que la FAO cuenta con importantes compromisos administrativos que no se pueden eludir y que constituyen una importante carga financiera para el organismo. Hacemos un llamado a la Secretaría para que busque alternativas que no constituyan una pesada carga para los Estados Miembros y que permitan destinar mayores recursos a otros programas.

Como país en desarrollo, no deja de ser una preocupación para nosotros el hecho de que un mayor presupuesto implica mayores cuotas a pagar, sin embargo consideramos que debemos hacer un importante esfuerzo para dotar a la FAO de los recursos que le permitan responder adecuadamente a los requerimientos de los Países Miembros. Es por ello que reiteramos nuestro apoyo a la hipótesis de crecimiento real para el período 2004-2005.

**Elías REYES BRAVO (México)**

El documento que se refiere al Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto es un documento muy completo que quizás requiera un componente regional un poco más amplio.

Es deseable que mantenga un equilibrio, como en buena medida lo refleja en sus distintos apartados, principalmente entre la agricultura, la ganadería, la pesca y los bosques.

En la identificación de las prioridades, la Secretaría ha de tener en cuenta las recomendaciones de los Comités Subsidiarios de este Consejo. Para mi país hay temas que resultan fundamentales y son susceptibles de compartir en cooperación con otros países, como los relativos a la sanidad agropecuaria y pesquera, la normalización, los recursos genéticos para la alimentación y la agricultura, las negociaciones comerciales multilaterales, la bioseguridad y los organismos genéticamente modificados, el diseño de políticas y programas para el desarrollo rural sostenible, las actividades entorno al Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable y el fomento de los agronegocios.

Es necesario mantener la capacidad económica de la FAO y, una vía importante para ello es mantener la regularidad, hacer un esfuerzo por ella con las contribuciones anuales por conceptos membresía a esta Organización.

**Mooneshwar RAMTHOHUL (Mauritius)**

The delegation from Mauritius would like to thank the Secretariat for the very comprehensive Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

With respect to paragraph 7, we feel that adequate balance should be kept in major international events such as the Doha Conference, Monterrey, Sustainable Development and Implementation of Millennium Development Goals. We define this proper balance between these activities and operational activities of direct benefit to the farming community in needy regions and in support of national capacity-building, especially in relation to the African countries.

The concerns and priorities of each region need to be properly addressed. Here, in particular, we refer to the NEPAD and we are looking forward to the discussions of the comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme by the African Ministers of Agriculture in Maputo next month. Your Director-General attaches a great deal of importance to the Africa Agriculture Development Programme.

Regarding paragraph 8, we are in favour of scenario one, which corresponds to the Real Growth level of resources over the approved Programme of Work and Budget 2004 - 2005. These would respond more to the preoccupations and needs expressed by the developing countries. Moreover, the additional resources would address the implementation of the World Food Summit goal and the recommendations of the World Conference on Sustainable Development.

**Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)**

I am going to focus on the budget level and efforts to keep budget levels low. I am not going to talk about programme priorities, because that was, by and large, covered under our statement that we delivered for the Report of the Programme Committee. I would like to note, however, our concern that the INF document that was submitted along with the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, which attempts to draw together all of the conclusions of the Technical Committees and put a price tag by them, I think I have to say, does fail to reflect the importance that Members across the board attached to the IPPC and the work of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. I would like to hear a response on that and I wonder how, in such an extensive document, that somehow an item, which was mentioned so frequently, and by so many Members, seems to have such little space and funding allocated to it.

Returning to the budget level. As you know the United States is a very strong supporter of FAO, and we feel that its mission to address global hunger and sustainable development is quite important. However, we also continue to advocate budget discipline, increased efficiency and prioritization in the financial resources of international organizations. The position that we have maintained over the last year on the budget has not changed. We continue to support a Zero Nominal Growth budget. We must insist that the Secretariat prepare a scenario for ZNG. We have made this request repeatedly. ZNG budgets can, in fact, benefit organizations. They ensure a cleaner, more efficient, more focused organization and they also keep assessments affordable for Member Nations. We are quite concerned with the proposed increases to the regular budget level of over 5 percent, for salary increases and other inflationary costs. We do not support these increases in the regular budget level. We believe that any such increases should be accommodated within existing resources.

One of the things that we have tried to do, in an effort to be constructive, is to suggest low-priority activities. We have suggested efficiencies, particularly in governance. Governance is very expensive, however ultimately we do feel that the Organization itself needs to take responsibility for some form of prioritization within its activities. Regrettably, some of this year's Technical Committees appear to have been seen as opportunities to propose new activities to Members. Now, these new activities seemed generally like a good idea. It is not surprising that Members, when confronted with them, said "that seems like an excellent idea, let us go ahead and do that", but then of course we are told later, "well that means that the budget has to go up because you have asked us to do more". We do not feel that that is a good way to do business. We

want the Secretariat to take more responsibility for managing the budget, and the programme activities, within a no growth scenario.

The Director of an international organization here in Rome, which I will not mention by name said once - and this organization was also basically kept at a no growth budget for many years – that no growth does not have to mean no change. I think that is a very important sentiment, and we feel it is possible. We feel that the change is possible. We feel better programme delivery is possible. We do feel that the results-based budgeting, which FAO is moving towards, should be an extremely helpful tool in understanding how to do more and better with fewer resources, because it will help the Organization and it will help Members to understand what is being done and how effectively it is being done.

Turning to the question of programme increases, which are given at more than 5 percent, this is also an area which we cannot support. We have had a long-standing concern with the projected decline in extra-budgetary contributions received by the Organization. Excuse me, it is not a projected decline, it is a real decline. This has led to a continual haemorrhage of regular budget resources to support declining support-cost income. This is a drag on the Regular Programme budget, and we feel it needs to be addressed urgently. We are willing to work with FAO and other Member Nations towards an agreement on a budget level that is appropriate to FAO's needs and is also mindful of Member Nation concerns.

### **Koji YONETANI (Japan)**

Let me start by stating our concern about the deliverable budget. In fact, the Government of Japan is deeply concerned about the significant increase in the Member Nations' net Assessed Contributions in both of the scenarios presented in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget. The Japanese delegation strongly requests the Secretariat to work seriously for preparing a full Programme of Work and Budget, based on the reduced Assessed Contributions in nominal terms compared to the present biennium. In fact, the Government of Japan will be facing a serious difficulty in paying the increased level of Assessed Contributions. Therefore, our Government is obliged to request reducing it. We believe that FAO will be able to achieve more results from its work, while lowering its budget level, by taking all possible measures for efficiency, rationalization and in clear prioritization. I will elaborate on these measures at a further stage.

Let me explain in detail a little bit of the background of this request for reducing the Assessed Contribution. The Government of Japan recognizes the important role of FAO in promoting international efforts for food and agriculture. Japan is also continually committed to supporting developing countries in these efforts to pursue the Millennium Development Goals and also to implement the Plan of Action emanating the World Food Summit: *five years later* and the World Summit for Sustainable Development. Therefore, Japan has been very active in supporting the work of FAO, but at the same time Japan also supports developing countries more significantly in some aspects through bilateral ODA programmes, for increased food security and agricultural and rural development. Japan has provided in fact about 40 percent of all bilateral assistance in 16 agricultural areas offered to developing countries. Having stated this strong resolve to continue pursuing our participation in international efforts, the reality that our Government has been facing for years in our country is that the total international cooperation budget cannot be increased unfortunately, because of the exceptional severe economic and fiscal situation in Japan. In fact, the consequence of prolonged economic difficulties had double impact on Japan's international cooperation. First is the need to maintain budgetary discipline and second is the weakening support from our people for the Government's International Cooperation Programme. Under these conditions, if we increase our contribution to FAO, the Government of Japan needs to make a hard decision to further cut down its bilateral assistance.

Such a decision would reduce the level of financial assistance, for example, aimed at building agriculture and rural infrastructures and would also cut back the Technical Cooperation Programmes of the Japan International Cooperation Agency, (JICA), by reducing the number of agricultural experts to give policy support to the developing countries or by reducing the number of training programmes. For several years Japan's global budget for international cooperation has



continued to be reduced, and in addition to that, Japan's bilateral ODA has already been reduced more significantly in terms of allocated financial resources at the expense of the increased burden of Assessed Contribution, which has been increased in yen terms by about 10 percent, due to the depreciating yen/dollar exchange rate.

It is under these difficult and unavoidable conditions that the Japanese Delegation is obliged to request a budget reduction, in particular the reduction in its Assessed Contribution compared to the current biennium.

Turning to the actions to be taken by FAO, I would like to stress that the Organization should aim at achieving more results with less budget. I will present in three pillars as to the means for realizing that. The three pillars are: first, implementing more vigorously efficiency measures, second reducing posts, and third focusing on priority.

First, concerning the efficiency saving measures, it is encouraging to note, as is stated in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, that FAO has implemented over the past five biennia important actions that realize substantial savings, amounting to between US\$55 to US\$62 million a year. We appreciate the efforts undertaken by the Secretariat in realizing these savings, defined by the Council as reductions in the costs of inputs without material negative impact on the outputs. Those measures should be further pursued. We encourage the Organization, for example, to develop new partnerships, in order to introduce Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC), to pursue office automation and outsourcing and to search for leaner management arrangements. Although it is assumed that the rate of savings made by the same measures declines as we progress, there is always room for further improvements. In addition, new efficiency saving measures need to be developed, including the implementation of a new programme model for non-technical programmes.

Although such efforts are already stipulated in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, the savings expected there are not quantified, therefore, the Japanese Delegation requests that the Secretariat examine a comprehensive action plan for further efficiency savings well before the next Session of the Council and to present it to the Finance Committee, with a quantified amount of saving to be incorporated in the full Programme of Work and Budget.

We would like to expect that such comprehensive efforts enable the same level of savings as previous years of around US\$60 million and, supposing saving were reduced by 25 percent, for example, to US\$45 million a year, that is US\$90 million for the biennium, such efficiency measures only would enable FAO to undertake the proposed Programme of Work at the Real Growth level while reducing the level of Assessed Contribution.

Secondly, it is essential to keep the number of posts to the minimum necessary level in order to prevent medium- and long-term budget increases. In this regard, it is surprising to see a significant increase in the number of Professional posts in both of the options presented in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget. That is a net increase of 108 posts in the Real Growth scenario and again a net increase of 72 posts in the Zero Real Growth scenarios. Our delegation can barely consider such a net increase to be an appropriate measure.

In cutting down the appropriation, we do request the Secretariat to avoid increasing staff costs by keeping post creation to the bare minimum, to compensate it by abolishing other posts.

Thirdly, the most courageous decision needs to be taken for selecting activities to be streamlined. Clear prioritization is essential, but not only for the sake of budgetary discipline, but also for demonstrating FAO's adaptation capacity. In other words, it is exactly because FAO is facing numerous and increasingly-complex requests that FAO needs clearer prioritization. Without more focused priority, FAO cannot maintain its comparative advantage even in the area of its work. Therefore, in preparing a full Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, the Japanese delegation strongly requests the Secretariat to formulate an optimum option of Programme of Work based on the reduced level of net Assessed Contributions compared to the current biennium. In working on such a Programme of Work and Budget, the Secretariat should give clearer focus to the activities that are more closely linked to the international objectives of food

security, agriculture and rural development and normative work, such as those related to food safety.

Based on these criteria, activities of relatively low-priority should be streamlined. Furthermore, FAO's work should be streamlined also in the area where its comparative advantage is not evident, or where another international organization is also working.

Having explained these three actions to be taken, I personally, representing the Japanese delegation, make this statement with the hope that we continue to work to establish conditions for gathering wider political support in our country from the Japanese people and thus enabling ourselves, enabling our Governments to continue actively supporting the work of FAO.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

Budgeting is always problematic and listening to the comments that have been put across this afternoon it has become more real in my mind that we are facing a challenge, but that we have to be brave to take on this challenge. Our Governments met last year in this very room and took decisions, among others, the International Alliance against Hunger, and we all agreed we were going to fight hunger. I would recall, in the debate we were talking about the International Alliance against Hunger, incorporating, among other things, the international dimension and the domestic dimension. I see FAO as one such Organization which helps us to contain or to be able to take on board the commitments that come with the international obligations. FAO represents this dimension and we have always referred to it as more or less the reserve that we all look to, particularly those of us from the developing world.

We are all committed to eradicating hunger; I have heard this statement being said so many times in this House, unless it was lip service. Therefore, we have to take decisions that reflect that position. Further, Council has taken many decisions that require new resources and I heard this afternoon that we were all promoting that those new projects or programmes see daylight. For me, I feel that if we are going to implement those new programmes without finding sources for new money, this will mean robbing resources from projects that are already operating. That has a direct effect on the fight against hunger. We would not sit here and look at each other in the face and claim to be fighting against hunger, when we know we are doing exactly the opposite. Statistics have shown that we are way behind that target that we set for ourselves in 1996. I have heard from some contributors that it is the administrative constraints, the evaluation, accountability, discipline, etc. that tend to discourage donors. I admit, however, in the same vein I have also heard, and we have been advised twice today by the Chairmen of the various Committees, that the necessary accountability measures are being put in place, particularly in the thematic programmes, which are the programmes that have got direct linkage with the hungry.

With this assurance behind us, I would like to appeal to all partners that we should be assured that conditions are slowly getting on track to enable us to increase the results from our inputs. Sure, there is need for improvement, but this is why we are here and this is why we are making these statements to the Secretariat. Let us all work with the Secretariat to improve those challenges, but this should not mean that we delay the programmes that we have committed ourselves to implement. Since Monterrey, the World Summit on Sustainable Development Conference in South Africa, the World Food Summit: *five years later*, we have discussed the budget and this is the very first budget we are discussing to try and put into action what we have been committing ourselves to.

Therefore, if our first budget cannot even reflect some of those objectives, what have we been talking about? Have we just been putting out press statements to entertain the world? We have to ensure that we begin to make a difference in what we are doing, begin to make a difference among the hungry. This year's budget should be focused in programmes that reduce hunger and increase agricultural productivity. We are quite pleased to hear that there are some normative functions that are being recommended to ensure that the evaluative mechanism in the field would be strengthened and I thought that, with that put in place, we would be able to meet the concerns

of those who are financing the programmes and the concerns of those who are at the receiving end.

With that, I think, in Monterrey we were cheating the world, because we talked of increasing the ODA and we have heard in many instances, when we refer to Monterrey, that we are increasing the ODA. Are we saying we are only increasing the ODA for other sectors?, for Africa, if we are increasing the ODA and we wanted to make an impact, agriculture is the sector in which to increase the ODA, not in other sectors? Other sectors can only emerge from the successes in agriculture. We are all appreciative of the efficiency, the requirements that are being requested by our partners and we, from the receiving end, undertake to do our part, to do the reporting measures that would please our donors. Sometimes we would like to invite you to come and see your projects, because many a time you are making assessments of projects that you do not know, projects where you think your money is not deriving any value. We would like you to make those visits, to go and see what you are financing, because we believe FAO is making a difference through those resources that we are channelling into the productive sector in agriculture.

At the same time, I would like to accept that the adjustments and suggestions that have been made from the House should be taken seriously by the Administration, to see that we meet each other halfway, so that the establishment and any administrative savings we can effect in the programme are built within the budget. For the Programme operations we recommend a Real Growth Budget, that is if we are really committed to the objectives of the World Food Summit: *five years later*, to the objectives of Monterrey and the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development. The field programmes and projects would ensure that there is food on the tables of many hungry people.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

I would like firstly to associate ourselves with many of the comments that were made by the United States of America and Japan in relation to budget levels, efficiency savings and prioritization. Australia notes that the Programme of Work and Budget has been prepared on the basis of Real Growth, in funding with an indication of reduction in programmes that would occur if the funding were only to be Zero Real Growth. While Australia applauds the explicit consideration of different funding assumptions, we believe that the framing of the PWB around the base case of RG for the next biennium is unrealistic, as recent funding levels for FAO have generally been of a Zero Nominal Growth.

In our view, a more realistic approach would have been to have a base assumption of ZNG, with an indication of extra funding for programmes and new programmes which might be funded, if ZRG were available. In light of the experience of recent biennia, ZRG is the most optimistic, rather than the most pessimistic, outcome likely. Australia's concern is that by choosing these two assumptions the range of programmes included in the document, as currently drafted, would not be able to be delivered if the Conference decides on a ZNG funding level.

We would, therefore, also insist that a further scenario ZNG be added to the Programme of Work and Budget, so that Members will not be making decisions in the dark on the impact of a Nominal Growth budget. We would also, in this regard, wish to be clear that ZNG is also the Australian Government's position on the appropriate budget level for FAO.

Australia has also made some comments on priority-setting and we do not intend to repeat these here. We would, however, wish to comment on the implications of priority-setting in the context of our consideration of the current budget proposal. In particular, Australia is concerned that the current draft of the Programme of Work and Budget before us identifies a number of areas for significant reductions if the budget moves from RG to ZRG, which had previously been identified by many Members as being areas of very high priority. This is clearly unsatisfactory and reflects what we consider to be the unresponsiveness of the Secretariat to the expressed views of the Members. This only provides further support for the need to change FAO's priority-setting mechanisms.

Having said that, we consider that some very clear guidance has been provided to the Secretariat by members, through the recent policy in our Governing Body Committees, and that these provide a clear basis on which to revise the Programme of Work and Budget, bearing in mind the outcomes of the meeting have not yet been reflected in a document we have. In particular, and without going into detail, because we are all aware of the conclusions of the recent Programme Committee, as outlined by the Chair of the Programme Committee, we would again highlight the very clear guidance that has been provided by the Programme Committee on funding of the IPPC, Codex, Fisheries and Forestry.

On this issue, we would also reiterate the comments of the United States of America in relation to the lack of attention paid to the IPPC in the document outlining the impact of technical Committees and we would certainly welcome some clarification on that from Mr Wade.

We have also sought to provide guidance during the Committees on areas of work that can be reduced or eliminated to enable more effective use of FAO's resources, to be directed to higher priority areas. In this regard we welcome the decision to reduce funding to the food chain strategy and to reallocate these savings equally to the work of the Codex Alimentarius and to related scientific assessment work. This is a positive example of actual prioritization by Members, albeit one that we should not have needed to address in the first place, as we believe FAO should be focusing on what it currently does and what Members have already identified as high priorities first.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

We have consumed all our time but I have two speakers on my list. I want to see if there are other speakers, as I said we will continue tomorrow morning but if we do not have your indulgence we can conclude. It seems that we have to continue it tomorrow. The Secretariat will make the list of speakers for tomorrow morning and, today, we adjourn our meeting.

*The meeting rose at 18.00 hours*

*La séance est levée à 18 h 00*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 18.00 horas*

# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>FIFTH PLENARY MEETING CINQUÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>25 June 2003</b>

The Fifth Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.00 hours

Mr Aziz Mekouar,

Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La cinquième séance plénière est ouverte à 10 h 00

sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,

Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la quinta sesión plenaria a las 10.00 horas

bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,

Presidente Independiente del Consejo

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous allons reprendre nos travaux, je vous prie d'excuser mon retard et je déclare ouverte la cinquième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil.

Avant de reprendre nos travaux, nous allons assister à la présentation multimédia intitulée: "Réforme, budget et personnel", préparée par la Division de l'information de l'Organisation

### **MULTIMEDIA PRESENTATION PRÉSENTATION MULTIMÉDIA PRESENTACIÓN MULTIMEDIA**

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Merci à la Division de l'information pour cette présentation.

Nous reprenons maintenant l'examen du point 12 de l'ordre du jour: Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005". Je rappelle que le document qui se réfère à ce point est le document CL 124/3.

## **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)

#### **12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continued)

#### **12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (suite)

#### **12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continuación)

#### **Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

I had thought my interventions of yesterday would have taken care of some of the observations I want to make this morning. However, having listened carefully to the comments made by some of the speakers, towards the end of the day yesterday, I feel constrained to make a few observations. My comments are going to be restricted to the budget level itself.

Last night, I contacted my colleagues in Abuja to hear their opinion, regarding one or two areas which I consider rather distressing. The comments that came yesterday were worrying for two reasons: firstly, it came from some of the leading donors of this Organization; and secondly, the request implied in those comments amounted to saying that we should go back to a drawing board and talk about the Zero Nominal Growth.

I would not want to be simply playing the role of an advocate for FAO, but I think this is an international organization which is owned by all of us. Therefore, I can rightly claim that Nigeria is a major stakeholder of this Organization. On that account I would like to make a special plea.

The presentation we have just witnessed has captured one of the major points which I wish to raise. Since my two-year association with the Organization, I have read through documents, pronouncements and speeches that, since 1994, there has been an effort to reduce the cost of managing this Organization and even the operational costs.

I would like to presume that what influenced the decision at that time was the clear objective to induce some financial discipline, prudence, efficiency and to eliminate wastage. Since then, nine years have gone by and we are still in the same process. If the intention was to squeeze inefficiency and wastage out of the system, it is my humble opinion that we are not getting to a

point where we are about to squeeze blood out of the Organization itself. In other words, it would appear that we do not seem to accept that there is a limiting point at which this should be stopped.

From the documents I have read, particularly the one we are confronted with today, document CL 124/3, page 24, Risk Assessment, paragraph 76, there is a very specific implication of the Zero Nominal Growth. The last paragraph on that page indicates that a ZNG contribution would mean a substantial increase and if we are to adopt that process it would mean a drastic cut of US\$34 million from FAO's budget. Paragraphs 89 to 92 give some details of the savings that the Organization has made over the years - we have seen some on the presentation of this morning. Even some of the speakers yesterday acknowledged these savings, that is, US\$55 to US\$60 million.

From my little understanding of what has been going on and what I have been able to read, Nigeria is satisfied that FAO has taken steps to save on costs. It has rationalized its operations, it has streamlined, it has decentralized and downsized over this nine-year period. Yet, we are being told today that we have not gone far enough. Therefore, the proposal of a Real Growth is not just unrealistic - as per the presentation of some of our distinguished Members - but even the ZRG should not be discussed, but as shown on this morning's presentation, we should go back to the ZNG which would amount to a reduction in absolute terms of approximately US\$100 million.

I am worried, in the sense that I have had the rare privilege of listening very carefully to the presentations and some of the international events, which have taken place in the last two years: The Conference on Least Developed Countries in Brussels, the Conference on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, the International Conference on Financing for Development in Mexico and, above all, the World Food Summit: *five years later*. The declarations and the pronouncements that were made at these conferences were very encouraging. The developing world was therefore left with the impression that we had finally become of age and were about to start.

Those who would have made the most significant contribution to this are the ones who are making fundamental reservations about whether we should even talk about increasing our level of contributions. I could not agree more with Her Excellency the Ambassador of Zimbabwe as to observations she made yesterday. We may have reached a point whereby we may request those who feel strongly and maybe justifiably, to not give their resources to where it is being perceived as going to waste. I may not be a rich man, but even the very rich people would not want to do that. Therefore, one can appreciate the anxiety and the worry by the members, particularly, the donors to this Organization.

It might help us if we now came down to the nitty gritty and tried to identify which areas should be further either eliminated or downplayed in the proposals of this Organization. Because even in the document, there are areas which will be adversely affected by the ZRG, the ZNG, etc. These have been indicated, if we are to stick to the Zero Real Growth, and hence the proposal for the Real Growth. Now we are being told that the indications in the document are not sufficient. At least, that is my understanding of what I have heard so far.

Maybe there is something in this proposal that some of us have not addressed our minds to. The time has come, and I would like to make a special plea, that the membership of this Council clearly indicate if we still need to cut, exactly which are the areas we are talking about. I mean that I do have sympathy for FAO accepting the proposals from the Membership, but I also have sympathy for those who are insisting that it must be done efficiently. We have now reached a point where we are trying to join the demands with what the Membership of the Council itself feels. If after all these years we have not as yet reached a point where the membership of the Council will want to accept that we should move on, then there is something we have not been informed about.

I think the time has come for us to be told, at least, in clear terms which areas FAO should look at, so that those areas are tabled to the Council and all of us may debate and accept or reject, rather

than this question of asking the Organization to go back and do its homework, while some of us are trying to refuse the document with the belief that we have come a long way.

I must confess that I am very disturbed and worried – in fact I am frightened – because the implication of what we are saying is that we want to remain where we were ten years ago, and yet also grow. The two cannot work. It is my belief that, even though the Organization itself is indicating here that they have met this efficiency in savings without negatively impacting on the quality of the services, they have been able to render – which is great – I am, however, of the view that they probably have now reached a point where even that can go no further.

I would like to conclude my statement this way: (1) I totally support the statement issued by the Chairman of the Africa Group, Her Excellency the Ambassador of Zimbabwe on this subject; (2) that Nigeria would want to record its apprehension and anxiety over the proposal that we should go back to the ZNG which sounds very frightening; and (3) that the Membership should help both FAO Management and the other less informed Members of the Council as to what areas we need to revisit specifically, in order to be able to tackle what we need to address.

At the rate we are going, we will spend the Thirty-second Session of the Conference discussing the same scenarios again. I feel that I have nothing else to advise my Government, because this matter was raised, we concluded, we saw the papers, we drew our own conclusions, but now the anxiety on the floor is that we are talking about something that we never even envisaged, talking about ZNG. Therefore, as I have previously mentioned, maybe the time has come for us to be given an indication as to which areas need to be addressed.

**Paul MURPHY (Canada)**

Canada made comments on its programming priorities during its interventions at the Council meeting last autumn and the COAG meeting in April and we will restrict our remarks here to the issue of overall budget levels. In that regard, Canada commends the Secretariat on the progress made in developing a budget, which reflects the main programme parameters set out in the Medium-Term Plan for 2004-2009 and the longer term orientations in the Strategic Framework. As a strong supporter of the work of FAO, we are pleased that the results-based budgeting of principles have been used to bring the Organization closer in line with modern management practices.

Canada recognizes that FAO faces many demands and high expectations from its membership and such imperatives as the millennium development goals. However, we believe that the proposed level for the next biennium budget is unrealistically high. Some members are already having difficulty in paying current level of assessment and, in our view, what FAO is proposing for 2004-2005 will not be sustainable.

Canada continues to believe that FAO, like any large organization, should continuously reform, so as to become more efficient, effective and productive. Part of that reform must be financial discipline. Hard choices have to be made in determining funding priorities, as the most focused use of resources remains an important component of good governance. It is important that FAO be an Organization that delivers the highest standards of budget discipline and efficiency. At this point in our deliberations, we are not convinced that the case has been made for a budget increase, particularly given the inability to set priorities.

As it concerns priority setting, Canada reiterates its long-standing request that the Secretariat prepare a Zero Nominal Growth budget scenario. We ask for a Zero Nominal Growth budget scenario so that Canada and all members can assess in detail the implications of such an approach and can understand in detail what additional benefits higher levels of spending would buy.

Regarding after-service medical coverage cost, we believe that in principle these costs should be treated in the same manner as other costs of the Organization, and prioritized accordingly. At the same time, we appreciate that the costs involved have an impact on the FAO budget and therefore, we shall listen with interest to the views of other delegations.



My delegation looks forward to working with others present to reach an agreement on the overall size and shape of the budget.

**Veli-Pekka TALVELA (Finlande)**

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je voudrais simplement vous demander de donner la parole à la délégation de la Grèce au nom de l'Union européenne.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

My statement is on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. As we have said previously, we attach great importance to achieving a well-balanced and transparent Programme of Work and Budget, which reflects the priorities of the Membership. We welcome the methodological improvements that have been made in this document. There is more and better information on extra-budgetary funding.

We note from the Report of the Finance Committee that the calculation of cost increases is based on an improved forecasting model. The discussion of risks in paragraphs 75 to 84, which appears for the first time, is important and welcome. We look forward to the further development of this approach.

We are also glad to see a much fuller discussion of efficiencies achieved by the Organization and the scope for further efficiency gains. It is difficult to have an objective discussion on the scope for efficiency gains, unless FAO is willing to benchmark itself against other Organizations. But our sense is that such a scope does exist, as indeed it does in most Organizations. While accordingly disappointed that the Summary Programme of Work and Budget does not include quantified efficiency targets, we note from paragraphs 99 to 102, that the Secretariat intends to address the question of efficiency by undertaking analysis of strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to reach non-technical programme entities dealing with service-effectiveness and delivery. However, according to paragraph 101, it would take three biennia to review all the programmes in this way. We think that six years is much too long for such an important task and we should like to know what it would take to complete it sooner.

As we have explained previously, we attach importance to the six strategies to address cross-organizational issues, namely insuring excellency, in-house inter-disciplinarity, broadening partnerships and alliances, continuing to improve the management process, level of resources for FAO and its membership and communicating FAO's messages. These were first outlined in the Strategic Framework. Part 3 of the latest Medium-Term Plan for the period 2004-2009 contains what we would regard as the first properly developed statement of those strategies. All of them have to do with strengthening FAO as an Organization, they are vitally important. But the promise of the Medium-Term Plan has not been followed through, the strategies have practically disappeared from view in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

Paragraph 27 of the Summary Programme of Work and Budget says merely that "Those priority actions listed in the Medium-Term Plan, which were deemed to be available to immediate implementation within the prescribed resource scenarios, have been taken into account in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget". What does that mean? Where are the priority actions? How can we make our own assessment of priorities? More generally, to whom has the responsibility for managing its strategy been assigned and how will progress be monitored and reported to the Governing Bodies.

The Priority Areas for Inter-disciplinary Action, PAIAs, are of the utmost importance in order to make full and effective use of the existing knowledge, expertise and resources of the Organization. Many of today's challenges in agriculture and rural development require a greater inter-disciplinary response. We note with great satisfaction the main streaming of gender issues through the new PAIA on gender and development and we hope that this priority area for inter-disciplinary action will address as well the HIV/AIDS epidemic, as this affects many women in the developing countries.

We would like the Programme Committee to be informed in the near future of the experience so far with PAIAs and prospects for the future, for example, regarding effectiveness, the number of priority areas and separate budget allocation for PAIAs.

We have expressed our desire to see a more effective priority-setting process in FAO on previous occasions in several Governing Bodies. We therefore welcome the on-going work by the Programme Committee on this important method. Priority-setting involves ranking activities and programmes, irrespective of the budget level, and determining the relative weight. The aim is to allocate the resources rationally to selected programmes, given the intergovernmental nature of FAO. The process of priority-setting is political in nature and cannot rely simply on methodology. Accordingly, the co-challenge is to foster membership involvement in programme planning, but the Secretariat needs to play a more active role in order to make the process more transparent, by presenting clear choices based on suggestions by the membership.

We encourage the Programme Committee to continue this discussion and look forward to recommendations on how to improve the current practice. In the meantime, we ask the Secretariat to take full account of the priorities expressed by the Membership in the technical committees in developing the full Programme of Work and Budget. A particular concern for the European Community is the need to re-address the budgetary balance between agriculture, forestry and fisheries. We made this point in the technical committees, as did many others. The allocations for fisheries and forestry, particularly in the Zero Real Growth scenarios Summary Programme of Work and Budget, are not in our opinion satisfactory. We should strengthen the normative activities of FAO, for example, the Codex Alimentarius, the IPPC, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Food safety is an issue of growing importance, not least for developing countries.

We fully support the work on food safety in the context of a food chain approach, where the responsibility of all actors along the production and distribution chain is recognized.

Ethical aspects are of growing importance for food and agricultural policies and FAO should contribute with others substantially to this. We accordingly call for adequate resources to be allocated to these areas of work.

We would like to stress, as we have done previously, the importance of making adequate financial provision for FAO's administrative infrastructure. This is essential if the Organization is to be an effective and efficient deliverer of services to the Membership.

The sad history of the ORACLE project is a salutary reminder of what can go wrong if an Organization fails to invest adequately in the systems needed to sustain its business. We welcome the presentation of two scenarios in the document. It is especially useful to have the Secretariat's view of the impact of Zero Real Growth set out in boxes, but we join others in regretting that the membership has not been offered the scenario involving a lower level of resources than Zero Real Growth.

An alternate budget scenario framed in these terms would help a membership grapple with a difficult question of prioritization. It is perfectly proper for the membership to say to FAO, "tell us how you would cope with less money, not because we will necessarily hold you to that, but because the reason you put forward will help us make up our own minds how to act".

The European Community and its Member States would accordingly be grateful to know how the Secretariat would adapt the budget on the hypothesis that the loss of purchasing power, attributed to the fall in the value of the dollar, was fully compensated, but the Organization had to absorb both the projected cost increases and the first instalment of the proposed funding plan for after-service medical costs. We pose the question because the answer will help us to come to the conclusion on an appropriate level for the budget. Moreover, we think that the membership at large will find it helpful to consider such a scenario. We should be surprised if the Secretariat had not done some contingency work on the scenario lower than Zero Real Growth. We therefore hope and expect that the answer to our question will be readily forthcoming.

We undertake to give a prompt and serious consideration alongside the scenarios already displayed in the document.

**Haris ZANNETIS (Cyprus)**

The delegations of Cyprus would like to make the following statement speaking on behalf of the countries in accession to the European Community. The countries acceding to the European Union and represented at this Session of the Council namely Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia wish to associate themselves with the statement just made by the delegate of Greece, who spoke on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)**

The Philippines would like to express its support to the Real Growth budget proposed by the Director-General in document CL 124/3, even if this means increasing our regular contribution to the Organization. We share his views on the justifications provided by the document, identified in his introduction.

For instance, in various reports of the technical committees, which have been identified by previous speakers such as Peru and Mexico, funding for the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the International Plant Protection Convention should be increased. The increase can only come from an expanded budget, if Member countries do not want to cut the budget from other sources.

In another instance, the Secretariat has to implement new and major international agreements such as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources as well as the Rotterdam Convention for Prior Informed Consent, the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the other international Plans of Action. Again, these need money and the money has to come either from increased contributions or from a cutback on other items.

We have also emphasized time and again the need for the Secretariat to support the capacity-building projects in developing countries.

The Organization has had a number of budget cutbacks for the past biennia. Nigeria earlier made a very eloquent statement on this matter.

We believe that as we continue to impose more and more demands on the Organization, with rising expectations and deteriorating exchange rates, the Organization should be provided the funds it needs.

Finally, we believe that should the Organization be denied the funds it requests, then ultimately the number of hungry and malnourished will geometrically increase rather than decrease, as we previously declared in 1996 and in 2002.

We also have some specific matters of concern. Firstly, regarding agricultural water use efficiency and conservation on page 57, we notice that there were two outputs reduced in the Zero Real Growth. We believe the importance of water as a resource is not enough. In the next few years we might already experience shortages.

Secondly, on pages 60 and 67 in both scenarios for the activities of the International Rice Commission, we notice that there was a budget reduction and, under this activity, we would note that the International Year of the Rice falls under this section. As you are aware, next year we will be celebrating the International Year of the Rice. We esteem rice is life. However, we understand that it only got US\$150 000 from the arrears the Organization just received. We believe this is not enough. We hope that this can be remedied by extra-budgetary funding.

Lastly, in the sub-section Veterinarian Public Health Management, we are also concerned that there were three outputs reduced under the Zero Real Growth scenario. In the interest of public health, it is prudent not only to be concerned with insect-borne diseases, but also animal-borne diseases in general, in view of the SARS outbreak, aerial flu in Asia and mad cow disease in Europe, and others.

**KIM EUNG-BON (Korea, Republic of)**

First of all, I would like to comment on the previous agenda Item 15.3, the Split Assessments, that I missed intervening in yesterday. At the moment we need more time to examine the effect of Split Assessments. This is a new system, and we should be careful, because this may have huge impacts on the Organization's financial situation.

We have to examine possible side-effects of this new system, and I would like to ask the Finance Committee to discuss this further in its next Session.

Now, I will move to this agenda. I would like to note the following points regarding the Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005.

Firstly, the budget for FAO should be based on the situation and the perspective of the world economy. In this regard, the world economy in 2003 is expected to mark 2.5 percent of growth, falling from that of last year, due to the delayed recovery of the advanced economies, and the uncertainties of the international financial market. Moreover, growth will decrease further in the long-term perspective.

Secondly, I would like to ask for more efforts in reforming FAO. The efficiency of the Organization has been enhanced thanks to continuous restructuring, but it is our understanding that there is room for further improvement.

As mentioned in paragraph 94 in this report, my delegation would like to suggest that FAO has to continue the efforts of streamlining other administrative operations and financial procedures to eliminate unnecessary processes and reduce requirements for staff. Such efforts should be made in a way to be directly connected with reduction of human resources and budgets.

Thirdly, more efforts should be made in finding areas where FAO can cut down expenses, such as, improving the circulation of publications.

The meeting document sent by post is not really helpful to Members as it arrives late. Moreover, most agendas are posted on the FAO homepage at the last moment. I think if all the documents relating to the meeting were posted on the homepage promptly, no mailing service would be required. Then, it would save a considerable amount of expense and labour. Mailing services could be provided on request.

Fourth, it is important to save labour and expense by integrating and consolidating similar businesses in an aggressive manner, through systematic cooperation among Rome-based international agricultural organizations.

It is also necessary to set priorities among business areas so that the Organization can properly respond to changes of the global agricultural environments. Based on priority, it is advisable to stop pursuing low-priority businesses or cut the budget for them sharply.

Fifth, a reasonable explanation on the reason of increasing programme management budget, shown in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, should be provided. The Programme management budget increased, for the year, by around 4 percent based on the Real Growth. It is not really understandable why such an increase occurred.

Sixth, the fact that the number of contributions outstanding for each Member is increasing should be taken into consideration when the Organization sets the budget for the Regular Programme.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that the Secretariat propose the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005 based on Zero Nominal Growth, considering all the points that my delegation has made.

Lastly, I would like to express my delegation's position regarding the budget for the International Year of Rice 2004.

As the Filipino delegate mentioned, it is very regrettable that even Real Growth Budget does not reflect any resource for implementing the International Year of Rice. I would also like to hear any

developments for making extra-budgetary resources for implementing the International Year of Rice in FAO dimension.

**Ms Rahma MSHANGAMA (Tanzania, United Republic of)**

Let me start by congratulating the Secretariat for a comprehensive budget document, like many other speakers have done.

I do support the statement made by Zimbabwe that we should implement practically the commitments already made in the various world fora.

My delegation appreciates the long time and enormous support rendered by the people and governments of the United States of America, Japan and other donors to FAO, but we still urge them to continue to do so because poverty, hunger and malnutrition are still rampant in most developing countries. We strongly urge other strong economies, particularly the European Community, to emulate and provide more support to FAO and through bilateral agreements.

We propose that most support should be focused on capacity-building so that recipient countries become food independent. In this regard, we support FAO's Special Programme for Food Security and Technical Assistance Programmes rendered.

We are equally concerned with the financial constraints FAO is experiencing and is likely to experience. However, we request FAO to revisit its plans so that an adequate balance between normative activities of general interest and operational activities of direct benefit to needy farmers is struck.

We very much support the technical and economic programmes supported by FAO, but we still see there is room to invest in the livestock sector, which sustains the livelihoods of many people in developing countries. Areas of interest should be capacity-building, livestock production and marketing, processing - especially in SMEs - and control of more livestock diseases than indicated. We should like to see livestock given the weight of a major programme of its own, like fisheries and forestry, rather than a small programme in the support services.

The majority of rural people in developing countries, who live in poverty and hunger, depend on agriculture. We observe prolonged drought in most parts of Africa. The United Republic of Tanzania undertook a study on the Irrigation Master Plan, and we believe its implementation would increase agriculture productivity to farmers and raise their incomes. This initiative needs support from FAO and other development partners in order to put it into reality.

The Special Programme for Food Security is another area where poor farmers in selected areas were relieved from poverty. The success obtained from the Special Programme for Food Security calls for additional funds to the Programme, as it directly targets the poor. To our surprise, we observe that funds to improve irrigation systems and for the Special Programme for Food Security will be reduced under Zero Real Growth.

Finally, my delegation supports and endorses the budget based on a Real Growth scenario.

**Jean Norbert DIRAMBA (Gabon)**

La délégation du Gabon félicite le Secrétariat pour le travail accompli et la qualité du sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005. Nous faisons nôtre la déclaration faite par la délégation du Zimbabwe, au nom du Groupe africain, sur ce point, hier après-midi, ainsi que celle toute récente, du Nigéria. Nous appuyons la proposition du Directeur général de la FAO visant à adopter l'organisation d'un budget de Croissance Réelle. Nous estimons que la prise en compte des engagements internationaux récents, des priorités du Cadre stratégique et du Plan à moyen terme de la FAO, ainsi que des avis des Comités techniques, ne peut se traduire en faits concrets pour le développement agricole et la lutte contre la faim, sans les ressources adéquates.

Nous réitérons notre attachement au Programme de coopération technique, au Chapitre coopération et partenariat, et à certains grands programmes comme les pêches et les forêts et

souhaiterions voir la mise en œuvre du renforcement de ce secteur dans le sens de la croissance réelle proposée dans le sommaire.

A cet égard, nous voudrions rappeler que le Comité financier et le Comité du programme, tout en préconisant un équilibre approprié entre les différentes activités de la FAO, ont souligné l'importance des activités sur le terrain et autres activités opérationnelles pour le renforcement des capacités à l'échelle nationale et le bénéfice des communautés d'agriculteurs dans les régions déshéritées.

Nous notons avec préoccupation la défiance constante de certains Pays Membres à l'égard de ces activités. A cet égard, nous comprenons l'invitation lancée par la délégation du Zimbabwe aux pays donateurs à visiter les projets de terrain, visites qui ont, en général, le mérite de l'éloquence des faits. Nous espérons que notre Conseil, puis la Conférence, pourront atteindre un consensus sur un montant du budget approprié pour la réalisation de ses objectifs d'aide aux populations nécessiteuses.

**Ackah Pierre ANGNIMAN (Côte d'Ivoire)**

Je vous remercie de me donner la parole et de permettre à la délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire d'exprimer son point de vue sur le sujet crucial du sommaire du Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005.

Ma délégation soutient l'intervention de l'Ambassadeur du Zimbabwe, faite au nom du Groupe africain, et qui touche l'ensemble des engagements pris par notre Organisation commune au cours des différents sommets.

Mon pays est un pays pauvre et faible, qui est reconnaissant aux efforts de la FAO et de tous les pays amis pour le soutien à son développement, notamment les efforts des Gouvernements des États-Unis, de l'Union européenne, du Japon, du Canada et tous les autres pays qui contribuent pour l'essentiel au budget de notre Organisation.

Le Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005 appelle de la part de ma délégation deux observations principales. La première concerne l'attente de mon pays et la deuxième concerne la nécessité d'aborder certaines questions de fond.

En ce qui concerne l'attente de mon pays, je voudrais illustrer cette attente par des points concrets. Le Rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du programme indique dans son paragraphe 15 que le Comité a reconnu que la mise en valeur de l'élevage et de l'eau, notamment en Afrique, conservait toute son importance. Le Programme de travail et de budget 2004-2005, dans son Grand Programme 2.1: Production agricole et système de soutien, présente le Programme 2.1.3: Élevage, avec des ressources budgétaires en réduction si l'on considère l'hypothèse de la Croissance Réelle Zéro.

En regardant le rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2003, que nous analyserons par la suite au Point 11, nous lisons que, d'après le groupe d'examineurs externes, le Service de la santé animale (AGAH) ne pourra pas assurer un bon niveau d'exécution de son programme sans un nouvel apport de ressources humaines. Il est donc recommandé à la FAO d'envisager sérieusement la possibilité de renforcer l'effectif du Service de la santé animale. Voilà un cas concret de notre dilemme.

Diminuer nos ressources, c'est-à-dire adopter un budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro ou à Croissance Nominale Zéro, comme le suggèrent certains pays, c'est condamner la FAO à opérer des coupes sombres dans des programmes qui touchent plusieurs de nos pays en développement.

Si j'ai pris cet exemple précis parmi tant d'autres, c'est parce que mon pays reconnaît l'apport réel de la FAO dans le cadre de la lutte contre la peste porcine africaine qui s'est déclarée dans mon pays, et qui a été jugulée avec l'appui de cette Organisation. De façon plus générale, le rôle de la FAO est indéniable pour la lutte contre la peste bovine dans le monde.

Au moment où nous avons donc besoin de consolider nos efforts, on nous demande de baisser les bras. C'est pourquoi, tout en étant sensible aux arguments évoqués par les uns et les autres, nous

plaidons pour un budget à Croissance Réelle et des moyens accrus pour différents programmes et différentes activités opérationnelles qui touchent nos pays en développement.

Je souhaite aussi aborder certaines questions de fond. Prenons le seul exemple de la production cotonnière dans le monde, chaque année, les États-Unis versent trois milliards de dollars de subventions à leurs 25 000 producteurs de coton, la Chine 1,2 milliards au sien, et l'Union européenne un million de dollars. Les producteurs de coton de l'Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre, qui eux, sont dix millions, souffrent de ces subventions, qui les contraignent à exporter leur coton à perte, avec un manque à gagner de 250 à 300 millions de dollars par an. Et cela ne concerne que le coton. Chaque année, des pays riches donnent 350 à 400 milliards de dollars de subventions déséquilibrantes à leurs agriculteurs contre 50 à 60 milliards de dollars d'aide publique au développement.

Voilà la réalité des chiffres! Et en prime, nous avons 800 millions de personnes qui souffrent de la faim. Nos discussions pour rechercher 50 à 60 millions de dollars, pour boucler un budget de la FAO à Croissance Réelle, ne sont-elles pas dérisoires face à ces enjeux du monde? Dans les faits, on étouffe plus qu'on ne soutient. Si nous le voulons, nous pouvons donner à la FAO les moyens de son action avec un budget à Croissance Réelle. Cela n'exclut pas les propositions pertinentes faites, pour rechercher, comme toujours, au sein de notre Organisation, l'efficacité dans l'administration et la gestion, la réduction de postes, le choix des priorités dans les programmes. Ce serait autant de moyens pour appuyer les actions des activités opérationnelles de terrain.

Nous souhaitons donc que notre Conseil adopte un budget à Croissance Réelle pour notre Organisation.

**LI ZHENG DONG (China) (Original language Chinese)**

We have just seen a Multimedia Presentation this morning before the Session. I believe that such a Presentation will help us in discussing the Programme of Work and Budget. From the Presentation, we could see that FAO, in the past decades, has been making great contributions to agricultural development, especially in the developing nations. FAO is an Organization for its hundred and eighty-three Members. Consequently, we believe that for the Organization to operate efficiently it is necessary to progressively increase its resources.

In the past biennia, the budget of FAO has increased at a very small rate. So, we believe that in discussing the present item we should take into consideration the nature and law of FAO, as well as the current situation and the past circumstances, so as to conduct efficiently the discussion of the present agenda item. The Chinese delegation could accept the proposal from previous figures in requesting the necessary reforms within FAO, with an appeal to step up its efficiency and its quality. Such a proposal, under any circumstance and at any time, could be considered as rational.

Our delegation attaches importance to this point. One example for this consideration is the quality of working languages. We feel that, in the past period, the quality of the Chinese service has not increased. We would urge the Secretariat to adopt necessary measures along this line.

Furthermore, in discussing the Programme of Work and Budget, we should also take into consideration the capacity of Member Nations to fulfil payments. Capacity for payment and the requirements of the Organization should be balanced so that we can carry out efficiently the Programme of Work and Budget of the Organization.

Now I would speak on the Programme of Work for the next biennium. The Chinese delegation supports the statement made by the Director-General, especially the eight priority areas mentioned in his statement.

FAO should continue its policy assistance and consultancy with Member Nations. In particular, FAO should support developing nations in actively participating in the standardizations of legislation regarding food and agriculture world-wide. FAO should also encourage and help these nations to participate in multilateral negotiations.

The Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) plays a role in the agricultural development of developing nations. The Chinese Government, as well as Governments of developing nations, have been consistently supporting the TCP activities conducted by FAO. However, we regret to take note that in the next biennium, under the Real Growth option, funding for TCP will not be increased. Consequently, the proportion of TCP in this Programme of Work will be decreased in comparison with the previous biennium.

Moreover, the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) of FAO has been conducive in helping Low-Income Food Deficit Countries in improving their food security situation. This Programme has been given a positive confirmation by the External Auditor. The SPFS has been given a positive role in many countries. Government authorities, peasants and farmers ask for the expansion of this Programme. We have taken note with concern that in the next biennium in terms of this Programme's budget, the funding will be decreased.

We have also taken note, with pleasure, that the Working Group on Aquaculture has not been taken into consideration under this RG option. The Chinese delegation wishes to express its concern over this issue. We believe that, under any circumstances, the Working Group on Aquaculture should be included in the regular Programme of Work and Budget.

**Mohammad Saied NOORI-NAEINI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

My delegation also joins others to congratulate the Secretariat for preparing a very good document on the item under consideration. My delegation strongly associates itself with the statements by India, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, the Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, Gabon and China. I would especially like to emphasize the support for a Real Growth project and as a component of that the TCP, SPFS and South-South Cooperation. These are modalities that are tailor-made to the problems of developing countries. Fortunately we have seen many improvements, especially in the management and implementation of TCP projects in the last biennium.

During some of the discussions in the corridors among our friends, we noticed that it is difficult to understand the real meaning of the titles of these three scenarios, which have been presented. It seems that the titles do not reflect the realities behind them, and somehow they are misleading. Talking about Real and Nominal, these two terms are used by economists when talking about money and purchasing power. Here in FAO, we are mostly talking about food, people, farmers, animals and they are all real. None of them are Nominal. So we should always have to talk about real things.

Following this explanation, let us now see our first scenario, which is Real Growth. We know that this is 5.5 percent growth relative to the last budget. So this is a growth budget. The difficulty is with the other two. When talking about Zero Real Growth, if it is a growth, how can it be zero? Growth means something is added relative to some benchmark. If not, then it is not growth. Therefore, this ZRG scenario, I think, is a no growth budget. What it reflects is that we are not considering any growth in the next biennium relative to the last biennium.

Most of the difficulty is with the ZNG, which is Zero Nominal Growth. It means that the next budget will be reduced at least by the level of inflation. So if you think about the realities, it means that the budget of FAO would be reduced for the next biennium. Consequently, the real title for this should be reduced growth, not ZNG. Most of the people have difficulty in understanding this, as they are foreigners in our organizations, experts in our capitals and this goes up to the levels of the Ministers. My advice is to, please, use understandable titles for these scenarios, which reflect the realities behind them, and then the discussion would be much easier.

How can ZNG or, in my terminology, reduced growth be consistent with the Millennium Development Goals, the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development objectives, World Food Summit objectives, by reducing the budget? Either in those meetings we promised things that we did not really mean, or here we are denying to keep the promises that we made.



There are some very pertinent suggestions about increasing efficiency, prioritization of activities in FAO, result-based budgeting or result-based programming. These are very positive suggestions and these should be taken into account by the Secretariat. We have discussed all these issues yesterday and I am not going to repeat them. However, we are stressing that the efficiency of the Organization should be increased. The Director-General said that during the past few years the number of staff of FAO has been decreased by 28 percent, this means we have lost one third of the staff of FAO. Is there really any more room for further cuts? Do we assume that previously this Organization was working very inefficiently? I believe this is not the case.

The Chairman of the Programme Committee, Mr. Hankey, yesterday explained and expressed that the Programme Committee is really unable to make a thorough and in-depth study of all these issues, so there are few meetings and lots of other things to do.

I would like to support the suggestion made by the distinguished delegate of India to create a Working Group, composed mainly of people who are here and who are familiar with the issues to work on. This Working Group could come up with realistic suggestions to be introduced into the Programme of Work and Budget.

Finally, I would like to say that we know that the economic situation in the world is very tight. I wish to finish my statement by a Persian proverb which says that real friends are those who come to help and rescue in time of hardship. In time of affluence, everybody is a friend.

**Veli-Pekka TALVELA (Finland)**

Finland speaks here on behalf of the Nordic Countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland. We also want to give our support to the statement made here by the delegation of Greece on behalf of the European Community and its fifteen Member States. The Summary Programme of Work and Budget for 2004-2005 gives us two alternative options to the FAO budget, the RG level and the ZRG level.

We appreciate the illustrative way in which these two options have been presented. The impact of the ZRG resource level has been clearly indicated after each budget entity. The Nordic countries want to join all the others who are concerned about the impact of the weakening US dollar against the Euro to the FAO budget. We ask the Secretariat to intensify work so that the next Conference is able to make a final decision on Split Assessments.

The matter of priority setting comes up when preparing a budget for any Organization. We would like to recall the observation made by the Committee of Agriculture that the increasing demand for FAO services and the policy of budget restraint of many countries creates an unavoidable need for the prioritization of programmes.

We appreciate the initiative taken by the Secretariat, but we also support COAG's call for a more active role of the Secretariat in guiding the Membership in setting priorities. By the same token, we are fully aware of all the difficulties involved and of the political nature of the work. In this context, we want to point out that in future priority-setting, the comparative advantages of FAO are duly observed.

After these general remarks, the Nordic Countries would like to take up some issues which are of particular importance to us. In the Nordic Countries, considerations to minimize threats to human, animal and plant health and life caused by pests and diseases play an important role in designing and applying production systems in agriculture, horticulture and forestry. To our countries, the IPPC is of considerable significance as the global, multilateral instrument to secure common action in protecting the world's cultivation of natural plant resources from the spread of plant pests and diseases, while minimizing interference with international movements of goods and people.

The Fifth Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures of the IPPC in April 2003 endorsed a Business Plan which specified minimum core activities of the ICPM and which budgeted the resources necessary to implement them. The Nordic Countries would strongly recommend that the IPPC Secretariat be provided with adequate resources.

The Nordic Countries also attach much importance to the work of Codex and would thus like to point out that the Organization's financing must be ensured as well. In addition, we would like to stress the importance of allocation of adequate resources to the Interim Committee for the International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA).

The Committee of Agriculture, at its Seventeenth Session, as well as the Sixty fourth Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems, requested that the Organization examine the possibility of combining the COAG and CCP meetings, in order to achieve efficiency savings, improve participation and encourage more strategic discussion on the issues. The Committees asked the Secretariat to prepare a note on alternative arrangements for consideration at the Programme and Finance Committees and at the Council.

The Nordic Countries look forward to the Secretariat's note and would welcome appropriate steps to be taken in order to proceed in this matter. In general, modern information technology offers possibilities to prepare and distribute statistics, as well as reviews on ongoing developments, also during the period between meetings.

Accordingly, meetings could be made shorter and focus on exchanging views on more strategic issues and, in some cases, meetings related to each other could even be merged.

When studying the SPWB, we noticed that Major Programme 3.4, FAO Representatives, is receiving increased allocations in the proposed RG and ZRG scenarios for Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005. Having also studied Council document CL 124/INF/14, which is composed in part of JIU's Review of Management and Administration in FAO, we are hesitant about this increase in the allocations of programme 3.4.

While emphasizing the importance of the coordination and harmonization processes in the field, we are of the opinion that the points brought up by the JIU should be adequately addressed prior to the expansion of the Programme. Simply increasing the allocations for the Programme would not be adequate in this respect.

A final point concerns the need of redressing the budgetary balance between Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. This is something that has been mentioned previously by us and by many other members in the Technical Committees this spring. The Medium-Term Plan proposes some redressing in favour of Fisheries and Forestry and this should be reflected in the Programme of Work and Budget for 2004-2005. The allocations for Fisheries and Forestry, particularly in the ZRG scenario in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget are not, in our opinion, satisfactory. It is our hope that the priorities of the Membership will be taken into account more accurately in the full Programme of Work and Budget.

**Ilia KRASTELNIKOV (Bulgaria)**

The Republic of Bulgaria, which is in the second group of the 5 in the enlargement of the European Union, would like to associate itself with the statement made by Greece on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States, which was supported also by Cyprus on behalf of the accession countries present at this session of the Council, and by Finland on behalf of the Nordic Countries.

**Natigor SIAGIAN (Indonesia)**

At the outset let me express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretariat, to the Programme Committee, to the Finance Committee for all that has been done in preparing this very important document for us. This is a very important one. While we are now in the stage of considering this Summary Programme of Work and Budget, we understand that the basis of all of this is our commitment for the alleviation of poverty, for the alleviation of hunger and for rural development. We are therefore following with great attention the explanations of the Director-General that we need to move forward in these efforts, especially for food security, otherwise it is very difficult to fulfil the mandate, that we have been given through the World Food Summit. As the previous speaker has stated, we have a commitment to the output of the

World Food Summit, the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Monterrey and even the Doha Declaration.

All in all, it should be a progressive move towards the alleviation of poverty and hunger. I therefore take note of the African Group statement, that is, the statement especially expressed by Her Excellency, the Ambassador of Zimbabwe, and the delegation leaders. As my colleague of the Philippines has stated, I would like to support this statement and therefore not to repeat it. However, there are some notes here and there on this document. The scenario of our Programme of Work and Budget is the scenario, as I have explained before, to move towards the alleviation of poverty and hunger. This should be effected through works in the sectors of agriculture production, water irrigation, and the strengthening of livestock.

On the other side of the coin, we need to also strengthen FAO's work in capacity-building, especially for the developing countries, so as to prepare them for a timely takeover of all the agriculture development activities. We need the serious assistance of FAO to the developing countries to prepare them for the future of development. Therefore, the capacity-building programme, including the preparation of work by the developing countries for the negotiations, needs urgent attention. I want to support the increase of the budget in these sectors of capacity-building.

Besides these activities, that have been stated by the previous speaker, is the work of FAO in the Special Programme for Food Security. This is a very important Programme for the food security activities of the Member Nations. It is a Programme that will really and concretely encourage the developing countries to fulfil the task for food security in their countries. I would also like to support the work of FAO in this field.

Lastly, in the field of managing FAO activities, we understand that there is a need to maintain FAO Representative activities in the field. There are problems, therefore, which need a more effective and efficient management. We also want to support the strengthening of FAO Representative and FAO Regional Office activities. To strengthen means to make them more effective and efficient, within the agreed budget allocations.

Finally, let me express my full support to the efforts of the Director-General in preparing the full document of the Programme of Work and Budget for timely consideration of our Conference. We support the need of having a Real Growth of the Programme of Work and Budget.

**Ms Maryam Ahmed Moustafa MOUSA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

I congratulate the Secretariat on this document and my delegation is in favour of the option of a Real Growth Budget. We support the proposal made by the Director-General in that respect. We also endorse the priorities found in the Summary Programme Work and Budget. We insist on the importance of field activities and the importance of strengthening the capacity of developing countries, in order to enable them to make an effective contribution to negotiations in trade and agriculture commodities.

I would like to insist on the importance of the programmes implemented for agriculture, because of the changes that are taking place in agriculture throughout the world and the disastrous effects of natural disasters and climatic change, especially in the case of sub-Saharan Africa. These are a whole series of challenges, which mean that the activities of the Committee on Agriculture are of vital importance. They are indeed the keystone to the intervention of this Organization. I would, therefore, like to stress the importance of the support given to the programmes in that sector, particularly the strengthening of grain cereal production, rice production, and the importance of genetic resources, of combating diseases. Similarly, we believe, that further funding should be made available for the effective implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention and the strengthening of the interim activities concerning plant genetic resources.

**Abdoulaye ABOUBAKARY (Cameroun)**

Permettez-moi, tout d'abord, de féliciter le Secrétariat pour l'excellent document qu'il nous a présenté.

C'est un document qui a fait l'effort de traduire les grandes orientations données par les différents organes techniques de la FAO, à savoir les Comités de la sécurité alimentaire, de l'agriculture, des pêches et des forêts.

Je souhaite également appuyer fortement les préoccupations de la Représentante du Zimbabwe qui résumait le point de vue collectif du Groupe africain sur ce point de l'ordre du jour.

Hier, lors de l'examen du rapport de la quatre-vingt-neuvième session du Comité du programme et du rapport conjoint des quatre-vingt-neuvième session et cent deuxième sessions du Comité financier et du Comité du programme, il est apparu clairement que les Membres sont, dans une large majorité, d'accord pour que les budgets du Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire (PSSA), du Programme de coopération technique (PCT), de la Convention internationale pour la protection des végétaux (CIPV), du Codex Alimentarius, des activités de l'élevage et des pêches et de la plupart des programmes des terrains bénéficient d'une priorité absolue quelque soit le niveau des ressources.

Les mêmes rapports nous disent que les Membres n'ont pas pu se mettre d'accord sur le niveau des ressources, sur la base de scénarii à croissance réelle ou à Croissance Réelle Zéro. Cette situation nous ramène à l'impasse dans laquelle nous nous trouvions au moment de l'adoption du Plan à moyen terme 2004-2009.

Ne perdons pas de vue que, depuis les Sommets de Rome, de Monterrey et de Johannesburg, les données sur le développement ont changé. Nous nous sommes fixés des objectifs dans le Plan stratégique 2000-2015 et le Plan à moyen terme 2004-2009 et nous avons l'obligation d'œuvrer ensemble pour les atteindre. Ceci implique une revue en profondeur des actions à mettre en œuvre pour opérer efficacement. Dans la liste des éléments de cette revue, il y a bien sûr les programmes techniques, mais surtout la base budgétaire pour la mise en œuvre de ces programmes techniques. La FAO opère, depuis toujours, sur une base budgétaire établie depuis des lustres et fonctionnant sur une Croissance Réelle Zéro. Cette base budgétaire a connu, au cours des années, des coupes régulières qui font qu'aujourd'hui le budget en termes réels a baissé. De plus, nous savons que la FAO a fait des efforts, depuis quelque temps pour diminuer ses engagements financiers. La délégation camerounaise considère qu'il est temps, au regard des enjeux actuels, et pour ne pas apporter d'autres distorsions dans le fonctionnement des programmes en cours, de relever la base de la budgétisation en optant pour un scénario à croissance réelle, ne serait-ce que pour revenir à un niveau de budget acceptable.

Il est vrai que les habitudes ont la peau dure et il est difficile de se départir de certains réflexes acquis au fil des ans. Nous devons instamment faire preuve de courage en prenant des décisions, sans doute révolutionnaires, mais absolument importantes, pour mener à bien le mandat qui est le nôtre au sein de cette Organisation.

Je respecte les raisons évoquées par les uns et les autres, notamment la délégation du Japon qui a apporté des justifications valables pour la non augmentation de ses contributions. Mais, il s'agit tout d'abord de solidarité internationale dans la lutte contre la faim dans le monde et, à cet égard, il ne devrait pas y avoir beaucoup de restrictions pour appuyer les actions pour le développement, surtout parce que le niveau de l'augmentation budgétaire proposée reste modeste pour une organisation comme la FAO.

J'ai suivi avec beaucoup d'attention les propositions faites par le Japon pour ramener l'augmentation budgétaire à un niveau encore plus bas dans le cadre d'un scénario à Croissance Réelle. A notre avis, c'est une piste qui mérite d'être explorée.

En résumé, la délégation camerounaise est satisfaite des grands programmes contenus dans le sommaire de Programme de travail et du budget 2004-2005 et nous souhaitons que des orientations précises soient données au Secrétariat pour préparer, à la lumière des propositions des différentes délégations, un programme de travail, pour la même période, basé sur une budgétisation à Croissance Réelle, qui sera soumis à la Conférence pour adoption.

**Anton KOHLER (Switzerland)**

Everybody in here knows that my country is committed to the goals of the World Food Summit and its major objective. Switzerland, therefore, would like to know in which way and to what extent a Zero Nominal Growth budget would affect the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action. The major goal to which all Member Nations are committed cannot be allowed to suffer any further. It would be irresponsible to find out, at the end of the day, namely in 12 years from now, that with the continued efficiency saving measures, which are required anyway even with a Zero Real Growth or a Real Growth budget, the Member Nations will have established a major obstacle on the way towards fulfilling their commitments.

Only when taking this perspective into consideration can Switzerland support the statement of the European Community. I repeat again: we want to know the implications and consequences of a continued Zero Nominal Growth budget, especially with regard to the target fulfilment of the World Food Summit goals. I am fully aware that our request may sound somewhat simple, but at the same time difficult to fulfil. We invite the Secretariat to undertake a serious effort in such exercise. Only then can we consider which alternative to choose. Any other decision would be irresponsible.

**Pinit KORSIEPORN (Thailand)**

Thailand has been, and continues to be, a strong supporter of FAO. My Government is confident with the leading roles of FAO in agriculture. We are also satisfied with the quality of FAO staff. My delegation has given comments during the debate on the report of the Finance Committee. I must confess here that Thailand is facing difficulty in committing itself to the financial application, not only to FAO, but also to other organizations.

I just want to highlight that Thailand associates with the Philippines, Indonesia and the Republic of Korea, calling for more financial support to be allocated to the celebration of the International Year of Rice in 2004. I want to remind the Council that rice farmers are hard-working farmers, but unfortunately they are the poorest among all the sectors in most Asian countries. The International Year of Rice would be the year to honour the rice farmers in our countries.

**Mme Catherine OUÉDRAOGO (Burkina Faso)**

Le Burkina Faso soutient, dans leur intégralité, les déclarations du Zimbabwe, du Gabon, de la République Unie de Tanzanie, de la Côte d'Ivoire, du Cameroun et partage parfaitement l'anxiété du Nigéria. Je souhaite, au nom de mon pays, que toute la dimension du sens et du contenu de la lutte contre la pauvreté soit prise en compte dans les différents engagements qui seront pris.

**Bachar AKBIK (Syria) (Original language Arabic)**

Unlike what is happening in other organizations which have their headquarters in Rome, which seem to be considered on the same footing as FAO, the future budget of FAO will not be favourable. Under these circumstances, we invite the Organization to review its priorities as regards the activities it is engaged in and as regards the Near East Region.

I would like to support what was said by my colleague, the Delegate of Egypt. We would invite the Organization to engage in even greater efforts regarding the support it gives to its activities deriving from the Committee on Agriculture. We would especially appreciate enhanced efforts regarding the aid it gives to our countries for the rational management of water resources, and for the combating of desertification and drought. Also, FAO should increase its efforts in field programmes as included in the Framework of the Technical Cooperation Programme regarding phytogenetic, plant health aspects and the strengthening of national capacities.

**Patrick K. LUKHELE (Swaziland)**

May I, on behalf of my delegation, commend the Secretariat and other FAO Members for having ably contributed to the preparation of this Summary Programme of Work and Budget for 2004-05.

My delegation wishes to submit that it is completely unrealistic for us here to expect FAO to execute its mandate with a budget level which was adopted almost ten years ago. This definitely goes against real life situations, as those in our own countries and families. How can FAO meet the increasing demands made on it by our Member Governments and the international community, such as the World Food Summit: *five years later*, the World Food Summit on Sustainable Development and others with an effectively reduced budget?

Some of our colleagues here are calling for prioritization in FAO programmes. Our colleagues from the European Community have rightly pointed out that such a process has to be led by us at a political level rather than relying simply on prioritization models. Consequently, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the interventions of, among others, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and the United Republic of Tanzania. I also wish to take note of the message we are likely to send to the poor and hungry populations of the world.

Lastly, Mr Chairman, my delegation supports the Real Growth scenario in this Programme of Work and Budget.

### **Koji YONETANI (Japon)**

Je m'excuse de demander la parole pour la deuxième fois, mais je me sens vraiment obligé d'intervenir sur cet important sujet qu'est le Programme de travail et budget et d'apporter d'autres éclaircissements sur notre position.

J'ai écouté avec beaucoup d'attention les commentaires faits par de nombreuses délégations et j'ai renouvelé mon intérêt pour les attentes des Pays Membres vis-à-vis de la FAO, notamment les attentes de la part des pays en développement. Je tiens à transmettre cette demande de renforcer les activités de la FAO à notre Gouvernement ainsi qu'à notre peuple. Quant à moi, de la part de la délégation du Japon, je voudrais respectueusement demander aux honorables délégués des Pays Membres de la FAO de bien vouloir transmettre mon message à leurs Gouvernements et aux populations de leurs pays.

Le message que notre délégation voudrait faire passer à tous les Membres de cette Organisation est que nous devons faire face à une décision difficile, une décision qui porte sur l'équilibre entre les actions multilatérales et les programmes bilatéraux. Si nous continuons à augmenter le niveau des contributions à la FAO, comme nous l'avons fait il y a deux ans, le Gouvernement du Japon devra continuer à réduire les ressources allouées à nos programmes bilatéraux.

### ***Continues in English***

Let me continue in English to explain the seriousness and nature of the difficulty that we are facing at home. It is the conviction of the Japanese Government that it is essential for FAO, like other international organizations, to take into account the capacity of payment of Member Nations and, in particular, when the capacity of the contribution and capacity of major contributing countries is seriously damaged.

In fact, in Japan the GDP in real terms was reduced by 0.5 percent in 2001 and continued stagnating in 2002, with the slightest growth rate of only 0.3 percent. Even more, the Japanese economy is experiencing an unprecedented deflation, with the inflation rate being -0.7 percent in 2001 and -0.9 percent in 2002. In this situation and also given the serious Japanese fiscal situation, our Government cannot but continue to severely restrict its expenditures.

The Japanese Government's public debt has doubled since several years and will increase dramatically up to almost US\$4 trillion by the end of the current fiscal year. This amount, US\$4 trillion, could be compared to \$2.3 trillion which is the total external debt of all developing countries in 2001, according to the World Bank statistics.

The public debt that our central and local governments owe will be more than 1.6 times Japan's GDP. In this context, Japan is clearly not in a position to bear an increased level of Assessed Contributions and, on the contrary, is obliged to request to reduce it.

I would also like to touch upon the social impacts of the difficulty that we are facing in our country. At the end of the month of April the statistics on unemployment in our country have been published. According to these, 100 000 more are fully unemployed and the level of unemployment in our country is the highest in our history for the fifth consecutive month. It is not only because of the corporate restructuring that we are having more and more unemployment, and the total level of the number of unemployed, according to the statistics, is 3.8 million. Among the unemployed, there are more and more of the younger generation that remain unemployed. Also, among the people who are employed, the salaries for the first employed remain stagnant and no increase has been witnessed in the past five years. Salaries for part-time workers are decreasing and also the number of unstable employment is increasing. That is apart from the unemployment statistics that I have mentioned a minute ago.

Also, the number of so-called homeless people in Japan, those people who are living without shelter, in the big parks in the city of Tokyo, are 24 000. These are the people living without shelter.

During the year 2001 we had 31 000 people who committed suicide in our country and about 50 percent of them were unemployed. An important part of the reason for suicide is economic difficulty. Due to these difficulties, the Government of Japan has been obliged to, very regrettably, reduce continuously our global budget for international cooperation development assistance and it has been so since 1998. Our development assistance budget was decreased by 10.3 percent in 2002 and 5.8 percent in 2003.

Consequently, within this continuously decreasing envelope of total development assistance budget, we need to make difficult choices and difficult decisions concerning the right balance between our bilateral programmes and multilateral cooperation. If we continue increasing contributions to multilateral organizations, we need to cut back further on bilateral programmes.

At this point, I would like to develop a little bit the consideration that we are having at home on the distribution of our resources between bilateral and multilateral assistance programmes.

We are attaching a high importance to the bilateral programmes as we feel it is a priority for us to have a direct partnership with each of many developing countries. We also attach great importance not only to just giving money, but to have human exchange, between the Japanese people and the people in developing countries.

I also need to point out the importance of prioritization and, of course, in our bilateral programmes we can make clear prioritization, not only based on the Japanese Government's considerations, but also based on our political dialogue with the developing countries.

Turning to the multilateral side, of course we recognize the comparative advantages that each international organization has in their areas of activity, but an important difficulty that we are facing is very little participation of our nationals in the activities of those organizations, as is also the case at FAO. As I said, with regard to our bilateral programmes, our population, Japanese people, have the conviction that it is not just with money, but with the exchange of people that we need to cooperate with the developing countries. So, without a reasonable participation of our nationals in the work of the international organizations, we cannot assure the support of our population in providing a continued important contribution to international organizations. This is why we are attaching so much importance to the issue of Equitable Geographical Representation and we are so insistent on the urgent need for amelioration to be made in the situation of FAO.

Also, another difficulty we are having is the lack of priority-setting. Without priority-setting we have no means to convince our people that our money will be effectively and efficiently used in such an organization.

These are some of the elements that our Government needs taking into consideration when making decisions regarding bilateral and multilateral programmes balance. Sorry for taking so much time, but I really felt obliged to explain those considerations, because it is an important element that we consider to be taken into account in these deliberations.

Since several years ago, Japan's bilateral ODA programme has been experiencing an important reform in the way it works, and that has for the purpose of regaining public support in our country, in order to reverse the decline of our ODA budget. Among the measures of our reform of the ODA Programme are diverse efficiency measures aiming at achieving more results with less budget; more focused prioritization based on, as I have said, policy dialogues with the recipient developing countries and increased transparency of assistance programmes *vis-à-vis* our taxpayers.

After these relentless reform efforts concerning bilateral ODA, it is becoming all the more difficult to ensure public support for paying an increasing amount of Assessed Contributions to an international organization, especially when the priority of an organization is not clearly focused, and especially where the views of important major contributors are not reasonably taken into account in the policies taken by an organization.

Before concluding my intervention, I would like to make a plea for cooperation of the Secretariat, of course, with the understanding of Member Nations. Cooperation is indispensable for our Government to be able to continue our active participation and support to the work of FAO. Regrettably, if the situation continues to be the same, that is, no focused priorities and with the resources requested continuously to be increased, I cannot assure you, to my regret, Japan's continued strong support to FAO. I strongly share the feeling expressed by our colleague from the Islamic Republic of Iran who cited the proverb that "friends in need are our friends". That proverb also exists in Japan. In the present situation, I feel that it is our Government who needs help for having more public support in our country to continue our cooperation and participation in this Organization.

In more concrete terms, I would like to request the Secretariat to present, in their preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget, a scenario based on Zero Nominal Growth, but in addition to that a scenario based on reduction of our Assessed Contributions. I understand the position of the Secretariat and realize that it cannot withdraw the scenarios of Zero Real Growth and Real Growth as there are a certain number of delegations supporting them. On the scenarios of Zero Real Growth and Real Growth, the request of our delegation is to review them on the basis of comprehensive efficiency-saving measures and on the basis of no increase of staff costs. In our view, there is too much of an increase, especially related to the number of Professional posts in both of the options presented in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

**Abdul Razak AYAZI (Observer for Afghanistan)**

I shall address three issues. Firstly, to place the 2004-2005 Summary Programme of Work and Budget in a wider context.

Secondly, to give an example of the negative effects of the stagnant budget, the so called Zero Real Growth budget, for one major programme.

Thirdly, resource allocation for Programme 244S1 relating to major programme Forestry.

Considering the Millenium Declaration, the Monterrey Conference, the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the World food Summit: *five years later*, the LDC Conference and other international fora, the G-77 commitment to fight poverty and the readiness of many developing countries to break the vicious circle of hunger and deprivation, as exemplified by Brazil, the 2004-2005 budget, as proposed by the Director-General, deserves high support from Member Nations. It needs to be examined against the atmosphere of rising expectations from those who have been marginalized but have taken the stand to say no to poverty, hunger, malnutrition and socio-economic inequality. It is these appalling social conditions that lead to frustration, which then leads to political unrest and which, in turn, leads to acts of violence.

All the signs of the last year give us the impression that in the first decade of this new Millennium resources for poverty eradication, both from the developed and developing countries, are likely to show an ascending trend. ODA is expected to make a quantum jump, Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries and least developed countries are expected to benefit most from this rising level of



ODA, marginalized people are likely to be the main beneficiaries, Governments of the developing countries are expected to reach out to those who have been neglected and international cooperation in favour of the pro poor growth is likely to be enhanced. We all know that the cornerstone of poverty reduction are the resources of these poor countries and the rapid growth of the agricultural and rural sector.

Taking this broader context, what should FAO do? Watch events from a distance and remain neutral or take a proactive action? FAO has to be proactive in this enabling environment. Absorbing a rising trend of ODA in countries where technical, institutional and managerial capacities are weak is a challenging task. For example, if the African Development Bank is encouraged and supported to double its lending to agriculture over the next five years, it is quite obvious that new opportunities and innovative methods will have to be explored to fulfil this target. The countries of Africa, as well as the donor community, are bound to look for help. Where will they get this help? Obviously the main source, if not the only source, is FAO with its global experience and its comparative advantage. There is bound to be call on FAO for help to identify new areas for lending to agricultural and rural development, to develop human capacity in the borrowing countries etc.

The Regular Programme cannot remain deaf to these challenges. It must respond quickly and effectively. A declining FAO budget, the so called Zero Nominal Growth budget or a stagnant FAO budget, the so-called Zero Real Growth budget, will deprive the Organization of rising to this challenge and of doing what is expected of its Charter. Only the Real Growth budget can face up to this challenge.

A number of distinguished speakers have highlighted the need for financial discipline, efficiency in planning and implementation, focus and prioritization. All these concepts are sound and relevant irrespective of the level of budget and ought to be pursued by the Organization on a continuing basis. Streamlining procedures, decentralization, enhanced monitoring and a vigorous evaluation process are the means to achieving efficiency, effectiveness and greater impact.

In fact, the Organization has been doing some of this. Staffing has been reduced by almost 30 percent, as the presentation showed this morning, activities of low priority have been eliminated, other activities have been streamlined and cross-cutting issues have been brought to the forefront, but to ask the Director-General to cut the budget further, to do more with less money and to impose prioritization by cutting essential services, is detrimental to the effectiveness of the Organization. FAO deserves to have its relevant share of the enabling environment, that the nations of the world are collectively pursuing.

On the Zero Real Growth budget, I shall limit myself to Major Programme 2.1 – Agricultural Production and Support System, which consist of five programmes. These five programmes envisage 420 outputs during the next biennium. Under the Zero Real Growth budget scenario, 71 of these 420 outputs will be either reduced or eliminated, that is about 17 percent of the 420 proposed outputs. I shall give some selected examples of the dangers, particularly to the developing countries, of this action.

Under Programme 2.1.1 - Natural Resources, work will be slowed down on water resources, irrigation technology and land evaluation methodology. The work on the health aspects of irrigation will be curtailed. Assistance for transboundary river basin management and conflict avoidance will be eliminated.

Under Programme 2.1.2 - Crops, support to IPPC will be largely reversed and scientific advice to the Codex Committee on Pesticides Residue will be reduced.

Under Programme 2.1.3 - Livestock, EMPRES will suffer. Global Rinderpest Programme would not be adequately supported and FAO's support to Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign would be diminished.

Under Programme 2.1.4 - Pro-agricultural Support System, work on the strategies for increasing farm income in marginal areas would not be initiated. Work on strategies for enhancing livelihood

of high vulnerable farm households, particularly HIV/AIDS and drought affected areas, would be reduced.

Under Programme 2.1.5 - Agricultural Application of Isotopes and Biotechnology, work on molecular methods for identifying genes and genotypes for resistance to drought and salinity would be reduced.

With respect to Programme 244S1, many Members of the Council, when discussing the COFO Report on 23 June, raised the issue of additional support to the Regional Forestry Commissions and for strengthening the Forestry units in the Regional and Sub-Regional Offices. On page 144 of the Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, some 14 outputs for the biennium are listed, of which six deal with the convening of the Regional Forestry Commissions. Under the Zero Real Growth scenario, two out of the 14 outputs will be reduced: bullet eight, which relates to the effective use of Forestry Commissions and bullet 14, which deals with the coordination between FAO Headquarters and the Decentralized Offices.

Is the Secretariat willing to reconsider the order of prioritization regarding Programme 244S1?

**Percy Walhata MISIKA (Observer for Namibia)**

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Secretariat and the Chairpersons of the two Committees, the Programme Committee and Finance Committee, for providing us with such a well-formulated, detailed and highly-informative document.

From the onset, let me express my support for the eloquent statements that have been made by the distinguished Chairperson of the Africa Group, Her Excellency the Ambassador of Zimbabwe, followed by the Representatives of Nigeria, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania and all others that spoke in support of the Real Growth budget scenario.

In my few years of participating in FAO matters, I have observed that in most cases we, as Members of this Organization, normally stand together and indeed speak with one voice when it comes to thanking, commending and appreciating the fact that the Secretariat of this Organization has heeded to our calls and has responded positively to those calls. In implementing certain activities that are demanded by us, we likewise speak with one voice when it comes to imposing or impressing upon the Organization as to what we view to be priority areas of action. Even in cases where one Member's priority may not be the entire Membership's priority, we usually express compassionate words of understanding and sympathy towards such Members.

However, the irony is that we never show the same unity of purpose and commitment when the Organization asks us to provide it with adequate requisite resources to respond to our own very demands.

We place commitments upon the Organization, yet we refuse to give the Organization the armour to execute those commitments. Why do we then come here purporting? We are here to ensure that FAO carries out its mandate, while in fact we, to a great extent, lay down obstacles that impede FAO from delivering?

When FAO was founded 58 years ago, the founders had a clear mandate for it, and that was to raise the levels of nutrition and standards of living, to improve agricultural productivity and to improve the conditions of rural populations.

This mandate, has been echoed and reinforced by our own Heads of State and Governments, at various fora, here we have the forum such as the World Food Summit, World Food Summit: *five years later*, World Food Summit on Sustainable Development, and the Monterrey Conference. In all these instances, we have applauded our leaders for having the vision to echo this worthwhile mandate. Yet, here we sit in Rome, away from our leaders and proclaim on their behalf that FAO is asking too much. Is this not a contradiction? Or are we saying the promises that our leaders made at these fora were promises to a part of the audiences of those fora? Or are we saying we are here in our capacities as delegates of our own Governments able to override the proclamations of our own Heads of State.

Eight hundred million people out there are on the verge of starvation, and urgently need access to adequate safe and nutritious food, that we all here enjoy. They look up to this Organization to assist them extricate themselves from the shackles of hunger. This Organization is their only ray of light in a very dark tunnel. Are we going to deny them this human right?

The Secretariat needs to be commended for the laudable efficiency saving measures in paragraphs 89 to 91, that it has painstakingly implemented, not only must it be praised for these welcome improvements, but, as a sign of appreciation, the Membership should rise and take its baby by the hand by giving it more resources to continue with this good work.

True, most of our economies, Namibia included, are facing very hard and difficult times, but equally true is that these very hard and difficult times are affecting the 800 million people who are hungry and poor even more. Hence, the need to render appropriate and adequate support to institutions mandated to redress their bitter plight. In our case it is FAO, and that support is the Real Growth Budget scenario for 2004-2005 which Namibia, like other like-minded nations who spoke before me, realizing this stark reality, fully support this scenario despite the difficulties we face. This is not asking too much, it is rather to ensure that the Organization implements the Medium-Term Plan, which we ourselves approved. In our view this is the only budget scenario that will address our needs without adversely affecting the institution's normative function.

In this regard, it is my hope that priority programmes for Africa, such as EMPRES Livestock, Agricultural Water Use Efficiency and Conservation, EMPRES Plan Pest Component, and SPFS and capacity-building to improve the capacity of developing nations, such as Namibia, to participate fully and effectively in multilateral trade negotiations and also to take advantage of the biotechnology and food security, will be adequately funded. These, of course, should be in addition to the mainstream priorities such as IPPC, Codex Alimentarius and International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources. These programmes are crucial to Africa, if we are to reduce by half the number of the hungry and malnutrition in our region by year 2015. This cannot be done with a Zero Nominal Growth nor Zero Real Growth budget scenario.

Some Members continue to demand that FAO benchmark itself with other UN Organizations, well and good, but the same Members know, as we all do, that these other UN Organizations have never been, nor are being, subjected to the Zero Nominal Growth budget scenario that has perpetually been imposed on FAO.

Comparison must be as a rule, and comparison as a rule must be done for comparable products, for example, eggs with eggs, tomatoes with tomatoes and not for products or institutions that have totally different environments. It would have been interesting to hear what these same Members would have been saying of those same institutions or organizations had their budgets been at the same level as that of FAO.

**Robert SABIITI (Observer for Uganda)**

Like other distinguished delegates, I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, to thank the Secretariat for having prepared a well-articulated work plan and budget for 2004-2005.

I would like, on behalf of my delegation, to support the submissions of the distinguished delegations of most developing countries notably Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Philippines, China, Islamic Republic of Iran, to mention a few, for a Real Growth budget proposal. This is important to support some of the programmes that developing countries consider to be pertinent for their growth. In this respect, their support for programmes for food security and TCPs are some of the programmes I would like to cite here.

Allow me to remind our delegations that the developing countries still have large populations that live in the countryside, in rural areas, who are being supported greatly by the efforts of FAO. These populations are increasing and one wonders that if we are going to go for the negative or the Zero Growth budget, then it might be difficult for our people to get out of the poverty and rampant malnutrition.

I would like to point out a few aspects that have not been emphasized by my distinguished fellow delegates. I would say that there is need for more support for FAO, so that it can go down to help us build our capacities in these different respects, especially in areas of programme planning, programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation and in addition to build our capacities in negotiations as we approach World Trade Organization negotiations, so that our developing countries can get a fair share in the world trade market.

More financing for FAO would go to further help developing countries, to link agriculture and rural development to emergencies and, if possible, to establish some kind of funding that would assist the developing countries in addressing issues of an emergency nature where they arise.

Most of the developing countries are in the process of implementing poverty reduction strategies that have a bearing on food security, and the Delegation of Uganda believes that more support to FAO would go a long way to support developing countries to realize these goals for economic development of their nations.

**Mme Marième MINT MOHAMED (Observateur de Mauritanie)**

Je me permets de vous souhaiter un bon séjour parmi nous. Permettez-moi d'exprimer mes vifs remerciements au Secrétariat pour son rapport qui contient des informations très riches.

Nous nous sommes réunis ici en 2002 pour nous unir contre la faim et nous avons constaté que la situation alimentaire mondiale était catastrophique, surtout dans les pays en voie de développement. Si je me rappelle bien, le Conseil avait invité la FAO et les donateurs à continuer à participer, dans le cadre de son Programme de travail adopté à la troisième Conférence de Bruxelles pour les PMA, avec plus de ressources extrabudgétaires, c'est-à-dire augmenter et non pas diminuer.

Il a été aussi noté que le NEPAD, qui est la clef de la réussite de l'Afrique, devait, à mon avis, recevoir une attention particulière, sans oublier que trop peu de progrès en matière de lutte contre la faim ont été réalisés pour espérer que le niveau de vie de nos populations s'améliore.

Plus de 840 millions de personnes, dont 779 million en Afrique, vivent encore avec moins d'un dollar par jour. L'Afrique est le seul continent où cette situation s'aggrave. Il est prévu qu'en 2015, la population augmentera de 50 millions de personnes, et il y en a, parmi nos chers donateurs, qui demandent une réduction de budget. Nous avons un proverbe en Mauritanie qui dit "Si les cris viennent de la montagne, où peut-on se cacher?".

Je voudrais m'associer à la proposition du Secrétaire général de la FAO, dans le sens d'un budget à croissance réelle. Je m'associe aussi à la déclaration de l'Egypte, de la République islamique d'Iran, du Zimbabwe, du Nigéria, de la République unie de Tanzanie, pour ne citer que quelques-uns de ces pays.

Comme d'autres représentants l'ont déjà dit, on ne peut pas progresser et en même temps réduire les sources allouées au Programme. Nous demandons donc un budget, comme je l'ai déjà dit, à Croissance Réelle, qui tienne compte de nos priorités et des priorités de nos Gouvernements pour que la FAO soit efficace dans la lutte contre la faim et la pauvreté.

Mon pays, qui est un pays PMA, a connu ces dernières années une sécheresse accrue qui a beaucoup affecté notre cheptel et notre agriculture. Nous pensons qu'une intervention urgente des donateurs, avec la coopération de la FAO, est nécessaire pour la Mauritanie. Je voudrais m'associer à la proposition du Secrétaire général de la FAO dans le sens d'un budget à Croissance Réelle.

**Moussa Bocar LY (Observateur du Sénégal)**

J'interviens dans le contexte, que vient de décrire si brillamment ma collègue de Mauritanie, qui affecte la région Afrique. La délégation sénégalaise apprécie positivement les efforts déployés quotidiennement par la FAO au service et au bénéfice des populations rurales. Elle le fait dans des conditions, reconnues par tous, difficiles.

Il y a dix ans de cela, on élisait ici même Monsieur Jacques Diouf, à la tête de cette Organisation, et il lui avait été confié une tâche colossale, qui consistait, en novembre 1993, à réfléchir dans le cadre du budget déjà voté à l'époque, pour proposer aux organes directeurs que vous êtes, des réformes, toujours dans le cadre du budget voté. Ainsi, quelques mois plus tard, en juin 1994, le Directeur général proposait au Conseil, des mesures de réformes, de restructuration, de rationalisation et de décentralisation que votre auguste assemblée a adoptées. C'est ce qui a donné naissance à ce que l'on a appelé les programmes prioritaires.

Cet exercice a continué dans le temps jusqu'à aujourd'hui, à l'heure où nous parlons, portant ainsi à des économies et des gains d'efficacité, que nous connaissons tous, et qui ont été documentés dans des publications de la FAO que nous pouvons tous consulter. Et ceci dans un *background* de réduction constante des budgets de la FAO depuis novembre 1993.

Notre délégation est sensible aux difficultés que rencontrent certains pays et délégations et qui nous ont été illustrées plusieurs fois aujourd'hui. Mais, comme l'a si bien rappelé l'Ambassadeur du Zimbabwe, Présidente du Groupe africain, au nom de tout le Groupe, la FAO est porteuse de défis, nos défis communs réaffirmés à l'occasion du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation en 1996 et renouvelés, l'année dernière à l'occasion du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation: *cinq ans après*. Il faut pour répondre à ces défis des ressources conséquentes pour fonctionner. Il faut donc que la FAO puisse être dotée de ressources adéquates. C'est pourquoi, avec l'Ambassadeur du Zimbabwe, qui a parlé au nom de tout le Groupe africain - et j'espère que cette fois-ci cela sera bien reflété dans le rapport de votre session - nous sommes pour le budget 2004-2005 à Croissance Réelle. Car en fait, la FAO est avant tout un cadre de solidarité humaine.

Les pays en développement ont déjà fait leur part car, en effet, la coopération entre pays en développement n'est pas un vain mot. Il suffit de penser au Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire de la FAO, surtout dans le domaine de l'eau. Je crois que les pays en développement ont assez contribué au succès de ce Programme spécial dont nous demandons l'extension et le financement. Les donateurs, qui en ont senti le besoin, ont fait des missions sur le terrain, notamment dans mon pays, le Sénégal, mais également au Burkina Faso et dans d'autres pays, pour voir avec les populations elles-mêmes, les bénéfices que celles-ci retirent de ce Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire.

Concernant les priorités, nous appuyons énergiquement les activités et programmes de terrain et les activités opérationnelles. Nous ne sommes pas contre les activités normatives, mais comme nous le verrons dans une semaine à l'occasion de l'ouverture du Codex Alimentarius, nous ne sommes pas au même niveau. Les pays en développement n'ont pas la possibilité d'envoyer leurs experts à ce genre de réunions, où par contre nos partenaires viennent en nombre important et avec des experts pour chaque point concerné. Je crois qu'il existe, dans le cadre de ce Codex Alimentarius, un projet qui dort pour le financement de la participation des experts des pays en développement. Il y a également une absence de logique à demander un budget à Croissance Réelle zéro, ou même nominale, et à toujours faire parvenir, au niveau du Secrétariat, des demandes qui devraient être financées. Je vous donne un tout petit exemple: récemment, plusieurs pays, et nous sommes d'accord là-dessus, ont proposé que l'on fasse une réévaluation des rapports qui sont présentés par les différents États Membres, quant à l'application du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Cette étude que le Secrétariat fera sur les raisons expliquant que nous, pays en développement, ne présentons pas, à temps et comme il le faut, nos rapports au niveau du CSA, nécessitera d'un financement qui n'était pas prévu, et pourtant nous, nous avons été d'accord aux côtés des pays occidentaux, pour appuyer cette demande. C'est pour vous dire que l'on met, à charge de la FAO, des demandes sans pour autant lui donner les ressources nécessaires pour répondre à ces demandes.

En plus il y a l'injustice dont la FAO est victime dans le cadre du système des Nations Unies, puisque c'est la seule Organisation qui, depuis dix ans, souffre d'une réduction constante de ses budgets. Nous y voyons là une sorte d'inconsistance.

Nous pensons, au niveau de la délégation sénégalaise, que nous sommes ici les mêmes délégations que dans les différentes ententes et différents *fora* des Nations Unies. C'est pourquoi,

il est difficile de comprendre, qu'au niveau de Monterrey, des engagements fermes et concrets ont été pris et que, dans une semaine, nous allons, au niveau d'un haut débat, à Genève, dans le cadre de l'ECOSOC, nous pencher sur la manière de financer l'agriculture et le développement rural de nos pays alors que nous sommes aujourd'hui dans cette enceinte de la FAO, qui somme toute, n'est que partie prenante, est un membre de la famille des Nations Unies, et que nous refusons de lui donner les moyens lui permettant de fonctionner et de répondre à ce que nos leaders lui ont demandé au plus haut niveau en 1996 et renouvelé en 2002.

**Souhaib Deen BANGOURA (Observateur de Guinée)**

Je serai laconique car la plupart de mes collègues ont déjà exprimé mes pensées. Je voudrais dire que j'appartiens à l'équipe de ceux qui ont opté pour le scénario à Croissance Réelle.

**N.J. KWENDAKWEMA (Observer for Zambia)**

The Zambian delegation would like to congratulate the Secretariat on their attempt to produce a realistic budget under very difficult circumstances.

We shall not take up any more time, since most of the delegates have already expressed certain feelings, that we agree with. We, therefore, fully support the presentations by Zimbabwe, Nigeria, United Republic of Tanzania, China, Islamic Republic of Iran and all those who are in support of a Real Growth budget, while calling for FAO to continue its efforts of restructuring.

**Neil FRASER (Observer for New Zealand)**

I take the floor, briefly, to address just one part of the Summary Programme of Work and Budget before us.

One item only – not because we do not have interests in other elements of the Programme of Work and Budget. We do. Of course we do. But I comment on only one issue in the interests of time efficiency, and to underscore our belief in the importance of this issue for all Members.

That single issue is the funding of the IPPC. New Zealand was the inaugural Chair of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), and, in that role, was very vigorous in developing a direction and a work plan for the Commission.

We are, therefore, gratified to hear such widespread support in this room; support that has also been clearly expressed in the appropriate Technical Committees and in the Programme Committee.

It is in light of these persistent and consistent calls that we add our voice to those who have specifically asked that the IPPC be fully funded to the level of the biennial Programme of Work and Budget, under any budget scenario or level eventually agreed upon.

**Mme Lydie ROSSINI VAN HISSENHOVEN (Observateur du Conseil international des femmes)**

C'est au nom du Conseil international des femmes, fondé en 1888 à Washington D.C. et doté du Statut consultatif auprès de la FAO depuis 1947, que je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat pour l'excellent document CL 124/3 et faire quelques commentaires et donner quelques informations.

Il serait trop long de m'attarder sur tous les points qui nous sont à cœur et que nous continuons à soutenir et à incorporer dans nos Plans d'actions et dans nos Programmes auprès de nos affiliés de par le monde qui constituent des millions d'être humains.

Nous regrettons que des restrictions budgétaires conditionnent le Programme 2.5.2, "Questions de parité et de population", sur laquelle, avec l'appui de vingt-deux organisations internationales, nous avons fortement insisté lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Le paragraphe 33 et ses quatre objectifs mentionnés au paragraphe 50 retiennent notre attention. Nous soutenons le paragraphe 252A3. Déjà en mars 2001, à New York, lors de la Commission du Statut de la femme, le CIF a organisé un séminaire sur la discrimination basée sur le genre et la Présidente a insisté sur la corrélation entre femme, santé et développement et a parlé des aspects socio-

économiques et éducationnels du Statut de la femme, des droits humains et de la prévention de la violence.

Bien que l'allègement de la pauvreté et son éradication soient une préoccupation mondiale depuis de nombreuses années, il faut encore insister sur les points suivants: apporter des changements aux politiques financières internationales, apporter des aides financières pour les petites entreprises, particulièrement pour les femmes, donner l'éducation et la formation aux techniques du marché et à la flexibilité du marché de l'emploi, abolir le travail des enfants et la prostitution des enfants, réviser le système de couverture sociale et instaurer des plans d'épargne efficaces.

Nous suivons avec préoccupation la pandémie du VIH/SIDA et avons organisé, en janvier 2002 à Nairobi, Kenya, un séminaire sur l'impact du SIDA en Afrique. Le Conseil national des femmes d'Indonésie (Kowani) se bat avec ce même problème au travers d'activités familiales, scolaires et communautaires. En outre, le CIF a transmis dans son Bulletin d'information mai/juin 2003, des informations relatives à la Journée internationale des femmes et le thème choisi par le PAM cette année est Les femmes et le SIDA.

Naturellement le Programme 2.5.3, Développement rural, nous concerne aussi et nous continuons à insister sur le paragraphe 253A1 pour que les droits d'accès à la terre et autres ressources naturelles deviennent une réalité ainsi que les droits de propriété pour les pauvres ruraux et en particulier les femmes.

Inutile de dire que nous nous sommes engagés dans le Programme 2.2.1, Nutrition, qualité et sécurité sanitaire des aliments, depuis la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition, à laquelle nous avons participé au moyen d'informations, de collectes de données, de séminaires et de Plans d'action.

En 1997, à Ismir, un séminaire international a été organisé sur l'impact de la nutrition, sur la santé des femmes et des enfants, mais déjà en août 1979, à Nairobi, le thème: "Nutrition, sécurité alimentaire et santé de l'enfant", avait été traité avec l'OMS en un séminaire international.

Nous appuyons les paragraphes 221A5, 221P1 et 221P7. Il y aurait encore beaucoup de choses à dire mais je ne veux abuser de votre indulgence et je terminerai par le chapitre du Programme 3.5, Coopération avec des partenariats extérieurs. Nous appuyons les paragraphes 253 et 256.

Nous pensons qu'une étroite collaboration sur le terrain est indispensable pour la lutte à la pauvreté et pour réaliser les objectifs du SMA. Ce sont les organisations internationales qui, à mon avis, jouent un rôle primordial, parce qu'elles transmettent à leurs affiliés les activités, programmes et projets de la FAO et, en même temps, informent la FAO de leurs projets, ateliers de formation, séminaires, etc.

Un exemple de collaboration ONG et organisations intergouvernementales est celui du Conseil national des Femmes du Congo avec l'Unesco, la Banque mondiale, le PNUD et l'Union européenne, qui a organisé un atelier séminaire intitulé: "Femmes, culture de paix et développement" dans lequel les femmes ont appris la fabrication du savon, du gari (farine de manioc), d'amidon (pâte de manioc), des jus d'oseille et d'orange, des connaissances d'hygiène alimentaire et une sensibilisation sur le SIDA et ont pris l'engagement de vulgariser, dans leurs villages respectifs, les connaissances acquises pendant ce séminaire. A la fin du séminaire, a eu lieu une distribution de vivres par le PAM aux participants et aux personnes vulnérables.

La liste: coopération avec la FAO, le PNUE, l'OMS, l'UNICEF, le HCR etc. pour la réalisation de séminaires internationaux est longue mais le CIF a mis à l'ordre du jour des thèmes et débats communs aux objectifs de la FAO. tels que environnement et pauvreté, éradication de la pauvreté dans un contexte global, femmes et technologies, femmes et développement, pour n'en citer que quelques-uns.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

C'est la fin de la séance, on reprendra à 14 h 30. Je voulais vous annoncer que cet après-midi, le Conseil sera présidé successivement par l'Ambassadeur Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck et par l'Ambassadeur Alfredo Néstor Puig Pino.

Je passe maintenant la parole à Mme Gardner qui voudrait faire une annonce

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

Just a quick announcement. The GRULAG Working Group, which was scheduled for today at 12:00, will meet tomorrow at 12:00 in the Ethiopia Room.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 hours*

*La séance est levée à 12 h 50*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 12.50 horas*



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>SIXTH PLENARY MEETING SIXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE SEXTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>25 June 2003</b>

The Sixth Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.50 hours  
Mr Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck,  
Vice Chairman of the Council, presiding

La sixième séance plénière est ouverte à 14 h 50  
sous la présidence de M. GuntramFreiherr Von Schenck,  
Vice-président du Conseil

Se abre la sexta sesión plenaria a las 14.50 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck,  
Vicepresidente del Consejo

## **12. Summary Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continued)

## **12. Sommaire du Programme de travail et budget 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (suite)

## **12. Resumen del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2004-2005**

(CL 124/3; CL 124/3-Corr.1; CL 124/INF/20) (continuación)

### **Yohannes TENSUE (Observer for Eritrea)**

I would like to join all the African Groups, the Near East and most of the Asian Group who support the Real Growth budget. The Summary Programme of Work and Budget prepared by the Secretariat and the recommendations contained therein is very satisfactory and excellent work has been done. However, I was amazed to hear this morning several countries, especially from the north, who have requested further work to see the impact of Nominal Real Growth. If they see what the impact of the Zero Real Growth scenario will have on the activities of FAO and the staff, they will understand that they would not have not needed to have gone further. According to my judgement, it is unnecessary work for the Secretariat and Mr Wade. We should agree with all the promises and explanations made here this morning for the development of the goals of Monterrey, Doha and others. It is very clear also that all the UN Organizations have gone for an increased budget. Why are they cornering FAO?

I will give you one simple clear example of how FAO, with a reduced budget for several biennia, has been affected by it. I had the opportunity to attend the UN Joint Staff Pension Board meeting at FAO. There are 18 UN Organizations in that Committee and there was a report about the disability claim in the UN Union Staff Board Meeting. FAO has the highest disability claim due to work-related stress and the Committee, the Joint Staff Pension Board and all the UN staff members were amazed by the fact. They were maybe expecting this level from the World Health Organization, but instead FAO had the highest. I am not quite sure of the figure, but it was over 40 percent, while the second highest figure was 12 percent. This shows that FAO staff members are working under stress and in the Report it showed 24 percent reduction in Professional staff. The job is done with few staff who are under stress. This should not continue. Even for those contractors, like consultants and other staff, especially those in the field, the renewal of their job is not secured. So we are criminalizing the staff. We have to provide a good resource, a good budget. We are very proud of FAO, of the growing reputation for the excellent performance and the excellence of FAO is well-recognized by all the other organizations. It is not acceptable that the Council request Conference to reduce the budget.

Another point which I would like to touch on. I am sure the Secretary of the Pension Committee could elaborate on what I have said. I am not telling a lie. I am member of the Pension Committee representing IFAD. I was really surprised when I saw the Report last year and found FAO to have the highest disability claim. This shows that the staff members are working under stress. The same appeared in the Staff Union Report. This has never been paid attention to, we have never discussed it, but it is repeatedly reported. So we should go for the Real Growth budget.

I would also like to touch on the young professional system introduced into FAO. Concerning the Young Professionals,- I am not against recruiting young professionals- but the criteria they have adopted in FAO is totally against the interest of the developing countries. Most of these young professionals, when they come to FAO, have all their salary paid by their Governments, but those from the developing countries recruit their nationals and pay half of the salary to work for FAO. Very few can manage it and ,you can see, it is very evident that most of them are from the developed countries. Three years ago when we had a briefing, we requested FAO to make an assessment about the Young Professionals and the criteria they have adopted or introduced on how they recruit them for a short period, three years, two years, whatever. No assessment was made, however, and no Report was received, and we do not know the proportion of representation.

Another point in the Report I would like to make is regarding the After-Service Medical Care and the figure of US\$14 million. According to my interpretation, as I said before, the increase in After-Service Medical Care made no change to the Pension Fund, but the claim of disability might contribute to an increase. If FAO staff had not worked under stress there would have been no unnecessary fund for this disability claim, but if enough money is provided, together with the security of their job and their position, then this disability claim would be minimal. So I need an explanation as to why there has been no change in the staff pension contributions, contributions from the staff or from the fund itself. There is an accrual account which handles the contributions, so if you could explain further how that figure is reached without any change in the UN regulations of pension contributions, I would be very glad.

**Nobuo KATO (Japan)**

I will try to be very brief as it is my third intervention, in order to rectify any misunderstandings in what I have said. I just want to confirm that our Government remains committed to work with the international community, to supporting the endeavour to achieve Millennium Development Goals and the outcomes of the summits including the World Food Summit: *five years later* and the World Summit on Sustainable Development. It is our hope and intention to continue supporting the Organization, FAO, including through our voluntary contribution to Trust Funds and also through promoting joint projects between our grant aid and through the works of FAO. Through both of these, we are trying to promote an efficient and effective programme in the field. Those intentions and the support that we continue to give through Trust Funds are different from the position that we are taking, clearly requesting a reduction for Assessed Contributions. In the hope of continuing support to the Organization, our Government needs cooperation and efforts on the part of FAO on issues of reform and priority-setting and more focused priority in the areas of comparative advantage of the Organization. With that we would be more assured of our Government's support to FAO in the near future.

Finally, just to make clear what I have requested at the end of my previous intervention. Our request to the Secretariat is to present an additional two options on the budget for the next biennium: one that is based on Zero Nominal Growth and another based on below Zero Nominal Growth.

**Humberto E. MOLINA REYES (Presidente, Comité de Finanzas)**

Quisiera en primer lugar agradecer las observaciones que las distintas delegaciones han realizado sobre el documento bajo análisis. No quisiera entrar en el fondo del debate respecto a los niveles que debería tener el presupuesto, no quiero prejuzgar las distintas razones que tienen las delegaciones para inclinarse por una u otra opción, sólo quiero subrayar algunos elementos que me parecen sustantivos e importantes o cruciales debería decir y que deben de estar considerados dentro del presupuesto. Como ustedes saben y como han mencionado distintas delegaciones así como en la presentación que yo he hecho ante este honorable Consejo, existe un compromiso que deben abordar los Estados Miembros que es el compromiso que tienen con la Organización y los funcionarios que han sido y que son el recurso humano más importante de la Organización; y me refiero a los 14,1 millones de pasivo acumulado por la asistencia médica. En todo caso y bajo cualquier hipótesis si es que este honorable Consejo así lo determina, deberá considerarse esta cifra como elemento a tener presente en nuestras discusiones.

Otro punto que me parece importante resaltar independientemente del nivel del presupuesto, es la protección que éste debe tener y creo que sobre esa materia seguiremos trabajando en el Comité de Finanzas. Es necesario tener presente que un 40 por ciento de los gastos se hacen en Euros y, por tanto, existe un impacto evidente de la moneda Euro *versus* el Dólar. Más allá del mecanismo de protección del presupuesto que se adopte va a tener que considerar se el impacto importante como mínimo del 40 por ciento que tendremos en el presupuesto de la Organización, tanto en sus efectos dentro del bienio como entre bienios.

Quisiera también destacar otro punto muy importante que fue dicho por una delegación. Como Comité de Finanzas nos preocupamos precisamente en seguir avanzando, en elevar el nivel de

eficiencia de esta Organización, y en aplicar las recomendaciones que ustedes dan en cuanto a los ahorros por eficacia independientemente del nivel que alcanza en presupuesto; la Organización ha estado haciendo esfuerzos sustantivos sobre esta materia, y puedo asegurar que vamos a seguir trabajando en esa línea de acción.

Esto era lo que quería decir, teniendo presente que distintas materias están aún pendientes de ser analizadas por la próxima sesión del Comité de Finanzas y vamos a dar algunas propuestas específicas sobre estos temas que han quedado pendientes.

**Blair HANKEY (Chairman, Programme Committee)**

I have no comments to make about the overall level of the budget, because it is not a matter that falls within the purview of the Programme Committee, however there are a number of observations I would like to make, which I do think are relevant to the mandate of the Programme Committee and relate to the debate we have had today.

Firstly, is in that priority-setting- and this is in the Report of the Programme Committee but it was said by many delegations today and I think it is true- is an essentially political exercise, although management methodology is something that can inform and assist this essentially political exercise.

Secondly, as the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran pointed out in the debate, but it's a fact, ZNG is a formula for budget reduction. It is not a formula of stability, because in nominal terms, in a growing economy and, even if the world economy is not growing now at the rate it has in some other time, it has continued to grow, and with inflation ZNG is not a formula for resource stability for the Organization, but a formula for budget reduction. So, in some way, as the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran pointed out, the use of the term is somewhat misleading. Although there is some scope for efficiency savings, I do not think any delegation has claimed, although it may be the view of some delegations, that the reductions implied by a ZNG budget can be realized by efficiency savings alone. More particularly, since there appears to be a consensus, or near consensus, on substantial increases for certain important programmes and those mentioned during the debate today include IPPC, Plant Genetic Resources, Codex, and perhaps not consensus but many delegations spoke in favour of increases for forestry and fisheries. Many delegations, certainly I think delegations which through their regional chairs represent a majority of the delegations here, spoke in favour of increases for technical assistance.

Anyway, given that there appears to be wide support for increases in certain programmes, if we are to have either a stable budget, which would be ZRG, or a declining budget which is what in effective terms ZNG is, there have to be evidently reductions or eliminations of certain programmes. It has to be admitted that, at least I think, the Secretariat has been given really or virtually no guidance from the Membership during this debate or in the Programme Committee as to what should be cut. A few delegations, however not many, have mentioned one or two programmes, but for these programmes the budget allocations are minor, frankly minuscule, compared to the increases that would be required for the programmes that have been mentioned for increase. Effectively what we as the Membership have done, we have asked, or at least some delegations have asked, for a ZNG budget or a ZRG budget, but what we have effectively done, since we have given no guidance as members to the organization, we have asked the Secretariat to make political choices, because we have all said priority setting is a political exercise.

I have real scepticism as to whether the Secretariat would be willing to do that political work for us. It is a matter of judgement as to whether or not it ought to, but I am rather sceptical, based on my discussions with the Secretariat, including the Director-General, on whether the Secretariat will undertake that work. If the Membership wants to give the Secretariat real political guidance as to priority-setting, if that really is the wish of the Membership, we have to have a mechanism to do so. I think it is clear from the Basic Texts of the organization that in the standing instructions of the Organization it is indeed the Programme Committee which has this task, and I read from Rule 26 paragraph 7 of the Basic Text where it says "The Programme Committee shall have the following functions: a) to review the Summary and draft Programme of Work and Budget of the

Organization for the ensuing biennium, particularly with respect to content and balance of the programme, having regard to the extent to which it is proposed that existing activities be expanded reduced in scope or discontinued. And the priorities to be given to existing activities, extension of such activities and to new activities”.

I think it is clear from the text of the Programme Committee that it is indeed entrusted with this work. However the delegation of Japan pointed out, and I believe correctly, that the Programme Committee has not done this work. The delegation of Pakistan again, I believe correctly, that it does not have the capacity to do this work. It does not have the capacity because it meets two weeks during the year and, at most during those two weeks, for each of those one week sessions, it can devote at most a day and a half to this work. Normally the Secretariat allocates a day, but by pushing and squeezing we can get a day and a half. However, three days a year is not enough to carry out this kind of work, because this kind of work is a highly-sensitive political work which would require several stages in negotiations and a close liaison between the Members of the Committee and Regional Groups. So, given the existing time allocated to the Programme Committee and the way the meetings are scheduled, the Programme Committee is certainly not ready to carry out this work and I do not think the work will really be carried materially further forward at the September meeting, than was done in the May meeting.

I also should say that it is not mentioned in the Report of the Programme Committee, but it clearly emerges from our discussions in Committee in May, that maybe some Members of the Committee were not willing to undertake that work. It was not a formal argument about the mandates, but they didn't think that would be a proper function for that Committee or they did not feel they would have the mandates from their Governments or regional groups to participate in such a negotiation. I think if the Membership really wants to do this work, it has two options. One is the option mentioned today by the delegation of India and supported by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which is to set up a special *ad hoc* working group to do it. If that were to be done it would have to be done at this Session of the Council, because if it is not done at this Session of the Council, there is no opportunity to do it again until the end of November at a pre-Conference Session of the Council. That would be the next opportunity, so effectively the work would be done in the few days prior to the Conference and at the Conference itself. That is possible and effectively that is what has been done on previous occasions, but we would have to recognize that if it is done in that way there is a certain evident crudeness to that method. It will not produce any kind of fine-tuned result, it will be a result forced simply by the pressure of whatever the budget level is set at. Probably in the end it will be left again to the Secretariat and, since the Secretariat is not able to make the political choices that perhaps ought to be made by the Membership, the Secretariat will probably continue to make cuts in every programme and so there will not be priority-setting.

I think that maybe the Council, and I urge the Chairman and the Bureau of the Council to think about this, should decide before we break on Saturday. The three options, are: to do nothing, which is probably what will happen, which means it will be done at the Conference. The Membership will set a level and leave it to the Secretariat to figure out how to spend it, which will probably mean pro-rata reductions throughout the programmes if it happens as it has happened before.

The second possibility is for the Council to allocate further resources to the Programme Committee, so that it could hold more frequent meetings. It already has the basic legal mandate to do this work, but I think it would also need to give it a political mandate and urge the Programme Committee to do this work, together with giving it the necessary resources.

The third option would be to establish an *ad hoc* group, to endow it with the resources for translation and secretary support and to define a mandate to decide on its composition. Obviously, as between the two options of using the Programme Committee or establishing an *ad hoc* group, it seems to me that the fact that the Programme Committee already exists, and it has a given composition, is both the negative and positive elements that it would bring.

We would not have to negotiate the composition, because that exists. On the other hand, Members may not feel that the relative composition of the Programme Committee is the optimum composition of a body to carry out such work. However, although I do urge - I know this will not be done at this minute - that we either shrug our shoulders and leave it all to the next Council at the end of November, or we look at one of these two options as a way of carrying out this work, but I really could not encourage you to think that the Programme Committee, in the one and half days or so that it will devote to this matter in September, will be able to carry the issue of priority-setting forward. I do not think that would be realistic. So these are my comments on the debate.

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

As expected I suppose, we have wide diversity of views, perhaps wider than I have seen for some time, which is a major concern for the Secretariat. Hopefully by the time we get to the Conference we will have narrowed the gap.

I will start off with certain factual questions and issues which were raised. The distinguished delegate of India expressed concern about the lack of project approvals in 2002 from the TCP and, in fact, it is true that there were no approvals for India in 2002. To give you a little bit of history, India had approvals amounting to US\$810 000 in 1996-1997, US\$910 000 in 1998-1999 and then in 2000-2001 there were US\$1 326 000. In 2002-2003 there have been projects approved for a total value of US\$397 000 and there are a further two projects, I believe, totalling US\$530 000, which have been submitted and are likely to be approved shortly. There is a fairly slow flow of projects coming from India, only three were submitted in February 2002 and one of those has been approved and the other two are being considered. So, I think we should conclude that this is an aberration in 2002, but that the average flow from biennium to biennium has been relatively consistent.

Peru and also Mexico asked how the budget is distributed regionally. This information will be provided in the full Programme of Work and Budget. The Summary document was meant to be kept reasonably short so it does not include, for example, the regional distribution, the distribution by budget component, the organigrammes, the list of professional posts, etc. all of which we provide with the full PWB, usually on the website for you to access at your convenience. So, we will be providing that information with the full PWB.

The distinguished delegate of Korea raised a technical point asking why programme management had risen by four percent. The rise, in fact, is a technical adjustment. We have taken the travel unit out of Finance, where it was originally shown on the Major Programme 5.2, and moved it into a group called the Management Support Service, which services all of the Departments. We did this on the recommendation of consultants and because it makes sense. The group that services all the technical Departments, actually all Departments, would be the right place to provide travel services, as most of these travel services relate, for example, to entitlement travel, etc. That, however, shifted US\$1.7 million, which is very close to four percent of programme management, from 5.2 into this particular group, where the costs of this group are distributed to the programme management costs of the Departments it serves. So, that is why you see that increase - there is no real budgetary change in terms of total expenditure on administration.

We note the comments of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the terminology. I cannot help but agree that Zero Nominal Growth is a remarkable expression for a budget cut. We will have difficulty changing that everywhere in the document because people are so used to the terminology, but we will include definitions in an appropriate place to allow those who are not familiar with UN-speak to be able to understand it.

The European Community regretted the absence of more information on the strategies to address cross-organizational issues. In the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, again we are trying to avoid expanding the document too much. In fact you will notice that it is considerably larger than the previous version, because we listed individual biennial outputs. However, we will, in the full Programme of Work and Budget, have a section entitled "Strategic Budget", which will

address all of the links to the Strategic Framework and will include coverage of the strategies to address cross-organizational issues.

Towards the end of the debate, Eritrea raised a question concerning their understanding of the US\$14.1 million for After-Service Medical Care and what may have caused this, given that there has been no change in the Pension Fund regulations. I should clarify that this has not actually anything to do with the Pension Fund, which is a fully-funded after-service benefit. After-Service Medical Care is handled within the Organization and is an after-service benefit which is not fully funded. There has been no real change, it is simply that Organizations such as ours and many private enterprise organizations as well, were not recognizing this future liability in their accounts until the international accounting standards were changed to insist that this be recognized. Now, we are well behind the private sector's process of recognizing these expenses, but we are catching up and that is why this has come to your attention in this budget.

Moving to the more substantive issues, priorities and priority-setting. I was a little concerned to see the views expressed that there was "a lack of priority setting" or "a lack of focused priorities", being used by some Member Nations as a reason for not supporting the budget. Now, in fact, FAO has what is probably the most comprehensive, and I would venture to suggest, the most sophisticated programme planning system in the UN. We, as far as I know, are the only organization that has the hierarchy of a Strategic Framework for 10 to 15 years linked to a rolling Medium-Term Plan of six years, linked to a very specific Programme of Work and Budget, which defines the biennial outputs that will contribute to the Medium-Term Plan objectives. That requires focus; that requires you to establish entities which address the strategic objectives of the Organization, which, in turn, address the global goals that you have established for yourselves as the Membership.

Furthermore, the Secretariat does have a distinct priority-setting process – that is described in the document PC 89/4 – which was addressed by the last Programme Committee. Of course, it can be improved. The Secretariat itself criticized its own methodology and it is going to make suggestions for improvements to it. That does not mean that we do not have a priority-setting process; it also does not mean that we do not produce a budget that generally satisfies the Membership in terms of priorities. In fact, every biennium we produce a Medium-Term Plan which you, the Council, endorses and every biennium we produce a budget which the Conference approves by consensus. So, while it is a difficult and complex process getting there, in the end we do tend to arrive at the destination, which is a consensus on what the priorities are for the Organization.

I will say this carefully, but I think the main problem that is being raised is in fact the Membership's difficulty with determining lower priority activities. How can the Membership agree which activities should be reduced on those occasions when reductions are necessary? And that is where you are asking the Secretariat to help you with that process, and certainly we will try to cooperate with you in that.

I would just like to comment very briefly on the remark of the Chairman of the Programme Committee that the Secretariat would likely *pro rata* any reduction. I assume he was saying that in good humour and not in reflection of the facts. We would not *pro rata* a reduction - we always look at it in terms of the objectives of the Organization.

Looking at the specific priorities that have been mentioned, I would like to advise you on what I believe will happen. This is a statement of intent. I cannot guarantee anything because the process is underway now.

The case of IPPC and Codex: the requirements for both these programmes, as have been stated, will be met under RG and ZRG, but nobody can guarantee, and I apologize to the distinguished delegate of New Zealand, that those levels will be maintained at any budget level.

The Interim Committee for Plant Genetic Resources on Food and Agriculture: under RG we have already included sufficient resources for one meeting, under ZRG we will only be able to fund

about half that amount. We are in any case, relying very much on extra-budgetary resources to support documentation and participation in the meeting.

International Year of the Rice: this is primarily funded from extra-budgetary resources or is intended to be, as was the decision of the Conference. There is a Trust Fund proposal which totals US\$4.4 million, which is currently being presented to potential donors. An informal meeting of donors is set for September, but, for your information, an amount of US\$250 000 has been proposed to be set aside from the arrears provision to help support the initiation of this process.

HIV/AIDS: this is, of course, already a high priority and a Senior Officer HIV/AIDS and Food Security is already included under ZRG and RG, and will remain there unless there is a further reduction (e.g. ZNG).

The question of the Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action (PAIA) for HIV/AIDS: this could well be an appropriate idea. However, I would like to reserve my position simply because normally the way the PAIAs are selected before being proposed to the Council in the Medium-Term Plan, is for them to be discussed at the Senior Management Meeting. So we need to review the case and I will come back to you.

I should mention one other specific priority raised which concerned cooperatives and suggesting that the cooperative budget should not be cut. In fact 2.5.3.A.2, the entity which encompasses our work on cooperatives, shows an increase under both ZRG and RG in the Summary Programme of Work and Budget. Of course, like any programme, this may change. To accommodate the changes that I have described above, we will need to consider reductions in other programmes and this may well be a programme that has to be considered for that purpose. In any case, the Secretariat will take its guidance from the Council Report as to which programmes should be protected and which should not be.

Moving from priorities to the question of Zero Nominal Growth, some delegates have indicated their preference for a ZNG scenario, but I think we have to address what is meant by that. There is always some difficulty in defining ZNG because of the effect of exchange rates.

To start with the absurd, if I may call it that if, for example, we were to define ZNG in Euros we would start with the US\$651.8 million you approved last time, we would convert them to Euros at the budget rate to arrive at €741 million, which is what they were worth at the time the budget was approved, and then we would convert that back to dollars at the current rate which is US\$859 million. So, I can confirm that the Secretariat would be able to handle that amount.

The European Community has proposed another definition, if I understood it correctly, which is to say that maybe we should be looking at ZNG, which consists of cost increases of US\$33.6 million and After-Service Medical Care which is US\$14.1 million, which will mean looking at reductions of US\$47.7 million.

The United States of America, however, has developed a different version of ZNG and a tentative figure can be developed as follows. We start with a budget of US\$651.8 million, we consider cost increases of US\$33.6 million, we consider the After-Service Medical Care of US\$14.1 million and then we consider a figure for the effect of exchange rates on cost increases. I have used an exchange rate of US\$1.16 to the Euro, which would be an adjustment of about US\$71 million. So, we would need a total budget of US\$770.7 million at ZRG if we are going to have no split assessment. That means that we would have to face a reduction of just under US\$120 million if we are going to use ZNG. In other words, ZNG implies a loss of purchasing power of US\$120 million, assuming we do not have split assessment.

Japan has another definition of what it requires, which is a reduction in assessments. This is a scenario which I presume as being below ZNG, although I am not clear as to what absolute amount it refers.

However, let us use the United States of America's figure as being the most concrete one we have. To give an idea of the enormity of this proposal, a cut of US\$ 120 million is more than the institution's combined spending on fisheries, forestry and sustainable development in all



locations. Or, if you like, it is more than what we spend on agriculture, Major Programme 2.1. Or, regardless of programme terms, it is a reduction of about 900 posts across the Organization.

What would that mean in practice? For most of the posts there are incumbents so we would have to pay out termination indemnities, and based on our experience, on average, the cost of the terminations that we have faced over the last eight biennia cost about US\$68 000 each, which means that we would have an additional cost of some US\$61 million. In other words, to save US\$120 million we would need to spend US\$61 million. I hope that the proponents of ZNG have some suggestions for the funding source.

What concerns me is what will happen in 2006-2007. If you agree with the view of most analysts, the Euro is currently over-valued and will weaken against the dollar over the medium term. One would expect in 2006-2007 to find that the US\$651.8, if that is the figure, is actually worth a lot more in Euro terms. That means that we would, assuming ZNG is maintained, be in a position to start hiring back the staff, maybe different staff, maybe the same staff, but we would have to go through a process of rebuilding the capacity of the Organization to deliver the Programme of Work because of this aberration in 2004-2005. That frankly is one of the main reasons why the Secretariat is proposing Split Assessments, because it will avoid this incredible instability in the budget levels of the Organization. It will eliminate the exchange rate effect from that process.

The Council has to conclude for itself what it wants to do, but the suggestion that we should contemplate ZNG under these conditions is, in my view, unrealistic and is not, from what I believe I have heard, the wish of the large majority of the Membership. Furthermore, I should emphasize that it is something that should not be done as an academic exercise; it should not be taken lightly. The impact on the institution will be extraordinary. There will be an enormously time-consuming disruption as groups of people will meet to argue out how and which posts should go, as they defend their territory, they defend their livelihoods. It will have a major deteriorating effect on morale. We should only do this if you are very serious about implementing it.

Switzerland asked a very profound question which I am not going to be able to answer very well, but I feel it deserves a response of sorts. It asked what the impact of ZNG would be on the achievement of the World Food Summit goals. Now, obviously I am not in a position to give you a number. I do not know how many more or less people will be suffering from malnutrition if you give us a ZNG budget, give us a ZRG budget, or give us an RG budget. However, there are three clear global goals of Member Nations and there are five corporate strategies which FAO, by which I mean the Membership, have established to assist Members reach their global goals and one of those is the World Food Summit goal of halving the number of the hungry.

Clearly, if we took a US\$120 million cut we would also have to cut the work on those strategies. That is all we do - we just work on supporting those strategies. So, Strategy A, which deals with access and reduction of food insecurity would be damaged. I imagine we would reduce our work on food nutrition, quality and safety; we would probably have to reduce work on EMPRES and on the Global Information and Early Warning System. Nothing would be untouched. I do not think it would be possible to take this sort of cut and protect anything absolutely.

Under Strategy B, which deals with the Regulatory Frameworks, I cannot see that it is likely that we would still be able to fund IPPC's increase and Codex's increase if we have a US\$120 million cut.

Under C, the Special Programme for Food Security would be damaged. C deals with the supply side of the equation.

Under D which deals with conservation and sustainability, the work that we do on the plans of action for fisheries, the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, on Forestry Management, on the support to the International Conventions - all of it would have to be trimmed at least, and some of it curtailed.

On E, which deals with information, yes I am sure that the work we are doing on FAOSTAT presently would have to be reduced and I am sure that WAICENT would suffer. Because just about everything would suffer to one degree or another.

So, in my view the answer to your question, Sir, is clearly that the US\$120 million or even a US\$50 million cut would affect our capacity to assist Member Nations to meet their goals and therefore, presumably, damage the extent to which they did meet those goals.

Turning to the question of efficiency savings. Several Members, including Japan, United States of America, Australia and Canada (with reference to continuous reform), have asked for reductions in either administrative costs or what is defined as efficiency savings.

First of all, can I state very clearly that we totally agree that there is always room for further efficiency savings. We know we can make more progress, but we are letting you know that it is getting harder. When we started this process in 1994, there were some fairly obvious areas we could go for. Those obvious areas have disappeared and now we have to look into the detail of processes, procedures and structures to see what other savings we can make. It took eight years to generate the figures in the document: US\$55-62 million per annum of efficiency savings, but it took us eight years to get there.

It is being suggested that we do roughly the same thing again, but in five months between now and the Conference and, furthermore, that we should anticipate that we will actually succeed and reduce the budget for 2004-2005 by US\$90 million on this basis. I am sorry, as a financial manager, I just simply could not recommend that approach, because it is not realistic. We have previously anticipated efficiency savings some time before we made them and, for example, in the current biennium we suffered a loss of close to US\$1 million of efficiency savings in Regional Offices, which proved not to be possible. I would prefer to count my chickens when they have hatched, because if you are really going to provide a stable budget to programme managers to implement the programmes you want, you have to guarantee that they are going to get the money. So, taking on possible efficiency savings in the structure of such a budget is a very risky thing to do.

However, we have not given up and I note that several delegates made specific suggestions, for example, the Republic of Korea. What we have decided to do, and this is mentioned in the document, is to take a more systematic approach, to try and go to the core of the processes of the institution and see how we can improve them. As you know, we have been introducing results-based budgeting throughout the technical programmes of the Organization. I think we have made good progress, although we have not completed it. Until we have the auto-evaluations in place and we start to see the results, we will not know how successful it has all been.

The next stage is to introduce results-based budgeting into what we call the non-technical programmes and, as part of the design of that, we are building in a requirement that periodically each of those programmes be subject to a so-called SWOT analysis (i.e. strengths and weaknesses and opportunities and threats), with the specific view of identifying corrective actions which could be taken to either improve the service or reduce the cost. We even have developed an entity called a Project which will be an entity whereby we invest resources in trying to assist a unit and improve its efficiency in some way.

Through that process, we expect to start to generate these more difficult efficiency savings which are hard to identify at the surface of things. You have to get into the depth of the subject area and you have to have the programme manager actively involved and on side before you succeed. Incidentally, this connects directly with the strategies to address cross-organizational issues, because it is those strategies that will create the projects, that will improve the services and the efficiency of those services in the Organization.

There is further coherence in the process in that it will be connected to the Medium-Term Plan and eventually to the capital budgeting proposals which are under consideration by the Finance Committee.

Of course, the problem with the proposal is that it is intended that each entity be considered once in six years, because we do not believe that completely repeating this exercise every year or every two years for every situation is value for money. Furthermore, the cycle of once every six years is based on what we felt could be absorbed by the Organization.

The European Community asked what it would cost to accelerate the process. I would have to take that question on notice, but I imagine that if there were additional resources we could accelerate the process in some way.

Related to efficiency savings, the distinguished delegate of Japan suggested that we needed to cut posts. For us cutting posts can often be and has been part of efficiency savings, but it can also be a matter of cutting programmes. So, we do not see cutting posts as one issue: we prefer to discuss programme reductions and efficiency savings. In fact, FAO has cut, as the Director-General indicated, somewhere between 28 and 30 percent of all posts since 1994. You saw the multimedia presentation on "Reform" this morning, which referred to a figure of 30 percent covering posts from all sources of funds. The figures have been very drastic. If you look at the Regular Programme itself at Headquarters, we took 36.6 percent of all General Service or support posts out of this Organization in HQ, in that period.

So there have been massive reductions and I do not think that we can keep doing that in the same way and respect the demands that you have in the Programme of Work, demands, which I might add, often come from the same donors who are making these proposals. So, it seems to me that there is a little bit of an inconsistency sometimes in these proposals.

Japan itself was concerned about the increase of 72 posts under Zero Real Growth and that needs some explanation. As you can see from page 30 there is a table that gives you the details of posts, and in paragraph 103 there is an explanation of the changes. Of the 72 posts, 46 professional posts involve the transfer of people from other funding into the Regular Programme. The whole of the emergency division (TCE) was created and then the posts which were funded from those resources were brought into the Regular Budget and as was the income. So 46 of the 72 posts have no budgetary impact at all, they are just completing the picture for that particular division.

The remaining 26 can basically all be attributed to an intentional policy, which was to increase the number of entry level professional staff in the Organization. I am talking here of P1 to P3 posts. That policy was aimed at reinvigorating our professional capacity by bringing in young, recently-qualified Professionals, full of enthusiasm, etc. We felt that this was an appropriately dynamic policy.

On the information document there was a question from United States and Australia, and I now refer to CL 124/INF/20, which was the document that gave you the impact of the recommendations of the Technical Committees. I am afraid the documents may not have been clear to everyone, although it does say "beyond those presented in the SPWB document"; that is, the impact over the proposals that we are making to you. This is the impact over the proposals for a Real Growth, as this is what we see as our proposal. IPPC is fully covered under Real Growth, so there was no need to add any additional resources for IPPC. I hope that is a satisfactory explanation.

Moving to my closing comments. I felt that there were an awful lot of inconsistencies and internal contradictions in our discussions this morning, and of course we have to learn to live with inconsistencies, but I am a bit concerned about the extent to which they exist in today's debate.

Many of these are matters for Member Nations, for example, the Millennium Development Goals, Monterrey's conclusions, the World Food Summit on Sustainable Development, our own Summits etc. all came to certain conclusion - but FAO's budget seems to be moving in the opposite direction. Yet FAO is very relevant to the outcome of all of these Summits - we have something to offer.

The inconsistency lies between donors' demands for priorities, particularly in the normative area, and their unwillingness to even maintain the budget at current levels.

The growth in government spending of our major donors and the growth in FAO's budget. If I take an index and set it at 100 in 1993, FAO's budget is now 96, so there is a real decline. If I look at the same index and same start period (i.e. 1993), and I take the latest information I have for government expenditure (i.e. here I am using your own currency, but I can do it in US dollars as well, if you prefer, it does not make a lot of difference), Australia is US\$139, FAO is US\$96; Canada is US\$114, FAO is US\$96; France is US\$113 back in 1997, I have no later figures, FAO is US\$96; Germany is US\$110, FAO is US\$96; Italy is US\$120, FAO is US\$96; Japan is US\$134, FAO is US\$96; Switzerland is US\$110, UK is US\$119; and the United States is US\$130.

It reminds me of a comment by the Islamic Republic of Iran, which was also referred to the distinguished delegate of Japan but in a different way. In good times you have plenty of friends, but your real friends come to the fore in times of hardship. It appears that our friends do not appear at any time at all - even in the good times we did not get increases.

There is also the inconsistency between the budget growth in UN Bodies. These are figures which are all published, I can give you the sources for everything I am saying. The United Nations, working on a base of 1993 and again an index of 100 in 1993, is 112, FAO is 96 of course; Unesco is 122, ILO is 107, WHO is 116, ITU is 101, WIPO is 309 (they have a remarkable income sources at the moment), and IAEA is 130. So let us be very clear: FAO is at a distinct disadvantage with the other UN Bodies, yet everyone says agriculture is the driving force for development in developing countries - so that is a contradiction that I also have difficulty managing.

Finally just to refer to what is happening in the system these days. ILO has just had its budget approved ZRG. The nominal increase is about US\$95 million approved by consensus including the United States, Japan and Australia - so they have accepted a US\$95 million growth in the ILO budget in US\$ terms as a ZRG budget. I have to indicate that is not what it is in Swiss francs terms. The assessment to Swiss francs went down, but I think we have to be able to compare like to like. So if you want to talk about US dollars here, we have to talk about US dollars there.

In WHO I do not know what the actual impact of it is. They got a nominal increase of close US\$25 million. I do not think it is full ZRG, but it is very difficult to interpret it in the documentation. So again we have another inconsistency in the way that Governments are deciding to treat FAO and how they are deciding to treat the other UN Agencies. This may be legitimate, this may be perfectly proper. I not suggesting that it is not, but I am suggesting, as we do not seem to be receiving any clear explanation of why this institution which deals with agriculture, fisheries and forestry is not getting the priority that you would expect it to get in these circumstances.

**Anton KOHLER (Switzerland)**

We regularly get the verbatim sometime later. I think it would be very good to have the verbatim of the Secretariats and Chairman of the Finance Committee and Programme Committee's replies, including Mr. Wade's brilliant comments as soon as we can get it, because we attach high priority to it.

**CHAIRMAN**

That is a very reasonable demand and I think we will try to do that. If there is no objection, we would take up now the report of WFP. Are there any objections? No.

**9. World Food Programme****9. Programme alimentaire mondial****9. Programa Mundial de Alimentos**

*9.1 Annual Report of the WFP Executive Board on its Activities in 2002 (CL 124/11)*

*9.1 Rapport annuel du Conseil d'administration du PAM sur les activités du PAM en 2002 (CL 124/11)*

*9.1 Informe anual de la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA sobre sus actividades en 2002 (CL 124/11)*

**CHAIRMAN**

So we move forward to Item 9.1, and we would like to hear any other Report of the WFP Executive Board on its activities in 2002.

The relevant document is CL 124/11. We continue with Item number 9, World Food Programme and sub-item 9.1 Annual Report of the WFP Executive Board and its activities in 2002, as already mentioned the relevant document is CL 124/11.

I would like to extend a warm welcome to Ms. Sisulu, Deputy Executive Director of Policy and External Affairs Department in WFP to the Council and invite her to introduce the Report of the WFP Executive Board.

**Ms Sheila SISULU (Deputy Executive Director, World Food Programme)**

I would like to give you a few highlights of the Annual Report of the World Food Programme. I will start first with the operational highlights, then look at the Executive Board activities and results-based management and finally, the Inter-Agency collaboration. So to start, the highlights at the operational level are as follows:

The 2002 Annual Report and World Food Programme summarizes a particularly challenging year for us. The Programme assisted 72 million beneficiaries in 82 countries using generous donations up to the value of US\$1.8 billion.

Needs in Africa were particularly great, accounting for nearly half of the beneficiaries and more than half of WFP's expenditures in 2002. Compared to 2001, an additional 11 million people, primarily in Southern Africa and the Horn, required food aid due to widespread economic, natural disasters and also conflict.

As the Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Humanitarian Needs in Southern Africa, the WFP's Executive Director, Mr. Jim Morris, advocated extensively with Governments, donors and partners to implement a comprehensive and rapid response to the crisis, WFP also launched a media campaign to attract international attention and funds to the hunger crisis on the African continent.

Other major operations helped people suffering from hunger in Afghanistan, Angola, Iraq, Central America, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Sudan. A number of long-standing operations continued to assist refugees and internally displaced persons, for example in Algeria, Colombia, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Nepal.

HIV/AIDS represented a new type of emergency in Southern Africa. In response to this pandemic, WFP introduced programming changes to meet the special needs of HIV/AIDS-affected beneficiaries, such as altering the nutritional value and composition of emergency rations. Locations of high HIV prevalence were targeted and distributions were adjusted accordingly. Numerous initiatives were pursued with partners to support nationally-articulated HIV/AIDS plans and strategies, including HIV/AIDS-specific projects in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

WFP's school feeding activities provided nutritious meals to over 15.6 million schoolchildren in 64 countries. Emphasis was placed on collaborating with partners to complement food aid

provided in schools with other interventions such as deworming, health education and micronutrient supplementation.

Funding support for emergency and protracted relief and recovery operation was generally good, but contributions for development continued to decline. As a result, WFP was able to assist less than half of planned beneficiaries of development activities.

Nearly 41 percent of the total food tonnage provided by the Programme was purchased rather than donated in-kind. WFP's food procurement from developing countries steadily increased over the past three years, reaching 67 percent of the food procured locally in 2002.

With reference to the Executive Board Activities and Results-Based Management, the Report has the following to say:

Progress was made towards implementing the WFP Executive Board's Governance Project. This included the streamlining of the Board's processes to focus on strategic and policy matters, the approval and regular updating of the Consolidated Framework of WFP Policies by the Board, and consultations on the 2004-2007 Strategic Plan.

As requested by its Executive Board, the Annual Report reviews the progress towards results-based management during the year. Key achievements include improvements in collection, monitoring and reporting of results data, and the Executive Director's decision in October 2002 to establish a Division for Results-Based Management.

Other major activities of the Board are reported, including its adoption of the harmonized UNDG programme approval procedures.

It is important to note that the WFP Executive Board revised the recommendations to ECOSOC, included in the original Annual Report of the Executive Director to the Board. These revisions are included in a separate sheet reflecting the Board's action. For the future, an italicized explanatory note should appear both above the recommendation paragraph, in the original document, and at the top of the sheet of revised recommendations. The explanatory note will be added to the documents before they are transmitted to ECOSOC.

On Interagency collaboration:

The year was characterized by extensive collaboration between the Rome-based Agencies at the Headquarters and field level. Highlights included the launching of the twin-track approach to reducing hunger and poverty at the Financing for Development Conference in Monterrey, and of the Anti-Hunger Programme at the World Food Summit: *five years later* in Rome.

Collaborative efforts with FAO in 44 countries, including joint projects implemented in 24 countries, directly benefited more than 3.7 million people. The Agencies also carried out 21 joint Crop and Food Supply Assessment Missions to food-insecure countries.

WFP and FAO jointly developed a tool for use in Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM), prepared the SEAGA guidelines to improve gender-sensitive analysis and design in emergencies, worked closely in the Inter-agency Working Group on FIVIMS, and implemented several HIV/AIDS initiatives. These activities are described in more detail in paragraphs 26, 33, 54, 85, 86, 90, 102 and 116-118 of the Report.

Section II of the Report reviews WFP's contributions to inter-agency collaboration, major international summits and conferences, and common UN systems goals, as set forth in General Assembly resolutions on the Triennial Policy Review of Operational Activities. This section also spells out WFP's contributions to meeting the Millennium Development Goals by targeting food assistance to the world's most food insecure populations, supporting universal primary education through school feeding and gender activities, reducing child and maternal malnutrition, and combating diseases such as HIV/AIDS.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

Mucho le agradeceré dar la palabra a la delegación de la República Dominicana que va a hacer una declaración en nombre de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

Estoy hablando en nombre de los países de América Latina y el Caribe sobre el tema del Programa Mundial de Alimentos (PMA) y doy la bienvenida a la distinguida Subdirectora Ejecutiva de esa institución.

Al manifestar nuestro apoyo al informe del Programa Mundial de Alimentos, deseamos reiterar en este foro nuestra preocupación por la disminución de los recursos para los proyectos de asistencia alimentaria para el desarrollo. Desde nuestra concepción, la labor que cumple el PMA en esta materia es muy importante por el positivo impacto que tiene en la seguridad alimentaria, en las oportunidades de desarrollo de las poblaciones beneficiadas, y por las ventajas que reporta desde el punto de vista social.

Reiteramos nuestro interés en que los recursos para el desarrollo recuperen sus niveles y se incrementen paulatinamente con miras a que el PMA pueda seguir teniendo un rol activo y decisivo en el apoyo a las poblaciones más necesitadas. En ese marco, el doble mandato del PMA debe reforzarse y solicitamos que este Consejo, como uno de los órganos rectores del PMA, así lo indique en su Informe Final.

Del mismo modo, mi Grupo Regional desea renovar su compromiso con la universalidad de la asistencia del PMA. Este principio está plenamente incorporado al estatuto y en este sentido debemos que tener un particular cuidado en el proceso de elaboración del nuevo Plan Estratégico. Tal como lo ha indicado reiteradamente el Grupo de países de América Latina y el Caribe (GRULAC), la alteración del mandato del PMA como organismo dependiente del sistema de las Naciones Unidas, no es factible política y jurídicamente y lo es por tanto la concentración de la asistencia que va más allá de lo establecido en la declaración sobre el cometido. Solicitamos también que esta orientación sea parte del Informe de este Consejo.

Por último, mi Grupo Regional desea reiterar la importancia que le asigna a la coordinación entre el PMA y la FAO en el terreno, por las características que imprime el Sistema de Naciones Unidas para el desarrollo a través del UNDAF y el CCA, del cual forma parte el PMA, consideramos que la FAO, a pesar de que no es parte de este grupo, debería acercarse más a sus labores a fin de que los proyectos de asistencia técnica puedan complementarse entre sí y enmarcarse más directamente en las prioridades que cada país tiene para alcanzar los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio.

**Fumihito KABUTA (Japan)**

Since Japan, as a Member of the WFP Executive Board, has joined the fruitful and in-depth debate on the WFP's policies and activities, we have no objection to endorse this Annual Report before us and just have four comments relating to this agenda item.

Firstly, as a major achievement in 2002, the Japanese delegation would like to highlight the excellent response to the humanitarian crisis in southern Africa. WFP, with the generous support of various donors, including the emerging donors, could respond rapidly and efficiently to the food crisis and avoid any critical humanitarian crisis. We cannot forget the active leadership of the Executive Director, Mr Morris, as the UN Secretary General's Special Envoy. We will keep an eye on the food insecurity situation in this Region, as well as other Regions, such as the Horn of Africa, Asia, Near East, Latin America and eastern Europe.

Secondly, regarding the closer cooperation between WFP and FAO, we support the twin-track approach to reducing rural poverty, which was launched last year, but in doing so clear demarcation between their activities is vital. We expect that WFP's Strategic Plan 2004-2007 could address this issue properly by prioritizing its main activities into four categories.

Thirdly, having said that, we believe that WFP has a mandate to development and recovery issues, as well as emergency response, when and where food is not available. On May 14, our Prime Minister Koizumi announced the Japanese Initiative for Cooperation for Africa, which notes that "Japan will consider ways to develop rural infrastructure, augment food self-sufficiency, combat desertification and also support projects such as Food-for-Work implemented by the World Food Programme".

Finally, needless to say, under the severe budgetary environment, efficiency, in other words, higher outcome with less cost, should be demanded. From this point of view, Japan highly appreciates WFP's efforts to introduce results-based management. We think that it should be worthwhile for FAO to consider a similar management approach, especially for field projects management, as expressed by many Members of this Council.

**Tony P. HALL (United States of America)**

I appreciate you chairing this Committee and your thoughts. Certainly, we are very appreciative of Sheila Sisulu and her comments. Again, I would like to say how great it is to have her in an important job in the World Food Programme. We are very grateful for her insight and her tremendous background, and are excited about the good work that she is going to do.

In the United States, we recognize the extraordinary efforts of the World Food Programme during this past year in responding to humanitarian food needs throughout the world. We particularly commend the World Food Programme for its response to the southern Africa drought emergency, which threatened the lives of more than 14 million.

We remain concerned that the amount of global food aid has dropped to the lowest level in four years. According to some estimates, global food aid requirements will exceed more than 12 million tonnes in 2003. That is nearly three million tonnes more than last year's level. We are particularly worried about shortfalls in meeting emergency needs in sub-Saharan Africa, where some 38 to 40 million Africans live with the threat of starvation, and another 156 million suffer quietly from chronic hunger.

Some of us in this room do not believe that food aid is the answer to feeding hungry people in the long run. Unfortunately, people do not eat in the long run, they need to eat when they are hungry and we are all working to improve our investment in agriculture development. My Government is following Canada's lead and putting more of its foreign aid in agriculture, but that is still not enough.

In 1984 the world was horrified when we first saw pictures of people starving in Ethiopia and I am sad to say that we are seeing those pictures again. Nobody wants to use the 'f' word, but famine is threatening the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea again. Some people are saying that famine is coming and, unless we do more to help, they will be right. We still have a few weeks to act before the hungry season hits and men, women and children start dying in massive numbers.

Although we are facing a grave crisis, we are not yet witnessing widespread starvation on the scale that we saw during 1984 and 1985. However, I have to stress that unless we all do more immediately, we will have to say that the Horn of Africa is experiencing its first famine of the Twenty-first Century.

Last summer, the United States Famine Early Warning System Network issued a warning, prompting the Government of Ethiopia to issue its first appeal for emergency assistance in July 2002. Due to a continued deterioration in the situation in April 2003, the Government of Ethiopia increased the number of people in need from 11.3 million to 12.6 million. There is an estimated food need of more than 1.52 million metric tonnes.

In addition to the perilous food security situation, deterioration in health, nutrition and sanitation conditions have made this a full blown humanitarian crisis and, as expressed in the UN Commons Appeals process, there are 12 to 14 million people threatened with starvation in Ethiopia and 1.5 million in Eritrea.



Last month the Executive Board of the UN's World Food Programme adopted a Final Report that said that "we see the crisis in the Horn of Africa as our top priority at this time. We urge the entire UN System and donor governments, both old and new, big and small, to recognize the magnitude and the severity of the situation. We recognize the need to work together, especially when the immediate crisis has passed, in order to prevent this situation in the future, and while our response to famine has improved, it still needs to be strengthened, in order to guarantee that famine will never again threaten the Horn of Africa or elsewhere." I think our moral duty demands no less.

I have criticized FAO for not doing an adequate job to address the food situation in Ethiopia. I said that after I returned from the Region in February and I said it again last week when I found out that the need for seeds was underestimated. I am confident that this Organization can do a better job in assisting the transition from relief to development and, like a relay race, FAO needs to take the baton from World Food Programme after an emergency to make sure that a country can grow enough to feed itself. Of course, if that baton is dropped, planting seasons are missed and people will not only hurt, but many will die.

The United States supports FAO's Emergency Operations Unit with extra budgetary-resources. We believe that this Unit is doing exactly what needs to be done. We also support the World Food Programme's twinning initiative, that matches non-traditional food donors with non-traditional cash donors to provide humanitarian food assistance.

We believe the simple concept can go a long way towards providing resources needed to meet crisis needs. We believe that the G8 Action Plan Against Famine, which we developed together with France, recognizes the need, not only for humanitarian intervention, but also for longer term solutions to food and security. It will help focus attention on improving the capacity of countries affected and of the international community to anticipate and prevent famine.

In reviewing the Annual Report of the World Food Programme, we need to do more to help the hungry and so do FAO and the UN System as a whole. Together we can make sure that famine becomes something for the history books.

**Ms Maryam Ahmed Moustafa MOUSA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

My country's delegation would like to take this opportunity to voice its full support to the Annual Report of the World Food Programme's Executive Board.

We would like to underscore the need to continue to support the efforts of the Programme in the Horn of Africa. We also applaud the efforts made by the World Food Programme in development assistance and especially regarding the assistance to those regions most usually affected by poverty, and the most seriously affected populations - generally that is women and children.

My country attaches great importance to the visit made by the Executive Director, as well as the conclusions following his encounter with our President.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

The Report of the World Food Programme for the year 2002 makes very impressive reading. While underscoring the remarkable work undertaken by WFP, it brings home the magnitude of the humanitarian problems facing the world.

There have been unprecedented weather-related disasters in recent years, which caused increasing food insecurity in vulnerable areas. Climate change clearly exacerbates the possibilities of such weather-related crises to escalate and the resultant demands on the WFP system can be well imagined. Unfortunately, the same appears to be the case with regard to the man-made crises also.

The World Food Programme was established with the mandate of using food aid to support economic and social development and to meet emergency and relief food needs. The point to be considered therefore, is how to maintain focus on the developmental or strategic goals, while responding to the more pressing humanitarian crises. India strongly believes that the Organization needs to exert still more power to adequately address these competing concerns.

We strongly believe that, although saving lives should be a priority for the Programme, creating durable assets and supporting livelihoods over a longer term should also be an important part of WFP's work. We also believe that WFP should retain global presence and continue operations in all Regions of the world.

We would also like to refer to some misgivings in certain quarters regarding the desirability of non-traditional donors playing a role in the Organization's aid programme. Speaking for India, I can safely assert that our role as exporter and donor of food grains in no way undermines our commitment to an involvement with local food security arrangements. Detailed reference to our extensive public distribution system for ensuring food security and the various emergency schemes to facilitate access to food by the poor, particularly during periods of disasters, finds place in my intervention on the world food security issues.

It should be absolutely clear that our role as a non-traditional donor to the World Food Programme and as an exporter of food grains is complementary rather than detrimental to our commitments to provide and promote food security at home.

We are happy to note that 67 percent of WFP's food requirements were purchased from developing countries. However, procurement in developing countries as a percentage of global food aid declined from 19 percent in 1997 to 10 percent in 2002. I am sure that procurement from developing countries can be stepped up still further.

It will be rewarding to also study the comparative prices of food procured by WFP in different parts of the world. This could be an area for improving WFP's financial and operational efficiency.

Out of the food assistance committed for Afghanistan by India through WFP, the first grants of 40 000 tonnes of wheat was converted to 9 500 tonnes of high-energy biscuits for school feeding programmes in that country.

The existing arrangements in WFP needs to be amended to facilitate greater involvement of non-traditional donors. The present stipulation, that donations of commodities be matched by cash contributions to cover associated costs of handling, storage and transports, acts as a major deterrent to this newly-emerging group. The associated costs are often not commensurate with substantive donations. We urge that such guidelines be reviewed to enable the developing countries to contribute to WFP's operations.

While, therefore, we assure our continued support to WFP operations, we fervently hope that the Organization will undertake wide-ranging policy adjustments so that its activities broadens to embrace non-traditional donors in a larger way, bringing in greater equities in the process. We are confident that the Organization will succeed in its endeavour to reduce hunger and suffering in the world, and to serve as an effective instrument in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

**Antonio Arturo PLAZA JIMÉNEZ (Chile)**

Deseamos apoyar la aclaración hecha por el Representante de la República Dominicana en nombre del GRULAC. Particularmente en lo vinculado con la necesidad de mantener la universalidad de la Organización.

Así mismo, deseamos apoyar el informe del PMA ya que encontramos que es un excelente documento con una gran cantidad de información referida a actividades creativas que demuestran la eficiencia y el buen manejo que tiene la actual administración. Reiteramos la necesidad que la Organización debe seguir mejorando y procurando mayores actividades vinculadas con el incremento del proceso de desarrollo. Creemos que es fundamental que la Organización busque – como lo dice el informe- nuevas alternativas y nuevas obras, que permitan a través de nuevos donantes movilizar recursos y ojalá que éstos se destinen en su gran mayoría a las actividades de desarrollo que, lamentablemente, están disminuyendo. Estamos seguros que la creación de capacidades a través del desarrollo es la mejor forma de hacer frente a las emergencias.

En materia de gestión, solicitamos al PMA que revise su actual política de compras con el fin de expandir su base de proveedores, que permitan incluir a un mayor número de países en desarrollo. Afirmamos que ésto favorecerá a la Organización no solamente en materia del tipo de alimentos, la cercanía entre ellos por lo que se refiere a su entrega y reparto, la economía de escalas y finalmente, de primaria importancia, los precios. En cuanto a las inversiones de los organismos, creemos fundamental que la actual política de inversiones de la Organización considere expandir su base de colocaciones incluyendo un mayor número de destinatarios -las llamadas economías emergentes- que en muchos casos son beneficiarios y donantes a la vez. No debemos dejar de lado un análisis estricto del riesgo de la inversión del capital ya que, sin lugar a dudas, no deseamos que estos fondos corran ningún tipo de riesgos o problemas.

Otro aspecto, del cual estamos muy satisfechos, es el proceso que está llevando a cabo la Organización para pasar a una administración basada en los resultados, lo cual creemos es la base de toda buena administración eficiente y moderna.

Al mismo tiempo, queremos felicitar a la Organización por las acciones innovadoras destinadas a identificar asociaciones que permiten encontrar nuevos y mayores recursos. En este aspecto, nuestro país se siente particularmente comprometido ya que hemos tenido la oportunidad de lanzar una iniciativa conjunta con el PMA para que en el Programa de Alimentación Escolar, que actualmente lleva la Organización, permita expandir el número de beneficiarios en América Latina. Asociación que, en esta materia, será llevada a cabo junto con el sector privado de nuestra región. Esto permitirá no sólo movilizar recursos sino que, al igual que nuestro programa en Chile, ayudará a alimentar y educar a muchos niños en nuestra Región.

Finalmente, le pedimos al PMA que siga buscando alternativas que permitan garantizar una mejor y mayor representación geográfica dentro del plantel permanente de la Organización, especialmente de América Latina.

#### **Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

La delegación de México expresa su apoyo a la declaración formulada por el Representante de la República Dominicana, en calidad de Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. El año pasado, un representante en este Consejo señaló la inconsistencia del título que se da a este tema; quizás sería más conveniente que se le denominara Informe Anual del Director Ejecutivo del PMA sobre las Actividades del Programa y no Informe de las Actividades de la Junta Ejecutiva.

Para mi delegación es muy grato haber escuchado la extraordinaria presentación que ha hecho la Sra. Sisulo. Mi Gobierno reconoce la encomiable labor que ha venido realizando en estos dos años el Sr. James Morris como Director Ejecutivo de este importante Programa de las Naciones Unidas y, se une a la aprobación del Informe que ya fue analizado por la Junta Ejecutiva.

En el prólogo del Informe Anual, el Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas y el Director General de esta Organización, afirman que las personas que sufren hambre necesitan asistencia alimentaria. Pero, agregan que también requieren inversiones sostenidas y a largo plazo en desarrollo agrícola y rural. Esta es una afirmación compatible con el doble mandato del PMA. Por ello mi delegación expresa su preocupación por la recurrente caída en el 2002 de los recursos destinados a la cartera de proyectos de desarrollo. Se requiere, sin duda, un mayor esfuerzo del PMA y de la comunidad internacional para revertir esta tendencia y fortalecer las operaciones de desarrollo, las que pueden constituirse en un aporte significativo del Programa para alcanzar los objetivos del milenio sobre desarrollo. Fortalecer las operaciones de desarrollo, permitiría al PMA cumplir con su doble mandato, pero quizás lo más importante es que haría más eficiente el uso de los recursos que la comunidad de donantes pone a disposición del Programa.

Fue muy interesante el relato hecho recientemente por el Sr. Morris en la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA sobre la inversión para el desarrollo hecha en una aldea en el corazón de África. En él indicó que cuando, de manera inesperada, aconteció un desastre natural en la Región, el PMA tuvo que gastar una gran cantidad de recursos para apoyar a las poblaciones vecinas de dicha aldea. Pero la necesidad de intervenir en la que había invertido previamente fue mínima. En

consecuencia, si el objetivo es combatir de manera estructural la vulnerabilidad de las personas pobres, el camino está en las operaciones vinculadas al desarrollo.

Los estudios más recientes indican que, lamentablemente, hay un incremento constante en la incidencia de catástrofes naturales. En ese sentido, los desafíos a los que debe hacer frente el PMA también aumentarán en el futuro. En la medida en que no haya un compromiso universal para combatir las causas que provocan, entre otros, el calentamiento global, el PMA deberá atender un mayor número de personas en emergencia. El Programa daría una enorme contribución a su propia labor y al bienestar de la humanidad, si realiza acciones más puntuales para fortalecer una conciencia universal de las causas que están provocando el incremento de las catástrofes naturales e impulsa, al mismo tiempo, actividades más firmes a favor del desarrollo. Ahora, está en marcha un proceso de negociación sobre la planificación estratégica para los próximos años del PMA. Por lo tanto, éste es un período propicio para afrontar de manera amplia los desafíos en materia alimentaria y para pensar al papel que debe desempeñar el Programa como agente internacional para mitigar situaciones desesperadas de hambre en el mundo y colaborar en la reducción de las causas que las provocan.

Quizás en este marco, el Consejo desee conocer un planteamiento hecho por muchos países en el Comité de Productos Básicos hace un par de meses. En el Informe de dicho Comité, se señala que estos países reiteraron su preocupación por la insuficiente transparencia de las transacciones de ayuda alimentaria y la reciente negligencia de algunos de los principales donantes respecto a la notificación de dichas transacciones. Los países donantes, por su parte, se comprometieron a mejorar sus prácticas en esa esfera. Esperemos que se cumpla lo señalado en el Comité de Productos Básicos.

Finalmente, mi país reafirma los principios sobre los que debe basarse la asistencia humanitaria que brindan los organismos y los programas de Naciones Unidas: neutralidad, imparcialidad y universalidad. En ese sentido, destaco la importancia que mantiene la multilateralidad y la incondicionalidad en las acciones de ayuda humanitaria.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

First of all, we would like to show our appreciation to WFP for the comprehensive report. We are also very grateful for the help received from WFP, especially when Indonesia was not only experiencing a deep economic crisis, but at the same time facing a prolonged drought from 1998 to 1999.

In this regard, on behalf of the delegation of Indonesia, I would like to have the support from the Council for the continuation of WFP's support in Indonesia.

Moreover, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of WFP and FAO in that Indonesia, as a big agricultural country, is currently facing the low price of rice. Consequently, the farmers are experiencing low purchasing power for food and other basic needs. We therefore ask for the consideration that, for the near future WFP, should consider providing food aid in the form of financial assistance, so that the aids may be utilized to purchase food or rice from our local produce or in the form of food for work. This may spur the economic development, especially in the rural areas.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

Mi delegación desea, en primer lugar, apoyar la declaración realizada por la República Dominicana en nombre del GRULAC y las solicitudes allí contenidas. Ya en ocasión de la sesión anual de la Junta Ejecutiva presentamos nuestros comentarios al Informe del Director Ejecutivo, a quien felicitamos por la excelente labor que viene desempeñando al frente del PMA. Apoyamos la aprobación de este Informe y agradecemos también la brillante presentación de la Sra. Sisulo.

Mi país es un país comprometido con el mandato y con las labores del PMA y cree firmemente en la importancia de la labor humanitaria que desarrolla el Sistema de las Naciones Unidas, orientado en sus normas y principios básicos. Entre ellos, como lo indicó la República Dominicana, la universalidad y el multilateralismo.

Nos sigue preocupando la escasez de recursos destinados a las operaciones de desarrollo, lo cual afecta directamente el nivel de asistencia alimentaria hacia mi Región. Aspiramos a que el nuevo Plan Estratégico y sus instrumentos complementarios aún en elaboración, puedan tener un efecto positivo en la captación de recursos que fortalezcan, a su vez, el doble mandato de emergencias y desarrollo del PMA. Nuestra creciente preocupación es la escasa atención de la cual podrían sufrir los pobres extremos de los países que no son menos adelantados. Sería muy desalentador que el apoyo a estos países que luchan contra la pobreza, que buscan generar oportunidades para un desarrollo equilibrado, que se enfrentan a problemas estructurales muy complejos, que realizan enormes esfuerzos para insertarse competitivamente en la globalización, apostando por la gobernabilidad, por la democracia y por el respeto de los derechos humanos, puedan reducirse, bajo criterios macro-económicos, afectando las corrientes de ayuda a millones de pobres extremos. Nosotros no creemos que se trate exclusivamente de un asunto de responsabilidad nacional. Creemos que se trata, también, de fortalecer esta responsabilidad nacional a través de la asistencia internacional.

En ese marco, la política futura del PMA, debe seguir teniendo en consideración la situación de estos países que, sin ser menos adelantados, requieren la asistencia alimentaria y también, complementariamente, desarrollar nuevas estrategias de cooperación y asistencia donde la experiencia del Programa sirva para desarrollar programas de consolidación de políticas alimentarias en las áreas de prevención de desastres, de manejo de crisis, de gestión de alimentos, entre otras.

Apreciamos con mucha satisfacción los esfuerzos conjuntos, de la dependencia del VAM y de la FAO para una base de datos de información geográfica, así como de la labor conjunta en el marco del SICIAV. Ello permite una evaluación más precisa de la seguridad alimentaria y de la vulnerabilidad a la que nos hemos referido. Creemos también que la cooperación del PMA con otras instituciones, como por ejemplo las de Bretton Woods, serán también útiles para este propósito y como una medida para que se priorice internacionalmente un mayor apoyo financiero a las actividades destinadas a reducir la inseguridad alimentaria. A todos los países nos cabe, también, una responsabilidad similar para brindarle una mayor visibilidad a este eficiente programa de las Naciones Unidas. De igual manera alentamos a una mayor movilización de recursos del sector privado, la cual reiteramos debería ser una de las actividades prioritarias de las oficinas nacionales.

Aspiramos firmemente al fortalecimiento del PMA a través de la consolidación de un programa mundial que se plasme realmente como un asociado estratégico de los gobiernos nacionales en la lucha contra la pobreza y el hambre y en el apoyo a los procesos de recuperación.

**Ms Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

I wish to welcome you to chairing this afternoon's Session. Allow me to commend WFP for the Annual Report that has been tabled to us by Ms. Sisulu. It has given us insights into the challenges that we face in the fight against hunger, particularly when we face emergencies.

The Africa Region is appreciative of the help that has been given to the continent in the past year, with regards the drought assistance that went to Southern Africa, to the Horn of Africa, and the programme that has been put in place for the Sahel and conflict areas in West Africa and Central Africa. We also appreciate the need for FAO to play a complementary role in the transitional period from emergencies, and indeed the WFP Annual Report has articulated this position, because this will help the rehabilitation of the population that will have passed through the emergency phase. For this, we are grateful to the countries that have participated in this particular programme in our continent.

We commend too the call by the United States of America, that will strengthen this role financially. This can only be demonstrated in our countries' subscriptions and pledges to FAO and WFP budgets.

As recipients, we are ready to play our part to ensure that the WFP programme is administered smoothly, and also to ensure that we continue to increase our own investment in our people.

Emergencies cannot be a permanent situation, but we feel that emergencies can be averted or avoided. At the same time, if we do find ourselves in emergencies, we should ensure that the transition phase is well planned to enable the exit from such an emergency. In the WFP programme, according to what we have heard from the submissions, - I would like to cite the one from the United States of America - the transitional phase should also be well resourced. We, therefore, urge proper acknowledgement of the importance of the field operations in playing that complementary role to the emergency operations. To this end, we have recommended the the WFP Board that project planning always incorporate in the exit phase sustainable projects for either food production or cost-generating to ensure that, when the programme ends, families can still find their feet.

We hope that these views will be well incorporated in the new Strategic Plan that we are all currently discussing, as Member Nations that are working with WFP. With these few remarks, I wish to indicate our support for the Annual Report that has been tabled by WFP, and indicate that we will continue to make an input to the Strategic Plan, in order to make sure that the implementation of the food operations of the World Food Programme in our countries are well articulated, and we try to iron out as many hitches as we can to make everything smooth.

#### **Julius KIPTAURUS (Kenya)**

On behalf of my delegation, I would like to support the World Food Programme Annual Report and its activities. As you are aware, nearly 800 million people in developing countries are chronically-hungry. These people cannot meet their basic requirements. We wish to express at this juncture our appreciation of the World Food Programme's activities on emergency air response in various countries. We welcome the efforts of the World Food Programme with its humanitarian assistance to so many people, who have been displaced by floods and civil strife in neighbouring countries. We hope that, with the success of SPFS programmes being implemented in developing countries, we will go a long way in reducing food insecurity.

#### **Philip MOUMIE (Cameroun)**

Nous tenons d'abord à remercier le PAM pour ce rapport. Bien que le Cameroun ait participé au sein du Conseil d'administration du PAM à son examen, nous voulons attirer l'attention du Conseil de la FAO sur un certain nombre de considérations contenues dans ce Rapport, figurant au paragraphe 136, page 38, de la version française. Nous avons noté l'intérêt du PAM pour les activités menées dans les domaines de l'éducation, de la nutrition, du renforcement des capacités et surtout de la création d'actifs en vue de promouvoir le développement rural. Je crois que les délégations qui nous ont précédés ont, elles aussi, attiré l'attention sur ces volets. Nous avons remarqué que la plupart des projets assistés par le PAM devraient prendre fin à un moment donné. Mais ceux qui participent au Conseil du PAM savent combien il est délicat de prendre une telle décision parce que des mesures ne sont pas toujours prises pour permettre à ceux qui ont bénéficié du projet, ou aux États qui en sont bénéficiaires, de prendre le relais. C'est pour cela que nous appuyons fortement cette recommandation qui va dans le sens général de renforcer les activités de développement au sein des pays.

Je voudrais également, au nom de notre délégation, appuyer la recommandation tendant à faciliter la transition des fonds finançant les secours vers les projets de développement. C'est un mécanisme très important qui devrait, dans certains pays, faciliter la mise en œuvre ou l'accroissement des ressources orientées vers le développement. Car, nous le savons, une très grande partie des ressources est consacrée aux urgences et dans les pays où les ressources destinées au développement ont été réduites, il est parfois incompréhensible de voir des ressources disponibles qui ne peuvent pas être réinvesties dans un projet de développement qui en manque cruellement. D'une manière générale, nous, délégation du Cameroun, apprécions l'effort que le PAM déploie chaque jour et les efforts, bien qu'il doivent être améliorés, d'achats locaux. Il s'agit d'une bonne façon de remplir une des obligations auxquelles le PAM a souscrit, en appuyant le Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, en matière d'encouragement des petits paysans qui, bien que parfois bénéficiaires de cette assistance alimentaire, contribuent dans les pays en développement à la fourniture de l'aide alimentaire. Je crois que les recommandations que

les autres délégations ont formulées dans ce domaine méritent d'être prises en considération et, nous espérons que la FAO, chaque fois que cela sera possible, encouragera des actions tendant à améliorer la production de ces petits paysans qui, à leur tour, peuvent contribuer énormément à la fourniture de l'aide alimentaire même lorsqu'ils en sont bénéficiaires indirectement.

**Ahmad Ibrahim YOUSIF (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)**

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the World Food Programme, its Secretariat and donor countries for everything that has been provided to my country in a number of different circumstances. Since Sudan has a potential for food and agriculture production, we turn to the World Food Programme, as well as, FAO and urge them to help us develop a project for production activities so that our local countrymen would be encouraged to not only grow enough food for themselves but also to grow enough to export to their neighbours. We are in favour of this excellent Annual Report and support it.

**GUO HANDI (China) (Original language Chinese)**

We would like to say that the Chinese delegation has a very brief statement to make.

First of all, we would like to express our appreciation for the activities carried out by World Food Programme in 2002 and we support the recommendations proposed to the effect that, after relief and emergencies, attention must be given to development. At the same time, we do hope that the meeting will note the World Food Programme's specific characteristics. In other words, although it concentrates on emergencies, it should also, nevertheless, pay attention to development activities.

**Mohammad Saied NOORI-NAEINI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

Since we are a Member of the Executive Board of the World Food Programme, we have expressed our views on the Annual Report beforehand in the relevant meetings. At this time, I take the floor to comment on the activities of World Food Programme in the year 2002. As usual, the World Food Programme has made a difference. the World Food Programme has been present in the neediest parts of the world when it was needed, and we appreciate this effective presence.

This is the first Report under the new leadership of Mr James Morris and I take this opportunity to thank him for his excellent leadership for the World Food Programme, both for the general affairs of the organization and as Special Envoy of the Secretary General to Africa. He has done an excellent job, and we want to record our thanks in this area.

There are two main areas that we want to emphasize. Firstly, we welcome the new initiative of increasing the donors to WFP and accepting new donors, adding to the traditional ones. We request that the development part of the programme of WFP, which has tended to decline, be supported. We would like to ask the Council to support this, which has also been echoed by other delegations.

**Alfredo Néstor PUIG PINO (Cuba)**

Mi delegación no pensaba intervenir en este tema dado que la presentación de este informe había sido ya examinada con profundidad en la última sesión de la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA. Sin embargo en mi país hay un viejo refrán que dice que lo que abunda no daña y todos hemos sido testigos de que aquí han abundado los elogios a la labor del PMA. Mi delegación no quiere pasar por alto este momento para reconocer esta labor; realmente es loable la labor realizada por el PMA en este último período que nos ocupa en el Informe, algo que ha sido también reconocido por los Miembros de la Junta Ejecutiva a la cual nosotros también modestamente nos sumamos.

Mi delegación ante todo agradece la presentación hecha por la Subdirectora Ejecutiva señora Sisulu que nos ilustra brevemente los resultados de la labor de esta Organización.

Nuestra delegación apoya firmemente la declaración expresada por el Representante de la República Dominicana a nombre del GRULAC, como también hace suyas las palabras pronunciadas por las distinguidas delegaciones de México, Chile, Perú e India cuando se referían

a las necesidades de incrementar las labores de desarrollo en la Organización, a la necesidad de mejorar el nivel de compras en nuestros países y con ello mejorar también las actividades y eficacia del Programa. Estas son actividades que están recogidas también fehacientemente en el Informe. Sin embargo mi delegación no quería dejar pasar por alto no solamente nuestra preocupación que en el contexto en el cual estamos desarrollando nuestras actividades y en el momento en que la Junta Ejecutiva del PMA está enfrascada en concluir su programa o su Plan Estratégico, no se deje de tener en cuenta la importancia que para nuestros países tiene el carácter multilateral y universal del PMA. Si analizamos los resultados alcanzados en este período, indudablemente que llegaremos a la conclusión de que el PMA aún con los escasos recursos recibidos, ha logrado una brillante actuación sobre todo, en las operaciones de urgencia y en las operaciones prolongadas de socorro. Sin embargo, lamentablemente, las labores dedicadas a actividades vinculadas con el desarrollo, no han tenido el mismo resultado. Hemos sido testigos del reconocimiento a la labor del PMA y consideramos que precisamente esa labor dicha en esta sala, merece de todos los Estados Miembros, de los principales donantes y de los nuevos contribuyentes, una mayor acción y una mayor contribución de recursos a esta Organización que todos hemos destacado sobre todo en el día de hoy.

Nuestra delegación considera que la labor fundamental del PMA, es la de asistir con ayuda alimentaria y estar presente en aquellos lugares donde su labor sea necesaria, pero para eso se requieren recursos e instamos a los Estados Miembros a que incrementen sus contribuciones. Nuestro país es un modesto contribuyente de alimentos al PMA y hará todo lo posible por mantener esas contribuciones.

**Carlos CHANOVE SALVATIERRA (Bolivia)**

La verdad que es la primera vez que nos confunden con el Brasil pese a que tenemos una larga frontera. Sin embargo deseo felicitar al señor Presidente por la excelente labor en la conducción de esta reunión. Asimismo deseo expresar mi satisfacción por la presentación que hizo la distinguida Subdirectora Ejecutiva del PMA.

La delegación de Bolivia suscribe plenamente lo expresado por el Representante de la República Dominicana como portavoz del Grupo de países de América Latina y el Caribe. Asimismo, queremos manifestar nuestra plena conformidad con los nuevos elementos que se van incorporando para que la labor del PMA sea más eficaz y productiva. Somos conscientes que el sistema de gestión por resultados, contribuirá de manera efectiva a la labor que desarrolla el Programa Mundial de Alimentos. Del mismo modo, entendemos que uno de los principales problemas que coadyuvan a que sea mayor la vulnerabilidad de los países en vías de desarrollo, son los desastres naturales y por ello creemos que el PMA debe ampliar sus esfuerzos para apoyar de manera sustantiva, a la capacitación de los Gobiernos de los países en vías de desarrollo sobre todo, para los programas de evaluación de vulnerabilidad, alerta temprana y sobre todo para la gestión de los desastres naturales.

**Ms Sheila SISULU (Deputy Executive Director, World Food Programme)**

I would like to thank all the delegations for the support that has been expressed and the general remarks that have been made about the Report. I will convey the commendations that have been expressed to my Executive Director, Jim Morris.

I also note the concerns that have been raised and the remarks, and would like to assure you that all of the concerns will continue to receive the attention of the Secretariat, because we agree with the concerns that have been raised. We, in particular, share the concern, that has been repeated over and over, regarding the dwindling support for development assistance because, as has been expressed, hungry people in emergencies need food urgently and immediately. If we are to meet the Millennium Development Goals of halving the hunger in the world, we need a much more long-term, in-depth strategy that will enable us to, in fact, half hunger in the world as set out. We appreciate the support voiced. We thank you for your concerns, and we undertake to address the issues that you have raised with us.



*Alfredo Néstor Puig Pino, ViceChairman, took the Chair*  
*Alfredo Néstor Puig Pino, Vice-président, assume la présidence*  
*Ocupa la presidencia Alfredo Néstor Puig Pino, Vicepresidente*

**11. Programme Evaluation Report 2003 (C 2003/4)**

**11. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2003 (C 2003/4)**

**11. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 2003 (C 2003/4)**

## **EL PRESIDENTE**

Continuando con el programa de la agenda de la sesión de la tarde, volvemos a la consideración del Tema 11 del Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa 2003. Quisiera ahora dar la palabra al señor Wade para continuar con el tema.

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

I do not want to take up too much of the Members of the Council's time with a lengthy presentation on this item, particularly as the document itself has a comprehensive introduction, as well as the Director-General's Foreword. In summary, the points I thought that I would like to emphasize are as follows.

The first is that the Programme Committee is the primary recipient of Evaluation Reports and that was a decision of the Council at its Hundred and Seventeenth Session. Also agreed by that Council, the Programme Evaluation Report is intended to be a summary of the evaluations, which have been reviewed by the Programme Committee for submission to the Council and the Conference. So, this document goes on from Council to Conference in November-December.

I also draw your attention to the fact that the detailed Reports, which have been considered by the Programme Committee, are available on the FAO Website should any Member be interested in accessing them. That information I gave you yesterday, about Governing Bodies and how to access the Website, would apply to these documents as well. You can also find them on a special Evaluation Website which comes under the Office of Programme and Budget and Evaluation on the main menu of the FAO Homepage.

I would also like to point out that the Director-General has maintained the practice, which he actually originally introduced, wherein he consults the Programme Committee in selecting the areas of work to be evaluated and has, as usual, accepted the advice of the Committee in this regard.

I note also that the methodology and approach to evaluations has been enhanced through the increased use of external expertise and, particularly, in the form of Peer Group Reviews.

Without blowing our own trumpets, I should like to draw attention to the fact that I think there has been increasing appreciation, as evidenced in the Programme Committee Reports, of the work of the Evaluation Service. But nonetheless, as requested by the last Conference, the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees is in fact currently considering options which might further enhance the independence of Evaluation in FAO.

As the Council is aware, the Evaluation regime in FAO has been under an ongoing programme of improvement, based upon the strategy which was outlined to you and approved by the Programme Committee in September 1999. Considerable progress has been made, as is evidenced by the reactions of the Programme Committee itself.

However, one of the last elements is currently under implementation with the assistance of extra-budgetary funds, generously provided by the United Kingdom Department of International Development (DFID). This concerns the planned comprehensive process of annual assessment and auto-evaluation. The latter, that is auto-evaluation, is particularly important to the effective implementation of results-based budgeting, as it is through this approach that the effective implementation of the programme entities in the Medium-Term Plan will be measured and then subsequently exposed to Peer Group review or some other form of external review.

The project supporting the initial implementation of auto-evaluation will allow the Evaluation Service to support the first efforts for auto-evaluation with guidelines, training and advice, as well as limited financial support for the process.

I should add that it is also envisaged that the Evaluation Service will review and provide a synthesis of the results of completed auto-evaluations to the Programme Committee and a summary of that will be included in future Programme Evaluation Reports.

Turning to the Council's handling of this document, which is before you, I note that the Council has already addressed most of the reports when considering the reports of the Programme Committee throughout the biennium. In fact, earlier yesterday, the Council, in examining the Report of the Programme Committee's Eighty-ninth Session, also considered the evaluations of Codex Alimentarius and other related food standards work, as well as the evaluation on statistical activities. Therefore, the main purpose of the PER is to provide a vehicle for the Council to report its work on evaluations to the Conference for its consideration and eventual approval. Therefore, the Council is requested to endorse the Report for transmission to the Conference, along with any observations it may wish to make.

I have with me Mr John Markie, Senior Officer of the Evaluation Service who shares the podium with me and who is, of course, available to respond to any questions you may have.

**Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

The United States recognizes that this edition of the Programme Evaluation Report is a major improvement on programme assessment and has used the process of thoroughness, transparency and independence in evaluating the six programmes in document C 2003/4 and endorses the Report.

We concur with the analysis given by the Chairman of the Programme Committee on the importance of priority-setting and results-based programme planning and budgeting. All six areas evaluated are important areas of benefit for many Members, and we agree that future evaluations present ways to improve programme activities within existing resources.

We look forward to the Programme Committee's continued involvement in guiding evaluations. The United States will comment briefly on three of the evaluations undertaken in the context of the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan.

Firstly, the Independent External Evaluation of the Special Programme on Food Security (SPFS). We agree that FAO should prioritize countries eligible for SPFS with a view to their ability to enter into Phase II of the Programme. We are beyond the stage of funding more country pilot projects within SPFS countries. In fact, the United States still questions why no single country has entered into Phase II of the Programme. We are concerned with FAO's ability to adequately deal with more of these requests since its launch of the Programme in 1994.

The Programme needs to widen its institutional capacities and we strongly believe that planning for the extension of existing Phase I activities should be re-evaluated. However, we do agree that all SPFS programmes should give greater priority to household food security and linkages with other developmental players. We also look forward to the monitoring and evaluation manual, mentioned in paragraph 119. By way of information, the United States has participated on several evaluation teams to SPFS countries in Africa and South America.

Secondly, on the subject of Thematic Evaluation of Strategy A3 "preparedness for, and effective and sustainable response to food and agricultural emergencies", we think this is an important cross-cutting high-priority theme. It is timely because of the many recent responses to natural disasters and civil conflicts affecting the food security of many millions. FAO should continue its holistic approach to emergency preparedness, drawing on its comparative advantage in early warning and assessment needs. We agree with the evaluation that FAO needs to improve its delivery of agricultural inputs in response to relief operations. In fact, we just heard our Ambassador talk about the underestimation of seeds needed for the Horn of Africa. We also look

forward to the Progress requested next year on the actions taken for implementation of recommendations.

Finally, the Codex evaluation, which will be discussed and adopted next week at the Codex Alimentarius Commission, is an extremely important evaluation affecting FAO and WHO Food Standards work. We agree on increased Codex OIE and IPPC cooperation on standard-setting work programmes and support the strengthening of the Codex Secretariat. As a stopgap measure to the lack of adequate resources to maintain the level of work required for these Secretariats, the United States will fund an APO in the Secretariat this year, for two years, as we have done for a number of years in the IPPC Secretariat.

This is not the long-term solution to the problem. We attach great importance to adequate funding from existing resources for the high-priority work done by these standard-setting bodies for the benefit of many Members of this Organization.

**Michihiro TAMURA (Japan)**

My delegation highly commends this report for its conciseness and usefulness for the purpose of effectiveness and efficiency of FAO activities. I also express our appreciation to the Programme Committee for its guiding role in the evaluation activities.

We believe that evaluations are quite important for FAO activities and, on various occasions, we have requested objective evaluations. In this regard, we support evaluation activities and are pleased to have this report. However, it is unfortunate that options to be implemented within the current budgetary level are not presented. From the viewpoint of the budgetary discipline, my delegation would like to strongly support the Director-General's request, as written in the Foreword contained in document C 2003/4, that the options submitted are to be implemented within the existing resources.

Within the Report I would like to mention, in particular Chapter 3, Evaluation of the Special Programme for Food Security. We think that SPFS is quite an important programme as a follow-up for the World Food Summit and, therefore, Japan supports several SPFS projects, mainly in the Asia Region. While the projects funded by Japan were not elaborated in this exercise, we deemed that the recommendations include quite valuable inputs for these projects.

Other than these evaluations, we examine the progress of these SPFS projects, mainly using progress reports and other information concerning our projects. Judging from these, we found mixed progresses of these projects, some had progressed well and others no. To deal with one of the projects lagging behind, a review mission was organized by FAO. Our colleague from the Japanese Embassy, who took part in the mission, pointed out shortcomings such as insufficient involvement of FAO in the project implementation, high costs and complicated support procedures.

My delegation hopes that FAO will address these issues without delay and take concrete measures. Furthermore, my delegation would like to stress the importance of the ownership of developing countries and also ask FAO to renew its efforts to foster the national ownership and to ensure the sufficient progress of SPFS projects.

**Ms Kirsti AARNIO (Finland)**

My delegation would like to ask you to give the floor to Greece, who is to make a statement on behalf of the European Community.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. The European Community welcomes the Programme Evaluation Report 2003. It is an essential part of the new programming cycle. All evaluations conducted in this biennium are included in the document. The evaluations have all been exclusively discussed in the Programme Committee. We welcome, in particular, the inclusion, in the Programme Evaluation Report, of the Programme Committee remarks and the recommendations at the end of each chapter.

It is indeed important and useful to present a comprehensive picture of all evaluations to the Council and the Conference, as it provides the Membership the opportunity to reflect on the programmes, the activities of the Organization and role of evaluation therein. The European Community appreciates the fact that FAO has made significant progress over the last years in strengthening the evaluation systems of the Organization.

As stated in the Director-General's Foreword, FAO is improving annual monitoring and assessment by programme managers and introducing systematic auto-evaluation of all programme identities. We welcome this development, as it is a significant step towards a results-based management. We favour a transparent evaluation process, whereby Management in its response clearly indicates in what way it will implement the recommendations of the Programme Evaluation Report. This should be the basis of a dialogue with Membership, aiming at continuous improvement of FAO's programmes and sharpening of strategic objectives and focus. We are happy to note that the Director-General, in his introduction, shares our views in this respect.

In our view, further steps are, however, necessary to improve the transparency and accountability of evaluations and the evaluation function. A logical step in this process would be to give the Evaluation Service a more independent position within the Organization. We encourage the Programme and Finance Committees, in their next joint meeting, to come up with clear recommendations in this respect.

#### **D. MFOTE (Zimbabwe)**

The Africa Group would like to commend the Secretariat for commissioning the Evaluation team that produced their comprehensive evaluation report, which we are discussing now. We see merit in enhancing auto-evaluation by programme staff, implementing partners and regional bodies, because they are on the spot. Some problems are better stemmed in the bud and paragraph 14, on Animal Health, refers to that.

If the capacity is lacking, let us upgrade it by enhancing regional programmes. The PAAT efforts should be enhanced, to ensure that we identify measures that assist in the harmonization of regional initiatives to see how it can step in to assist in the emergencies. Country programmes and country officers should play a significant role and nationals should form the core of these offices, as they are on the ground.

The Africa Group supports the Committee's view, in paragraph 35, on the Veterinary Services. This is the core of public animal health and we would not wish to see it privatized, as most of the poor farmers would not afford the cost.

It is pleasing to note the lessons learnt from the SPFS, which are highlighted in the Report. As we said yesterday, it is critical that our donor partners spare time on their business schedules to visit programmes and projects that FAO is supporting in different Member States. We have also reiterated again and again in such fora that implementation of FAO-funded programmes should not be done in isolation of ongoing programmes, but linked to national programmes of Member States to realize the intended benefits, as well as enhance or ensure sustainability.

The challenge of inflexibility of SPFS during the first phase, which is highlighted in paragraph 7 of the Report, has compromised the effectiveness of the programme. The Africa Group would need the SPFS to broaden its scope to cover both production, economic, financial and social issues, input product marketing and credit related initiatives. In addition, the programme should impress the participatory approach to encourage national ownership.

We therefore endorse the Programme Evaluation Report for 2003.

#### **Ángel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)**

Quisiera referirme también al Informe sobre Evaluación del Programa, pues hay algunos temas que ciertamente nos preocupan.

Con respecto al comercio de productos pecuarios, como también el de los productos agropecuarios en general, su actividad, la generación de empleo, y la generación de divisas para

nuestros países, constituyen una parte importante para superar situaciones de pobreza, para lograr un pleno desarrollo, y para generar ocupación laboral interesante.

Los aspectos relacionados con la sanidad animal son vitales para poder remover ciertos obstáculos al comercio, y en este sentido queremos reconocer la excelencia de la Organización en el establecimiento de programas que tienen el propósito de controlar y erradicar algunas enfermedades que afectan al ganado. Estamos convencidos que labores de esta naturaleza permitan un buen desarrollo de un sector tan importante de la agricultura como lo es la ganadería y la actividad agrícola en sí.

Para un país como el nuestro, que ha hecho esfuerzos para poder erradicar algunas enfermedades que obstaculizan el comercio como la fiebre aftosa, la peste porcina clásica y la mosca de la fruta, son hitos interesantes que nos mueven a plantear nuestra preocupación respecto de algunas situaciones de escasez de personal en la Organización, fundamentalmente en los grupos de profesionales que trabajan en EMPRES. Queremos hacer un llamado de atención, manifestando nuestra preocupación respecto a un tema de suma importancia.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

Speaking on behalf of countries acceding the European Community represented at this meeting, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and my own country, I wish to put on record our association with the statement of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Ackah Pierre ANGNIMAN (Côte d'Ivoire)**

La délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire souscrit aux conclusions contenues dans le rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2003. Si nous évaluons le Programme, en prenant toutes les précautions de transparence, il est essentiel de relier les conclusions de l'évaluation avec les programmes en cours et leur incidence sur le budget.

Le paragraphe 25 du Rapport recommande à la FAO d'envisager sérieusement le renforcement de l'effectif du Service de santé animale, en veillant à l'élargissement progressif des ressources ordinaires et à une recherche active de ressources extrabudgétaires, parce qu'il est manifestement reconnu qu'il devient difficile pour ce Service d'opérer normalement. Or, nous savons tous l'importance de l'élevage dans beaucoup de pays pour la réduction et la lutte contre la pauvreté.

C'est pourquoi je me permets, encore une fois, d'insister sur cet aspect.

**Mme Marième MINT MOHAMED (Observateur de Mauritanie)**

Je vous remercie de me donner la parole une deuxième fois et je voudrais remercier le Secrétariat pour l'excellent document qui nous a été distribué. Je rends vivement hommage au Secrétariat pour l'excellence de ce rapport d'évaluation du Programme.

Les ressources animales sont de plus en plus importantes pour les pays en développement au point que pour certains de ces pays, l'élevage a plus d'importance que l'agriculture. En effet, le secteur de l'élevage représente une source de revenus pour pratiquement trente pour cent des ruraux. Voilà la raison pour laquelle il est essentiel de lutter contre les maladies animales comme, par exemple les maladies transfrontalières et la peste bovine, en particulier en Afrique, et tout particulièrement en Afrique de l'Ouest.

**N.J. KWENDAKWEMA (Observer for Zambia)**

On behalf of my delegation, I would like to make some comments on the Programme Evaluation Report, particularly on Chapter 1, the Coordination of Animal Health Component. I would like to note that work has mainly focused on strengthening the trainer services at the country level. This is commendable.

Some countries in Southern Africa, including Zambia, are ravaged by serious livestock diseases, disease problems of FMD and CBPP. I would like to note that these diseases are being given priority under EMPRES. However, it is a sad note that Regular Programme resources, devoted to

animal health work, show a decline from US\$18.8 million for 1996-1997 to US\$16.8 million for 2000-2001. This decline has resulted in a general decline in FAO's Field Programme. FMD and CBPP are diseases of major concern to my country and others in the Region, resulting in drastic decline in livestock numbers.

Zambia is surrounded by eight countries, a number of which have livestock that move across borders. This situation compounds the problem of livestock diseases through the transboundary movement of cattle and people. It is, therefore, important that FAO places priority in resource allocation and technical assistance to help combat livestock diseases, like FMD and CBPP in southern Africa.

FAO should adopt strategies, apart from veterinary services, for example, sensitization and control of livestock movement, better livestock husbandry practices, better livestock nutrition. With these remarks my delegation endorses the report fully.

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

Just one comment, with your permission I would ask Mr Markie if he would like to comment on any of the remarks received.

My comment concerns the situation with animal health and the recommendations in the Report, concerning additional resources. It may interest Members to know that part of the feedback that exists is that the reports of the Evaluation Service go to the Programme and Budget Service, both of which are in my office, and the Programme and Budget Service includes all such recommendations in the priority-setting mechanism, that we discussed earlier on. In addition to Conference and Council Reports, we also take up the specific recommendations of the Evaluation Service, so long as they have been endorsed by the Programme Committee, so you can see how this, in fact, feeds back into the resource allocation process. In this case, Veterinary Public Health Management, which is 213A6, did receive an increase in ZRG and in RG, so there is some tangible result from these efforts even if it is not as much as many Members would like to see.

**John MARKIE (FAO Staff)**

I would also like to thank the Members of the Council, because it is very gratifying for the Evaluation Service that the efforts, which we have been asked to make in securing an improved evaluation regime, are meeting with your approval, and to emphasize that we regard this as working progress and that we are striving for improved independence, objectivity and depth in the evaluation system.

Members may note that, as part of the emerging practice, the Programme Committee now generally requests the Organization to provide a follow-up report on the progress, which has been made in implementing those recommendations of evaluation, which the Organization has accepted.

With particular respect to the evaluation of the SPFS, such a review took place at the last meeting of the Programme Committee. The Programme Committee found that many of the concerns and interests expressed by Members today for the strengthening of the SPFS as becoming a more flexible programme, encompassing aspects and taking into consideration aspects beyond production, etc., had, in fact, been taken on board by the Organization that was acting upon them.

**EL PRESIDENTE**

Habiendo concluido el señor Wade su intervención, podemos dar por concluidas las consideraciones sobre el Tema 11 del orden del día de nuestra Agenda y podemos ahora pasar a la consideración del tema 8, no sin antes recordar que estamos algo atrasados en la consideración de los temas que nos corresponden en la sesión de la tarde, por lo que aspiramos a que podamos concluir este tema en el tiempo previsto.

**8. Convening of Second Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators (CL 124/17)****8. Convocation du deuxième Forum mondial des responsables de la réglementation en matière de sécurité sanitaire des aliments (CL 124/17)****8. Convocatoria del Segundo Foro Mundial de las Autoridades de Reglamentación sobre Inocuidad de los Alimentos (CL 124/17)****EL PRESIDENTE**

Vamos a considerar el tema 8 de la agenda, que será el último de la sesión de la tarde: Convocatoria del Segundo Foro Mundial de las Autoridades de Reglamentación sobre Inocuidad de Alimentos, para lo cual tienen ante ustedes el documento CL124/17.

Antes de dar inicio a nuestras deliberaciones, quisiera pedir al señor de Haen, Subdirector General del Departamento Económico Social de la FAO, para que introduzca el Tema.

**Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

You will recall that Conferences, such as the First Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators, that was held in January 2002 in Marrakech, Morocco, and the Pan-European Conference on Food Safety and Quality, that was held in February 2002 in Budapest, provide an opportunity for food safety regulators and developed and developing countries to exchange information and exchange experiences on food safety management and to foster partnerships and alliances in support of capacity building.

The Council at its Hundred and Twenty-third Session agreed in principle that FAO, in association with WHO, could initiate the preparation of a Second Global Forum on Food Safety Regulators on the understanding that this Council would take a final decision on the convening of such a Second Global Forum. This guidance by the previous Council was given after having arrived at a rather positive assessment of the outcome of the First Global Forum, that the participants had expressed that the Council tended to share, if I have interpreted the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of Council correctly.

Council was also expecting the views of the Codex Alimentarius Commission on the evaluation of the First Global Forum, as well as the views of the Committee on Agriculture on this matter.

The Secretariat, together with the Secretariat of WHO, has subsequently convened a preparatory meeting, let me say a preliminary meeting, in February this year in Geneva, on the occasion of the Extraordinary Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission meeting and this was a preliminary meeting by all G-8 members, including the European Community. This meeting agreed, in accordance with the recommendation of the First Global Forum, that such a Second Global Forum should be held and that it should be held in a developing country tentatively, in the second half of 2004 and under the main theme, "Building Effective Food Safety Systems". Several Members of the G-8 have since that time expressed their readiness to support a Second Global Forum financially, so that I can say that we are very confident that the funding of such a forum could be ensured. The costs range between US\$380 000 and US\$510 000, depending on options that we have put forward at that time.

In addition, this preliminary meeting suggested that other donor countries should be approached as well, and that support could be provided either through direct contribution to the budget of such a global forum or through in-kind donations, such as the support of the participation of representatives from developing countries or through the provision of papers.

FAO and WHO will be organizing another more complete preparatory meeting immediately after the conclusion of the Codex Alimentarius Commission meeting and more specifically on 8 July, and we have invited to this representatives of countries from the Group of 77, as well as from the OECD Group and of each of FAO and WHO Regions, so that countries at all levels of development and from all Regions shall be represented.

The meeting of 8 July will examine, in particular, the budget proposals, the relevant aspects of the Organization, the selection of topics and sub-themes and the candidature of countries for hosting the global forum. I must say that and I must inform you that to date, no country has offered or confirmed its willingness to host the Second Global Forum and I bring this matter before you in order to have Council's general decision, with regard to the holding of the Global Forum, the endorsement of the overall theme, which is as I said, "Building Effective Food Safety Systems", but also in the hope that Council may encourage or invite possible or interested countries to host the forum.

A few remarks on regional fora for Food Safety or Food Safety and Quality, as the forum was called in the Pan European Conference in Budapest. At the Hundred and Twenty-third Session, you have considered that decisions to convene further FAO/WHO Pan Regional Conferences on Food Safety should be left to the countries of each region.

For Asia, the Codex Regional Coordinating Committee did recommend that a Pan Regional Conference be held also in the year 2004 and I am glad to inform that the Government of Malaysia has offered to host such a meeting in May, if I recall correctly, in the latter part of May 2004 in Malaysia. In line with Council guidance, the views of the countries of the regions were first solicited, and we did this through a first Preparatory Meeting of representatives of the concerned countries that we have held here in Rome on 16 April, and that meeting supported the proposal and discussed the themes and the format of the Conference, it provided ideas for containing the costs of that Conference and one measure to contain the costs was that Member Nations offered to take charge of the preparation of the documents, of the substantive documents, in addition to country documentation. We have also agreed that support to certain Member Nations, that wish to have support for the participation of their representatives, would also be somehow decentralized and kind of partnership arrangement be found between donors and recipients of such grants. Nevertheless the remaining costs for that Conference, which would be held in English and in Chinese, would amount to US\$68 000 and we are still trying to find the necessary sums through extra-budgetary resources and again we would be grateful for pledges on this regard.

In summary, we have the Global Forum for which the funding is secured, but not the host country and we have the Pan Asian Conference for which the host country is found, but not the funding, and both are remaining issues that we need to tackle during the Preparatory Meetings that we will hold. With regard to the Pan Asian Conference, we will hold a second Preparatory Meeting on 3 July in order to finalize the themes for the discussed specific topics, identify potential authors for the discussion papers and, of course, find a solution to the outstanding funding needs.

**Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

The United States continues to recognize the importance of food safety issues for consumer protection and fair food trade and for the need for Members to build effective food safety systems, using a science-based food chain approach from forum to fork.

Firstly, the United States supports capacity-building that helps developing country establish food safety systems. The United States believes that this can be accomplished within the framework of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Secondly, developing countries and countries in transition require technical and financial assistance, in order to effectively participate in the food safety standard setting work of Codex. The Doha Development Round underscored the importance of increased involvement of developing countries in trade and the recent report of the Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of Codex stressed the importance of trust funds for capacity building. The United States favours increasing developing country participation in Codex, and supports the FAO/WHO Trust Fund as a means to accomplish this objective. Even though a few Member Nations have expressed their readiness to contribute financially to a Second Global Forum, the United States believes that such a meeting should be a low priority, particularly as FAO and WHO are currently seeking monies for a Trust Fund to facilitate participation by developing countries and countries in transition in the work of



the Codex Alimentarius Commission. If a Second Global Forum were to occur, the meeting should be limited to information-sharing. There should be no attempt to arrive at consensus positions, and there should be absolutely no overlap with the work of Codex.

**Ms Kirsti AARNIO (Finland)**

I would like to ask you to give the floor to Greece, who is speaking on behalf of the European Community on this Item.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

The European Community has already expressed, in fora such as the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the Committee on Agriculture, its support for the convening of the Second Global Forum, and agreed to the main theme of discussion, namely 'Building Effective Food Safety Systems'. The European Community and some of the Member Nations have also expressed their willingness to consider a material contribution to the organization of the Forum. The European Community welcomes also the convening of the Preparatory Meeting next month, in connection with the Codex Alimentarius Session, which will give the opportunity of a broader exchange of views on both the organizational aspects of the Forum, as well as the subthemes to be discussed.

We would like to inform you that the themes selected for the next European Regional Conference in May 2004 in Montpellier, France, are as follows: Main theme: 'Food security and quality: in particular, aspects regarding quality, nutritional balance, organoleptic qualities, the importance of agricultural land and cultural heritage' - "*terroirs*" is the French version. Secondary theme: 'Agronomic research: its role and contribution to sustainable rural development'. I think that the above covers the matters which the Council, in document CL 124/7, is requested to consider under this agenda Item.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

Es un placer verlo presidir esta sesión del Consejo.

Para mi país, incluidos productores, asociaciones campesinas y el Gobierno mismo, el tema relativo a la inocuidad de los alimentos es de suma importancia. Por ello participamos con empeño y entusiasmo en el primer Foro Mundial realizado en Marrakech.

Hemos fortalecido nuestras instituciones nacionales creando una Dependencia sobre inocuidad agroalimentaria, acuícola y pesquera, e integrado una Comisión Interministerial que atiende asuntos de biotecnología y de organismos genéticamente modificados.

Recientemente, en el mes de abril de este año, los productores nacionales, sus agrupaciones, el gobierno federal y otras partes interesadas, firmaron el Acuerdo Nacional para el Campo, para el Desarrollo de la Sociedad Rural y la Seguridad Alimentaria, en el que el tema de la inocuidad y la calidad de los alimentos es de gran relevancia.

Con dichas acciones el Gobierno de México ha dado pasos firmes para fortalecer la conciencia nacional sobre la necesidad de brindar a los consumidores alimentos inocuos y de calidad, pero también muestran la voluntad de los productores y los comercializadores mexicanos de colocar en los mercados internacionales productos agroalimentarios que reúnan dichas características.

Por ello, para mi Gobierno han sido muy útiles los trabajos realizados en el primer Foro Mundial y refrenda la recomendación para que el tema principal del segundo Foro Mundial sea el establecimiento de sistemas eficaces de inocuidad de los alimentos. Mi país estaría gustoso de participar en ese importante evento y de intercambiar información y experiencia sobre la gestión de la inocuidad de los alimentos, así como de respaldar alianzas y asociaciones que apoyen la creación de capacidad en esta materia.

**GUO HANDI (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The Chinese delegation would like to begin by thanking the Secretariat for having prepared this document and we also appreciate the work done by FAO, in order to prepare for this session.

We have noted what it says in paragraph 6 of document CL 124/17. FAO and WHO are both Specialized Agencies of the United Nations System. The constitutions of both these organizations have specific provisions concerning the use of working languages in the course of official meetings. Consequently, for the second Global Forum for Food Safety Regulators, which will be organized jointly by these two international organizations, all the official languages should be used as it states in their constitutions.

We perfectly understand the good intentions designed to reduce expenses of meetings and we also perfectly understand the steps that our Organization is planning to take, but we do not think that this should flout the Constitution. The Chinese delegation attaches importance to this Forum for Food Safety Regulators, which is going to be held in the autumn of 2004. We are of the view that WHO, as well as FAO, thanks to the cooperation and support of their Member Nations, will manage to complete the preparations for that meeting.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

We would like to give a short statement in this regard. Indonesia appreciated the generous offer of the Government of Malaysia to host the Conference on Food Safety and Quality for Asia in Kuala Lumpur, which is planned for May 2004.

Indonesia supports the inclusion of the agenda on practical action, to promote food safety issues that will give the opportunity to discuss the technical methods and decide on the need for everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food, as it was affirmed in the opening statement of the 1996 Declaration of World Food Security.

Indonesia would like to inform the Council that the first Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators was found very useful, as it provided the opportunity for food safety regulators in developed and developing countries to share their experiences, exchange information on food safety management and fostering partnerships/alliance in support of the respective country's capacity-building. In that regard, Indonesia requests the Council to make a recommendation to the Codex Alimentarius Commission in its Twenty-sixth Session that it is important to evaluate the outcomes of the first Global Forum's recommendations, before confirming the second Global Forum.

**Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)**

Generally, we sympathize with paragraph 16 of document CL 124/17 to convene a second Forum of Food Safety Regulators.

We are, however, worried and concerned that this might develop into another institutional mechanism, such as a Third and Fourth Forum. Consultations and fora have a habit of developing themselves into further institutions.

Now, if all sessions of the Global Forum will not formally adopt a report or recommendations, as is stated in paragraph 5 of the document, and will simply be exchanging experiences, then we can grudgingly support this.

As a developing country, we have a hard time sending delegations into so many Codex meetings. An additional forum presents an additional burden on our resources.

Perhaps we can at some point in the future reflect and see whether it is duplicating the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Further work can only be worthwhile if these complement and enhance the work and outputs of the existing organizations, which in this case is Codex.

We believe that it will be a better use of money, if it were to be given to their developing trading partners as technical assistance in developing their SPS standards, as agreed to in the Uruguay Round.

Perhaps what can be done is to refocus ourselves to the Codex, since it is the recognized international standard setting mechanism by the WTO.

While we do support the present request, we would like to also include the strengthening of the Codex.

Finally, it is not every day that we support the United States; this time we associate ourselves with its statement.

**Haris ZANNETIS (Cyprus)**

I am speaking on behalf of the countries acceding the European Community, and presented at this session of the Council, namely Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. We wish to inform the Council that these countries wish to associate themselves with the statement made by the delegate of Greece, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States, on this agenda Item.

Speaking now on behalf of my own delegation, I wish to note that the importance of food safety issues, both for consumer protection and in relation to food trade, are recognized by everyone and no further elaboration is needed.

It is encouraging to note that the proposal to hold a second Global Forum on Food Safety Regulators has been supported in all fora where it has been discussed, such as the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Committee on Agriculture, as well as the preliminary meeting of the representatives of the main contributors, as we have been informed by Mr de Haen in his introduction. The idea, therefore, seems to be unanimously accepted.

Regarding the required resources for convening the Global Forum, we welcome the expression of readiness by several countries to contribute to the budget of the Forum, and we hope that other countries, which are in a position to contribute, will follow this example.

**Ms Kirsti AARNIO (Finland)**

Finland speaks here on behalf of the five Nordic Countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

The Nordic countries appreciate the clear presentation in document CL 124/17, and we support the statement made by Greece on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

The Nordic Countries support the convening of a Second Global Forum in a developing country under the main theme "Building Effective Food Safety Systems".

The Nordic Countries place great emphasis on continued focus on food safety and, last summer, the Nordic Ministers responsible for food met in Greenland. They agreed on a Declaration which will form the basis for further work in this field for the Nordic Countries. This week the same ministers convened in Kalmar in Sweden and reaffirmed the mutual Nordic interest in close cooperation on food safety issues.

The Greenland Ministerial Declaration recognizes the importance of international organizations and processes in this connection. In particular, the organizations and processes, in which rules are set and normative work is undertaken, are seen as particularly important. We recognize FAO as one of the key actors in this regard.

Within the Nordic Countries, consumer safety is at the heart of our food policy. We wish to influence international processes in the same direction and will participate in further discussions in the international arena with this aim.

**Worwate TAMRONGTANYALAK (Thailand)**

I would like to thank the Secretariat for preparing the document CL 124/17, on the convening of global and regional meetings of food safety regulations.

As a net food exporting country, Thailand attaches great importance to the quality and safety of food for both domestic and international markets. In continuing to produce quality and safe food, my Government has made the year 2004 as the Year of Food Safety.

Several activities have been implemented and will continue to be strengthened next year and beyond.

The Government is aiming to make it known that Thailand is a quality kitchen of the world. In this connection, my delegation strongly supports the convening of the second Global Forum in a developing country in 2004.

Recognizing that the Pan Regional Conference on Food Safety and Quality is to be held before the Second Global Forum, in the case of Asia, the Government of Malaysia has offered to host this Pan Regional Conference in Kuala Lumpur.

In addition, my delegation fully agrees with the theme "Building Effective Food Safety Systems" for the second Global Forum.

My delegation wishes also to express appreciation to Canada, the European Community, France, Germany and Japan for their readiness to contribute financially to the second Global Forum budget. We urge other developed countries to show their support too. We are hopeful that this support will continue for the following session of the Global Forum. However, it was mentioned earlier at the beginning of the session that no countries have expressed interest in hosting the Second Global Forum. However, in paragraph 9, we understand that there are three countries, namely, Malaysia, Chile and Mexico, who are willing to host the Forum in 2004. In this regard, if there is a withdrawal of any country, I am very pleased to announce that Thailand is ready to host the second Global Forum in 2004. I believe we definitely have facilities to meet the requirement of the selection committee. If Thailand is chosen to be the host of the Forum, this could become one of the highlights in compliance with the Food Safety Year in 2004 in Thailand.

In any case, if Thailand is not chosen to be the host of the Second Forum, I am more than happy to announce that Thailand is ready to host the Third Global Forum in 2006.

With regard to the outcome of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Thailand, together with many countries, supports the recommendation of the evaluation team.

**Nobuo KATO (Japan)**

Ensuring food safety for our population is one of the policy priorities of our Government and the Japanese Diet adopted the Food Safety Basic Law last month.

Concerning the Second Global Forum, I would like to draw attention to the fact that an appropriate financial arrangement needs to be found for convening such a meeting. Although Japan is listed among several countries in paragraph 7 of the document CL 124/17 which have expressed their readiness to contribute financially, it is not our understanding that our delegation has expressed such readiness to the Preparatory Meeting, so I would just like to state that the Government of Japan is not in a position to contribute financially to the GF-2.

**Arnaldo DE BAENA FERNANDES (Brazil)**

My delegation takes note of the idea of the realization of a second Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators, as mentioned in document CL 124/17. We agree that this meeting may help national activities, especially in developing countries, in the field of capacity-building and information sharing programmes. We must, however, ensure that this initiative does not duplicate, in any aspect, activities under the responsibility of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

We would like to stress that Codex is the sole international institution with a mandate to establish science based standards in the realm of food safety and it must remain so.

**Ángel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)**

El tema de la inocuidad de alimentos para nuestra delegación es relevante. Nuestro país participó en el primer Foro sobre Autoridad en Reglamentación de Inocuidad de Alimentos en Marrakech,

participamos en uno de los Grupos de Trabajo y valoramos el esfuerzo que todos los Estados Miembros que allí participaron tuvieron una relevante participación, transmitiendo experiencias, haciendo interesantes aportes sobre la información, el manejo y la administración del riesgo. Creemos que la comunidad internacional valora la preocupación de estos organismos sobre el tema.

Comparto la preocupación de la delegación de Brasil y de otras delegaciones con respecto a evitar la duplicación de esfuerzos. Creemos que un tema importante como éste debe ser tratado en los organismos o las instancias que son pertinentes para ello. Yo creo que un foro de esta naturaleza se debería contribuir a complementar los esfuerzos, no a duplicarlos. La preocupación de los consumidores por la certeza de la calidad y la inocuidad de los productos alimenticios no es menor. De tal modo que compartimos la preocupación y alentamos a esta Organización con el propósito de poder efectuar un segundo Foro Mundial sobre Inocuidad de Alimentos. Estamos convencidos de que a la población consumidora se le debe asegurar que a estos productos se han suministrado solamente nutrientes adecuados. Compartimos esta preocupación y alentamos efectivamente a los países que se ofrezcan como sede de este segundo Foro Mundial sobre inocuidad de alimentos.

**Carlos CHANOVE SALVATIERRA (Bolivia)**

Mi delegación quiere expresarle felicitaciones por la correcta conducción de la reunión en esta parte.

Mi delegación considera que es de alta prioridad asegurar la inocuidad de los alimentos. Entendemos también que los francos y no vinculantes intercambios de opiniones sobre los retos y los éxitos por los sistemas de regulación de la inocuidad de los alimentos, son altamente provechosos y que los debemos compartir entre todos.

Sin embargo, cuando hay instancias internacionales que se están ocupando específicamente del tema que estamos tratando y sobre todo cuando hay escasez de recursos, consideramos que deberíamos evitar incurrir en una duplicación de esfuerzos con organismos tales como el Codex Alimentarius.

**Moungui MÉDI (Cameroun)**

La délégation du Cameroun se rend compte que l'idée du deuxième Forum mondial découle du premier. Le thème et les lieux ont été proposés par le premier Forum. Nous avons intégré ces éléments pendant le Conseil de l'année dernière et la délégation du Cameroun a rejoint les points de vue des autres délégations pour accepter l'idée de ce deuxième Forum mondial. Nous pensons que nous pouvons donc continuer à soutenir cette idée pour des raisons simples.

Tout d'abord, nous sommes intéressés à la participation des pays africains dans les différentes réunions du Codex Alimentarius et, *a priori*, nous avons constaté que cette représentation est presque nulle, pour ne pas dire inexistante. J'ai personnellement regardé combien de pays africains ont, durant ces quatre dernières années, participé à des réunions du Codex Alimentarius et je n'en ai identifié que trois ou quatre. Il y a un pays comme l'Egypte qui participe de manière régulière mais les autres pays n'ont pas pu le faire. C'est donc dire qu'*a priori*, dans le processus qui est en cours, nous sommes exclus.

Mais nous voulons changer cette situation et pensons que nous avons également notre voix à faire entendre. Comme les moyens nous manquent pour participer au Codex Alimentarius de manière régulière, car le Codex Alimentarius se réunit de manière régulière, et les délégations africaines n'arrivent pas à participer de manière soutenue, nous pensons que la mise en place d'un Forum pouvant mobiliser suffisamment de ressources et d'énergies nationales serait la bienvenue.

Nous soutenons donc fermement cette idée de l'organisation de ce Forum. L'organisation de ce forum dans un pays du Tiers-Monde est également une idée que nous avons soutenue l'année dernière et que nous continuons à soutenir.

Pour revenir à ce que disait notre collègue de la Chine, en ce qui concerne les langues de travail, c'est vrai que les raisons qui ont été données ici pour la restriction des langues sont des raisons essentiellement budgétaires. Nous voulons d'abord remercier tous les pays qui se sont déjà offerts pour participer financièrement à l'organisation de ce Forum et prier également les bonnes volontés pour que la demande de la Chine puisse être prise en considération afin que la participation maximale des pays en voie de développement soit assurée.

**Sra. Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOTTI (Guatemala)**

Guatemala se alegra en verle presidir esta sesión.

Se asocia a la preocupación expresada por Indonesia, haciendo hincapié en el fortalecimiento de los programas de ayuda técnica a los países en desarrollo, para llegar a establecer sistemas eficaces de inocuidad de los alimentos. Asimismo, se asocia a las declaraciones de Brasil, Estados Unidos y Bolivia, porque creemos que si estamos buscando recursos para fortalecer el Codex, no debemos duplicar esfuerzos para otros rubros.

**Paul MURPHY (Canada)**

Simply to say that Canada too supports the idea of convening a second Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators, along the lines outlined by the Assistant Director-General in his opening remarks, but we can also certainly associate ourselves with those delegations who are expressing strong concern that the global forum not duplicate any of the work of functions of Codex.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia recognizes the importance of food safety and for this reason strongly supports the work of the Codex Alimentarius. Given this, we would support the comments made earlier by the United States of America and also by others in relation to the role of Codex and the importance of it. We would emphasize that such a Forum should focus on information exchange, not address policy issues. It should be both focused on practical activities and should not overlap or duplicate the work of Codex Alimentarius.

We would also note that the last Council provided some parameters on the nature of such a conference. We consider this still applies and we would also note that the Preparatory Meeting for this Session would provide a further opportunity to comment on the specifics.

**EL PRESIDENTE**

La Presidencia considera que estaríamos ya en condiciones de cerrar con la lista de oradores. No obstante, si algún Estado Miembro, algún Observador o alguna Organización desea intervenir.

Considerando que no hay interesados en hacer una intervención, se cierra la lista de oradores y preguntamos al señor de Haen si tiene algún comentario o desea responder a algunos de los planteamientos de los Estados Miembros.

**Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

I am glad to say a few words, although there were not really many questions posed to us. I would like to note that I have listed many speakers who supported the general idea of holding a second Global Forum. The theme was also generally endorsed, although several said they would like to discuss further details at the Preparatory Meeting. We have noted this and look forward to that event on the 8 July.

I think I should say a word about the relationship between such global fora and Codex Alimentarius, because several of you raised or expressed concern that there should not be any overlap. I myself have fully participated in the first Global Forum and I can state clearly that I did not see any tendency for an overlap. Codex Alimentarius is an intergovernmental body that sets standards. These global fora did not even attempt to set or to prepare the setting of a standard. They clearly focused on exchange of experience in using such standards and implementing them at the country level, in analysis that means management assessment and communication of risk, but not standard-setting. I believe that your message is clear that this should remain so at the

Second Global Forum. I am confident that the Members who participated in the first Global Forum had the same view and so your guidance is very welcome and I trust that we, the Secretariat, together with WHO, will make every effort that this remains so.

Capacity-building was the main aim that participants of the first Global Forum expressed for the second as well, so the proposed title that was chosen for the second Global Forum expresses this view also very clearly. I wanted to assure you that, as a Secretariat, we will remind participants and those of the Preparatory Meeting that it is the Council's wish to avoid such an overlap.

We have noted the remarks made with regard to languages and with regard to funding. I think there is nothing to be added. Only to say that, up to now, for the full cost of convening the Global Forum and providing six languages as would be required, if we take WHO and FAO together the pledges received to-date do not cover all costs. We would welcome pledges for whoever wishes to support the resources. We have, compared to the one option which is an option that would cost US\$ 512 000, 61 percent of those costs already pledged. I would say, being still so far away from the Global Forum, this is perhaps a positive outcome, but of course we need 39 percent more in order to give the green light for the final preparations for such a Global Forum.

Of course, as Secretariat, we have noted with gratitude the statement by Thailand offering to host this Global Forum. I believe the rest is for the Chair of the Council to draw conclusions.

I should only also like to make reference to the Pan Asian Conference on Food Safety Regulators, I have not noted any questions with regard to that, only positive comments were made. So we trust the Council will give us final guidance on the further preparation of that Asian Forum.

#### **EL PRESIDENTE**

Indudablemente este tema ha sido debatido exhaustivamente, por lo que podríamos resumir que el Consejo endosa la propuesta para realizar la Segunda Reunión del Foro Global de Reguladores de Seguridad Alimentaria, que el Consejo está de acuerdo que el Foro no será solamente para un intercambio de experiencias sino que debe contribuir al examen periódico del mismo y que por lo tanto no duplicará las labores del Codex Alimentarius.

El Consejo desea aprovechar la oportunidad para agradecer a la distinguida delegación de Tailandia por su disposición de ser sede del Foro Global.

Con estas palabras, creo que estamos en condiciones de concluir el examen de este tema en la tarde de hoy y por ende nuestras labores.

Creo que la distinguida delegación de los Estados Unidos está pidiendo la palabra.

#### **Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

In summing up, I would like a clarification on a word or phrase that you used. I think we felt very strongly that the meeting should be limited to information-sharing and I did not get that from you. Can you please clarify.

#### **EL PRESIDENTE**

No, quizás me expresé mal, pero nuestro pronunciamiento sigue esa línea, y precisamente sea para un intercambio de experiencias sobre este tema.

Antes que finalizar creo que la Secretaría tiene algún anuncio que hacer.

#### **SECRETARY-GENERAL**

Thank you for translating from English into Spanish your statement. We are grateful to you for that.

The Drafting Committee will now meet immediately in the Mexico Room. We are a little bit late in starting. So will all Members of the Drafting Committee go to the Mexico Room.

*The meeting rose at 18.50 hours*  
*La séance est levée à 18 h 50*  
*Se levanta la sesión a las 18.50 horas*



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING SEPTIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE SÉPTIMA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>26 June 2003</b>

The Seventh Plenary Meeting was opened at 9.55 hours

Mr Aziz Mekouar,

Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La septième séance plénière est ouverte à 9 h 55

sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,

Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la séptima sesión plenaria a las 9.55 horas

bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,

Presidente Independiente del Consejo

## **10. Preparations for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the FAO Conference**

### **10. Préparatifs de la trente-deuxième session de la Conférence de la FAO**

### **10. Preparativos para el 32º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO**

*10.1 Arrangements for the Session and Provisional Timetable (CL 124/12)*

*10.1 Organisation et calendrier provisoire de la session (CL 124/12)*

*10.1 Preparativos para el período de sesiones y el calendario provisional (CL 124/12)*

*10.2 Deadline for Nominations for the post of Independent Chairman of the Council (CL 124/12)*

*10.2 Date limite pour la soumission de candidatures aux fonctions de Président indépendant du Conseil (CL 124/12)*

*10.2 Plazo para la presentación de candidaturas al cargo de Presidente Independiente del Consejo (CL 124/12)*

*10.3 Nomination of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of Commission I and Commission II (CL 124/12)*

*10.3 Nomination des candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et de Présidents des Commissions I et II (CL 124/12)*

*10.3 Presentación de candidaturas para los cargos de Presidente de la Conferencia y Presidentes de las Comisiones I y II (CL 124/12)*

*10.4 Nomination of Nine Members of the Credentials Committee (Countries) (CL 124/12)*

*10.4 Nomination des candidatures des neuf membres de la Commission de vérification des pouvoirs (pays) (CL 124/12)*

*10.4 Presentación de candidaturas para nueve miembros del Comité de Credenciales (países) (CL 124/12)*

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je déclare ouverte la septième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil. Nous allons commencer avec le point 10 de l'ordre du jour: Préparation de la trente-deuxième session de la Conférence de la FAO. Nous allons examiner l'un après l'autre, les sous-points 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 et 10.4.

Je vous propose de passer immédiatement au sous point 10.1 de l'ordre du jour sur l'organisation et le calendrier provisoire de la session de la Conférence que vous pouvez trouver dans le document CL 124/12. J'ai été prié de vous informer qu'une erreur de frappe est survenue dans le calendrier résumé qui se trouve à l'Annexe B de ce document. Il ne s'agit pas du jeudi 5 décembre mais du jeudi 4 décembre.

## **SECRETARY-GENERAL**

I take pleasure in presenting to you document CL 124/12 which contains proposals for the conduct of the Thirty-second Session of the Conference, including the Draft Provisional Agenda. The Tentative Timetable is also contained in that document.

In keeping with the request from the May 2003 Joint Meeting, the document also proposes that three Ministerial Level Roundtables be held from 17.30 to 21.30 hours on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday 1, 2 and 3 December. The Report of this Council contains guidance to the Secretariat on this matter, specifically concerning the timing and to ensure that there is consultation on the theme, so that has already been taken care of by the Council.

A document on the themes will be circulated to the Membership shortly after this Council. I would also like to draw to your attention that the Conference will vote on, first of all, the admission of new Members. The Federated States of Micronesia, Timor-Leste and Tuvalu have applied and there will be vote on their admission at the Conference.

Second, there will be a vote on the appointment of the Independent Chairman of the Council, as well as the Election of Council Members and the vote on the budget level for the next biennium. Your attention is drawn to the fact that this Council needs to take some decisions, as set out in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the document.

### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Y a-t-il des questions? Je considère que le Conseil adopte le calendrier provisoire de la Conférence tel que présenté à l'Annexe B du document CL 124/12.

Nous abordons maintenant le sous-point 10.2: Date limite de la soumission des candidatures aux fonctions de Président indépendant du Conseil. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/12. Il est proposé au paragraphe 12 de ce document que la date limite pour la soumission des candidatures aux fonctions de Président indépendant du Conseil soit fixée au vendredi 5 septembre à 17 heures et que les Membres du Conseil soient informés des candidatures avant le vendredi 12 septembre 2003. Pas d'objections aux dates proposées? C'est donc adopté.

*Adopted*

*Adopté*

*Aprobado*

Continuons avec le sous-point 10.3 de l'Ordre du jour sur la désignation des candidatures aux fonctions de Présidents des Commissions I et II. Il s'agit du document CL 124/12. Après consultation entre les groupes régionaux, il est proposé qu'un Représentant de la Nouvelle-Zélande soit élu à la fonction de Président de la Conférence. Pas d'objections? Je crois que nous pouvons acclamer le Président de la Conférence.

*Applause*

*Applaudissements*

*Aplausos*

Comme cela se fait habituellement, le Directeur général prendra contact avec le Gouvernement de la Nouvelle-Zélande et communiquera le nom de son Représentant à la prochaine session du Conseil en novembre 2003. Le Conseil confirmera, à cette occasion, la proposition de candidature en vue de la soumettre à la Conférence.

En ce qui concerne la fonction de Président de la Commission I de la Conférence, il est proposé qu'un Représentant de l'Autriche occupe cette fonction. Pas d'objections?

Enfin, j'ai été informé que le Groupe des 77 n'a pas encore désigné de pays pour la fonction de Président de la Commission II. J'espère qu'il sera en mesure de le faire avant que le Comité de rédaction ne se réunisse en fin de journée. Y a-t-il des remarques à ce sujet?

Nous passons donc au point 10.4 de l'Ordre du jour, c'est-à-dire à la Désignation des candidatures des neuf membres de la Commission de vérification des pouvoirs. Le document pertinent est le document CL 124/12. Les membres de la Commission de la vérification des pouvoirs n'ont pas encore été désignés par les groupes régionaux. Je sais que des consultations sont en cours.

Je voudrais souligner l'importance de parvenir à un consensus et de désigner les membres de la Commission, qui pourra ainsi commencer son travail dans les délais, c'est-à-dire quinze jours avant l'ouverture de la session de la Conférence. Je demande donc aux groupes régionaux de faire tout leur possible pour atteindre un accord avant la fin de la journée. Pas de remarques à ce sujet? Nous avons donc conclu le point 10 de l'ordre du jour.

### **Neil FRASER (Observer for New Zealand)**

I think before passing quickly off, Item 10, we would like to express our pleasure at having the honour of chairing the Conference this year. We thank the Members of the South-West Pacific who nominated us and FAO Membership for endorsing that nomination. New Zealand last chaired the Conference in 1955, so you might say that we are a bit out of practice, because most of the Institutional Memory has gone.

We can assure the Membership we will put all the resources we can into ensuring that the next Conference is as productive as possible for FAO, for the Members and especially for the ministers, who will come here.

It is likely that the New Zealand Chair will be Minister, Jim Sutton, he has several relevant portfolios that make him well suited to this task as Minister for Agriculture for Forestry, for Biosecurity, for Rural Affairs and for Trade Negotiations. He also co-chaired one of the Round Tables at the World Food Summit: *five years later* event, so he is well qualified for this position, we believe.

It is too early to talk about the objectives for the New Zealand chairmanship of the Conference and we would however, take this opportunity to alert Members for those unaware of the New Zealand style. The New Zealand style is we like to think direct, frank, informal, fair and principled. We know from experience that Ministers do not like inactively sitting for endless hours in Plenary and will want to get involved in issues and get maximum value from their time in Rome at Conference. Given our positive assessment of the Round Tables held at the World Food Summit: *five years later* we warmly welcome the decision to have Round Tables at Conference and we will work with the Secretariat to ensure that these are participatory, relevant and as lively as possible.

The New Zealand delegation here in Rome will be working hard to ensure Members' voices are heard in the lead up to the Conference. To this end please contact the Permanent Representation if you have special concerns or requests which are able to be accommodated, if they can enhance the Conference for Ministers and Member Nations.

***Guntram Freiherr Von Schnenck, Vice-Chairperson, took the Chair***  
***Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck, Vice-président, assume la présidence***  
***Ocupa la presidencia Guntram Freiherr Von Schenck, Vice-Chairperson***

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Examinons maintenant le point 4 de l'ordre du jour relatif au rapport de la soixante-quatrième session du Comité des produits, qui s'est tenue à Rome du 18 au 21 mars 2003. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/6.

J'attire particulièrement votre attention sur le tableau qui se trouve au début de ce document et qui contient une liste des questions soumises à l'attention du Conseil. J'invite Monsieur de Haen, Sous-Directeur général chargé du Département des affaires économiques et sociales, à présenter le rapport.

**4. Report of the 64<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems**  
**(Rome, 18-21 March 2003) (CL 124/6)**

**4. Rapport de la soixante-quatrième session du Comité des produits**  
**(Rome, 18-21 mars 2003) (CL 124/6)**

**4. Informe del 64º período de sesiones del Comité de Problemas de Productos Básicos**  
**(Roma, 18-21 de marzo de 2003) (CL 124/6)**

**Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

The Sixty-fourth Session of the CCP was held in March this year and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that it was preceded by a Side Event that did not figure on the agenda as Side Event but it was a Commodity Consultation the day before, attended by some of the members of the CCP and some invited experts which turned out to be rather successful in addressing specific commodity issues.

In my introduction, which will be brief, I only want to draw your attention to a number of policy issues that were debated during the CCP. The role of the CCP is to review commodity problems of an international nature, to survey the world commodity situation and to develop appropriate policy recommendations for the FAO Council. I would underline that the CCP is the only truly global platform for discussion of problems facing commodity producers, exporters and importers

in food and agriculture and also the body that can agree on appropriate responses to the arising issues.

On the occasion of this Session of the CCP, the Committee reviewed the state of world agricultural commodity markets and emphasized the vital importance of commodity prices to developing countries, whether as commodity exporters or as commodity importers, both aspects were discussed in some detail. The food security implications of commodity prices and market developments were a recurring theme of the documents presented to the CCP and of the discussions during the Session. The Committee acknowledged the importance of the market fundamentals, that is of demand and supply developments and determining the recent low and rather variable commodity prices that prevail on most of the agricultural markets but the Committee also highlighted the important role played by continuing production support, exports subsidies and protective barriers against imports in a number of countries. These distortions have an adverse effect on the economic development of other countries and that is also reflected in the Report of the Committee.

Even with improved market access, many developing countries could still face obstacles in expanding and diversifying their exports and need assistance to identify and exploit market opportunities.

These obstacles are *inter alia* due to problems of compliance with phytosanitary and technical requirements of importing countries. Moreover, increasing market concentration and market power of food marketing and distribution companies in commodity chains are further challenges for exporters of some commodities. The Committee was concerned by these difficulties caused by market as well as policy factors which developing countries continue to face and the Committee encouraged further research into the incidence of such constraints and how they might be overcome. So, for the exporters' situation. The dependence of developing countries on food imports was another issue discussed by the CCP.

The Committee considered the implications of the recent trends for food security, sharply rising trend in the net food imports of developing countries, particularly Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries could undermine the development of existing or potentially-viable domestic production, if these imports come in at prices with which domestic producers cannot compete.

The Committee expressed particular concern where the availability of cheap imports was the result of domestic support provided to producers in the exporting countries. Increasing the frequent surges in the import of food products by developing countries have potentially adverse affects on their domestic agriculture but many developing countries lack access to the agricultural safeguard provisions of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture – that was noted by the Committee – and I might conclude this aspect by saying that there was some support by some members of the Committee for proposals in the WTO negotiations for making available to developing countries a simple agricultural safeguard mechanism suited to their institutional capacity. This is an issue currently under negotiation, and certainly not for negotiation here in FAO.

The Committee noted that the Commodities and Trade Division continues to undertake detailed analysis of specific trade policy issues. It was also informed that the Secretariat is expanding its work in capacity-building and support to Member governments in relation to the ongoing WTO negotiations and in its technical assistance to individual Member Governments in relation to commodity policy.

The new programme known by its abbreviation Umbrella II, entitled "Trade-Related Capacity- Building Programme for Agriculture, Fishery and Forestry", has recently been launched and presented to interested donors and beneficiary countries.

The Committee welcomed these developments and capacity-building and recommended still increased efforts in this regard to assist developing countries in coping with changing trading environments and to participate fully and equitably in agricultural trade.

I take this occasion to say that although the Umbrella II Programme has met with, I would say, broad support by FAO's Members and interest has been expressed by certain donors, we are still looking forward to concrete commitments and pledges to enable the Secretariat to implement this Programme as soon as possible as the negotiations in WHO are ongoing.

Finally, the Committee also touched the issue of food aid and its appropriate form in the context of endorsement of the report of the Consultative Sub-Committee on Surplus Disposal (CSSD). It stressed the importance of accurate information concerning food aid flows and regretted that the reporting on food aid transactions to the CSSD was increasingly incomplete. Members present will recall that those countries who had reduced their reporting frequency have expressed their intention to improve the reporting so that we come back to the former situation where the coverage of reporting of food aid transactions was more complete than in recent years.

Members of the Committee also refer to the different views expressed in the current debate and the WTO on the form of food aid. Some stressed that food aid should not be used as a market development tool, I am speaking of non-emergency food aid here only, and opinions were divided as to whether only food aid given in grant form should qualify as food aid or also food given under concessional terms, an issue also under negotiation in the WTO.

To conclude, there was general agreement that the documentation provided to this Session of CCP and the debate were of high technical quality than in previous sessions but nevertheless there was concern that participation on capitals was low and that the Secretariat had to make efforts to analyze the reasons for this low participation. The Secretariat was requested to explore alternative means of enhancing participation and at the subsequent meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, this issue was taken up again and the specific proposal was made that CCP and COAG should be combined in some way. As you know the Secretaries of these two Technical Committees, that is CCP and COAG, are preparing a document outlining possible formats for submission to the next session of the Programme Committee, and subsequently certainly also for consideration by Council. So this response to the concerns raised about the combination of meetings, or the kind of interaction between COAG and CCP, is still not completed, but will be before the Programme Committee in September.

**Elías REYES BRAVO (México)**

El documento relativo al informe sobre el problema de productos básicos, subraya que el Comité examinó la situación de los mercados mundiales de los productos básicos, confirmando la importancia fundamental que los precios de estos productos tienen para la economía y para la seguridad alimentaria en la mayor parte de los países en desarrollo.

México comparte la opinión de otras delegaciones de que los apoyos distorsionantes de la producción y el comercio así como los subsidios a la exportación, constituyen las principales causas del bajo nivel y variabilidad de los precios observados recientemente en los mercados internacionales. Mi delegación se manifiesta por la eliminación de los apoyos distorsionantes en la agricultura y de los subsidios a la exportación, a fin de contribuir a la existencia de condiciones de competencia justa en el comercio mundial de productos agropecuarios. La Ronda Uruguay propició que el nivel de protección arancelaria y el nivel de subsidios y apoyos internos se redujera proporcionalmente de manera diferenciada, dependiendo del nivel de desarrollo de las economías. Sin embargo, se siguen provocando distorsiones en el mercado, más como producto de la capacidad financiera de los países que de sus compromisos contractuales. Esta situación ha frenado el desarrollo de la agricultura en los países en desarrollo. En caso de seguir prevaleciendo la diferencia en la aplicación de los subsidios, se pierde la pretendida equidad en el comercio internacional.

En relación con el contenido del informe que nos ocupa, mi delegación considera que la FAO debe fortalecer su interacción con el Fondo Común para los Productos Básicos a fin de movilizar mayores recursos para el desarrollo de proyectos.

La delegación de México desea expresar la aprobación de este Informe y apoya las propuestas contenidas en el mismo, principalmente las siguientes: evaluar la capacidad de los países en

desarrollo para responder a los aumentos repentinos de las importaciones y en particular los posibles mecanismos institucionales alternativos, para permitirles aplicar medidas de salvaguardia apropiadas; seguir analizando las repercusiones del Acuerdo sobre la Agricultura de la Organización Mundial del Comercio, en la seguridad alimentaria; y cuantificar las consecuencias económicas de las políticas proteccionistas y las medidas de ayuda distorsionadoras del comercio.

**Hamed Awad Allah HAMED (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

The delegation of Egypt would like to thank the Secretariat for this very informative document, the Report on the Sixty-fourth Session. It is a document which reflects all the important discussions held focusing on commodities.

There was an analysis of the various problems faced by exports of developing countries, notably and the problems of access to international markets. The document emphasizes that it is important to help countries to strengthen their capacities and my delegation would stress that it is very important to analyze the trends of agricultural products. We emphasize the fact that it is very important to strengthen countries' ability to take part in negotiations, particularly with the World Trade Organization and it is important to help countries to participate constructively in these negotiations.

**Flavio Célio GOLDMAN (Brasil)**

Pido que se le de la palabra a la delegación de la República Dominicana, que hará una intervención en nombre de los países del GRULAC.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

Como ha indicado la distinguida Representación de Brasil, voy a hacer uso de la palabra en nombre del Grupo de Países de América Latina y el Caribe.

Además de agradecer la presentación del informe a la Secretaría, el GRULAC desea manifestar, como consta en dicho informe, la continua preocupación por el elevado nivel de las ayudas internas, el limitado acceso a los mercados y los mecanismos de ayuda a las exportaciones en los países desarrollados, así como sus efectos distorsionantes sobre los mercados internacionales de productos básicos y el desarrollo económico de otros países. En este contexto, los países deben impulsar las negociaciones multilaterales con el objetivo de reducir las distorsiones en el mercado agrícola internacional en el marco de la Declaración de Doha. Además, el Grupo de Países de América Latina y el Caribe considera de suma importancia la propuesta de estudios sobre productos básicos, entre ellos azúcar y café, prosiguiendo con el análisis de las tendencias de la composición y orientación de las exportaciones agrícolas.

Se debe tener en cuenta, entre otras tareas, la de cuantificar las consecuencias económicas tanto de las políticas proteccionistas como de las medidas de ayuda como causa de distorsión del comercio. Cuantificar, también, las consecuencias de los efectos de la concentración del mercado por las empresas transnacionales o multinacionales, la distribución del aumento del comercio en relación con un gran número de cadenas de productos agrícolas, especialmente en los precios al productor y al consumidor y, por último, la incidencia y efectos de la progresividad arancelaria respecto de los productos con valor añadido y, en particular, de las exportaciones de los países en desarrollo.

**Jorge DE LA CABALLERÍA (European Community)**

I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

Referring to document CL 124/6, the European Community and its Member States endorses the Report from the Sixty-fourth Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems. In this context, we refrain from repeating our comments made in the said Committee, which are still valid. However, we would like to underline our concerns expressed during the Committee meeting in March of the limited participation, especially from the developing countries.

The European Community supports the efforts of the Secretariat to explore various options for the format of future sessions, including the possibility of combining the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Commodity Problems meetings in order to achieve efficiency-savings and improve participation. In this regard, we thank Mr de Haen for the information given already in his presentation.

**Shri R.C.A. JAIN (India)**

The Report of the Committee on Commodity Problems provides very useful insights into the increasingly complex milieu of marketing agricultural products. The issues dealt with within the Report are of enormous importance and abiding interest to our country.

We are indeed concerned that the deleterious impact with the steady fall in the prices of various subsidized commodities is having on the viability of our larger subsistence level farm economies. This scenario is inexorably leading to the doubts and misgivings that such phenomena are the result of trade liberalization articulated in the WTO Agreement on Agriculture.

We express our appreciation for the studies prepared by FAO Secretariat on major developments and issues in agricultural commodity markets, medium-term projections for agricultural commodities and on export trends and suggest continuation of this kind of analysis.

General expectations of securing higher exports and better prices for smallholders' farm products have not come to pass. We are of the definite view that the generally low prices of commodities and the consequent decline in profitability is primarily on account of the production support majors and the export subsidies extended by developed countries rather than the protective barriers, the factor primarily blamed by the Committee for this baneful phenomena.

In the scenario of falling world prices, developing countries have to depend on tariff instruments to protect livelihood incomes of its farmers, the majority of whom are small and marginal. Substantial lowering of tariff may undermine the viability of such subsistence farming unless an effective mechanism is evolved within the WTO framework to protect smallholders' incomes.

Declining international prices have a negative impact on domestic production in developing countries, dampening their efforts to achieve increased yields and higher production and thereby threatening food security in the long run.

The increasing hold of multinationals and supermarket chains over commodities trade and market is a matter of grave concern. Such irregularities tend to impose their own certification and food safety criteria due to constraints of resources and expertise. Many of the developing countries find themselves in a situation of helplessness in dealing with such megaplayers. This has already led to a declining share of developing countries in the revenues generated from the sale of agricultural products in global markets.

The capacity to adopt new technologies for markets, such as, genetically-modified crops, is similarly constrained. Differential access to improve technologies in the agriculture sector has tended to widen the gap between those countries able to compete effectively in international markets and those that continue to suffer from inaccessibility to emerging technologies.

It is our view that FAO needs to undertake more research on the changing nature of market structures and supply chains, and the implications for agricultural development and food security.

We are also concerned about the problems being faced by developing countries in compliance with SPS standards. With longer and fragmented supply chains in developing countries, including the smallholder and subsistence farmers, the chain of traceability is, in our opinion, iniquitous and impractical. The adjusting and growing mismatch between the SPS regimes of developing and developed countries has potentially very disturbing consequences for the developing countries. The traceability required down the line, in our opinion, is a very distant goal at this stage in these countries.



In short, India would urge that the entire gambit of food chain issues, in the context of agricultural commodities exports, should receive much greater attention from FAO so that the smallholder does not get entirely eliminated from the benefits of international trade.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

According to paragraph 6 of the Report of the CPP, The State of Agricultural Markets, in the main Report of the Committee on Commodity Problems meeting, it is important for the Council to discuss the role of genetically-modified organisms (GMOs).

In the agricultural commodities markets, as we all understand, biotechnology is important in increasing the agricultural productivity and quality preference. We shall have, thus, a better understanding of GMOs through intensive discussion on their controversial nature, based upon specific, universally and domestic preference for GMOs.

Indonesia agrees to call on FAO to assist Member Nations in capacity-building for assessment of impact and development of regulatory systems with regard to biotechnologies.

Indonesia would like to express its concern regarding the lowering price of some important agriculture commodities, such as, rice, corn, soy bean and sugarcane, as well as some cash crops under certain international markets. The low price of these commodities consequently might undermine their domestic price and, therefore, affect significantly the welfare of millions of farmers who comprise the majority of rural households in Indonesia.

This effect came because of the very strong linkages of agriculture to the other sectors which affect the performance of the economy, especially lowering prices for some exported cash crops necessary for foreign exchange earnings and thus lowering farmers income.

In addition, the lower price of rice might affect its domestic price and local production and it also might threaten food security.

Indonesia supports the request made for assistance to identify market alternatives in building capacity to promote exports and overcome market obstacles, as well as the medium-term outlook for world agriculture commodity markets as an important issue to consider, especially the trend of agriculture price and trade growth.

The Indonesian delegation noticed the serious declining trend of relative prices of major agricultural commodities projected by FAO studies and expressed its concern with this trend. This information is important because as mentioned above, the chain of the prices significantly affects the farmers' welfare and the performance of the economy.

Indonesia seriously noted paragraphs 23, 28 and 29 trade policy issues in the context of food security, especially the effect of the surges of food crops imports on agriculture in developing countries.

We note some substitution product on horticulture and livestock also face declining world prices. We note the diversity of CSSD and we support the need to strengthen the CSSD activities. FAO should also assist the Members, especially the developing countries, in their efforts to promote capacity-building so they can participate on an equal footing with others in the process of WTO negotiations.

**Sra. Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOTTI (Guatemala)**

Ante todo agradecemos a la Secretaría por la presentación del Informe, el cual acabamos de endosar. Además queremos manifestar nuestra adhesión a la declaración del GRULAC y de la delegación de México, haciendo hincapié sobre las recomendaciones a la FAO.

**Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)**

The Philippines would like to express its endorsement of the Report of the Sixty-fourth Session of the Committee for Commodity Problems. While we do appreciate the excellent analysis being done by the Secretariat on the State of World Agricultural Commodity Markets, paragraphs 6-9, as well as its assessment of the medium-term outlook for agricultural commodity markets and its

implications for food security on paragraphs 10-14, we have to admit that during the Session the endorsements of the Reports of the various Commodity Groups practically did not elicit lively debate from the Member Nations.

If I may add, the only thing that triggered an interesting exchange was on the Consultative Sub-Committee on Surplus Disposal (CSSD). Consequently, we would like to request the Secretariat to devise more ways to make the Session of the CCP more exciting in the future. The Philippines is willing to participate, if needed, in the discussions under paragraph 44 of the Report.

**James BUTLER (United States of America)**

The United States of America disassociated from consensus on this Committee's Report. The United States of America was not a part of the Drafting Committee. When our delegation raised suggested changes in the Plenary Session, there seemed to be no procedure in place for the United States' concerns regarding the Report to be considered. The United States of America did join consensus because we thought the recommendation that FAO identify winners and losers from protectionism and domestic support should be less politically-charged and more analytical in nature.

We also believe that the Report should have balanced the record of food aid discussions to include the position expressed by the United States of America and others that food aid donations play an important role in food security, and should be made in conformity to the Food Aid Convention and disciplines to be articulated in the WTO negotiations on agriculture.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

The Czech Republic is also speaking on behalf of Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Malta and Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, as countries acceding the European Community represented at this meeting. We wish to associate ourselves with the statement of the European Commission, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Flavio Célio GOLDMAN (Brazil)**

The Brazilian delegation fully supports the intervention made by the President of GRULAC, the Representative of the Dominican Republic and endorses the Report adopted by the last Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems. At the present Session of the Council, we would like to emphasize some aspects of that Report regarding the current international situation in the field of agriculture.

Trade distortions continue to depress commodities' international prices. The situation is clearly the result of the adoption of agricultural policies by many developing countries whose farmers are today heavily-dependent on subsidies. As agricultural production increases artificially, international prices decline sharply. Furthermore, international trade is affected negatively by tariff and non-tariff barriers which deny developing countries full access to international markets. No one can deny that developed countries' policies are affecting negatively developing countries' efforts to fight underdevelopment, to combat poverty and to eliminate hunger.

Brazil is conscious that social exclusion results from an unjust model of development. The main responsibility for reducing poverty and improving food security belongs to national authorities. Anyhow, the importance of international cooperation and solidarity cannot be understated. International trade, and above all, trade without distortions and barriers is part of this common effort. According to the Doha Declaration, the time has come for WTO Member Nations to reveal and reform the circumstances. Doha decisions represent an opportunity to establish the basis for the elimination of marked distortions, especially those affecting agriculture.

The Brazilian delegation emphasizes that the three main pillars included in the Chapter on agriculture of the Doha Declaration, that is to say, substantial improvements in market access, reductions of, with a view to phasing out all forms of export subsidies and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support, must be urgently adopted.

**KIM EUNG-BON (Korea, Republic of)**

During the CCP and COAG Session, my delegation suggested combining the CCP and COAG committees. The combining of these two Committees has two purposes. The first one is to encourage additional participation from developing countries. The second is to obtain more efficient cost-savings.

In this regard, I was very pleased to hear Mr de Haen mention this morning that the Secretariat is preparing a paper to be dealt with during the next Finance Committee. We expect the Finance Committee to produce a good modality for the two Committees.

**Michihiro TAMURA (Japan)**

We are pleased to say that we can support as a whole the Report of the Sixty-fourth Session of the Committee on Commodity Problems document CL 124/6 which reflects and summarizes the results of discussions at the Committee. For the sake of efficiency, I will not repeat our comments made at the Sixty-fourth Session of the CCP, which are still valid. However, I would like to make some observations concerning the Report.

With regard to sustainable agriculture and rural development, Japan has been allocating the importance of the co-existence of various types of agriculture because there are numerous types. From this point of view, we believe that the impact of the international agricultural trade policy reform is not identical for individual countries as pointed out in paragraph 27. Therefore, as mentioned in paragraphs 20 and 28, my delegation can support FAO's work of identifying winners and losers from agricultural trade reforms.

Furthermore, my delegation would like to suggest that FAO, when carrying out the analysis included in paragraph 28, assess impacts of trade liberalization on different agricultural groups separately, in order to understand the impacts precisely. In the meantime, Japan recognizes the importance of promoting capacity-building in developing countries and fully supports the notion described in paragraph 29. In fact, Japan is supporting capacity-building of activities through an FAO Trust Fund project and a WTO Trust Fund project.

My delegation would also like to refer to measures to increase participation and revitalize CCP and COAG Sessions, as mentioned in the reports of the Twenty-fourth CCP in document CL 124/6 and the Twenty-seventh Session of COAG in CL 124/9. In this regard, my delegation would like to support the remarks made by the European Community and the Republic of Korea, and would be pleased to hear comments from the Secretariat.

Therefore, we believe that alternative arrangements will be explored, including combining CCP and COAG sessions. My delegation fully supports these points and is of the opinion that some kind of measures have to be taken.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia supports the Report of the Committee on Commodity Problems, and while we do not intend to reiterate our detailed comments here as noted by others, they still remain valid. We would, nevertheless, just wish to highlight a couple of points.

The report identifies, in particular, important issues in relation to the impact of protectionism and trade-distorting support policies. We would wish to express our support for these and for the CCP's agreement to further trade-related analyses on the consequences of such policies.

We also support the Report's recognition of the importance of capacity-building in this area, as well as in relation to International Standard Setting.

Finally, we would also wish to endorse the balanced and appropriate conclusions of the Report on Food Aid.

**Majid DEGHANSHOAR (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

On behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank the Secretariat of CCP for the preparation of the excellent paper, which has been presented here. In addition, my delegation fully supports the

recommendation by the honourable delegation of Indonesia requesting FAO to support Member Nations' own evaluation of a GMO-based agro-product. We fully endorse their paper.

**Sra. Raquel LIEBERS BALDIVIESO (Bolivia)**

La delegación de Bolivia manifiesta su adhesión a la intervención realizada por el Representante de la República Dominicana como Presidente del Grupo de los países de América Latina y el Caribe.

La reforma fundamental del comercio agrícola en el mundo es la clave para lograr el desarrollo de los objetivos propuestos en la decisión histórica tomada en Doha, la de lanzar la primera ronda de desarrollo. Esta frase ha sido pronunciada durante la 14ª Reunión Ministerial del Grupo Cairns en octubre del año pasado en Santa Cruz, Bolivia.

Hasta el momento, lamentablemente, no ha habido progreso en la reducción masiva de subsidios y el proteccionismo. No podemos negar que el desarrollo y la reducción de la pobreza de los países en desarrollo depende particularmente de la reforma del comercio agrícola en el mundo, sobre todo cuando los países industrializados no dejan sus políticas de protección al sector agropecuario.

El Gobierno de Bolivia hace los esfuerzos más intensos para reducir la pobreza rural y la consecuente inseguridad alimentaria. Bolivia tiene un potencial agropecuario muy grande, era exportador de trigo hace unos sesenta años. Ahora importamos anualmente más de 300.000 toneladas de trigo. Nuestro país tiene un producto bruto interno *per capita* de menos de 1.000 dólares EE.UU. por año, pero en las áreas rurales los campesinos no llegan a 250 dólares EE.UU. por año. Luchamos contra la producción ilegal de la hoja de coca, un producto tradicional indígena en nuestro país, cuya transformación en una droga ilícita no es más que una oportunidad para nuestros campesinos pobres.

Sin amplio acceso de nuestros productos agrícolas en mercados extranjeros, no podemos cumplir con nuestra lucha contra la pobreza, contra la inseguridad alimentaria ni contra la producción ilícita de la hoja de coca. Por lo tanto, no solamente necesitamos más oportunidades para la exportación de productos básicos agrícolas, sino también promover con urgencia la elaboración de productos con un valor agregado para la exportación. Así podremos generar empleo e ingreso para nuestra población pobre, que siempre está dispuesta a trabajar con equidad y dignidad.

Los esfuerzos del Gobierno y de los agricultores bolivianos formulados en el Plan Agrícola de Bolivia necesitan el apoyo prioritario para mejorar la productividad y eficiencia, la integración de las cadenas productivas, la agroindustria y la competitividad. Obras masivas de riego están en ejecución. El excelentísimo señor Presidente de Bolivia declaró el Plan de Riego: 110.000 hectáreas bajo riego en los cinco años de su gestión como clave y prioridad principal en la estrategia del desarrollo agropecuario rural y en la lucha contra la pobreza e inseguridad alimentaria.

El informe que estamos discutiendo es un documento de alta importancia y la delegación de mi país quiere felicitar a la FAO y sus colaboradores por su eficiente coincidencia con la situación actual. Sin embargo, en un sin número de estudios y análisis recientemente realizados también por la FAO, se demuestra que los países más pobres, con un gran potencial de exportación agrícola como Bolivia están encontrando más y mayores desventajas por las consecuencias de la liberalización del comercio. Una disminución considerable en el ingreso rural y el aumento de la inseguridad alimentaria son una de las consecuencias más preocupantes. Tanto para la seguridad alimentaria, la lucha contra la pobreza dentro de los países de bajo ingreso, y para la sostenibilidad del manejo de los recursos naturales a nivel mundial, es indispensable que el proceso de la liberalización del comercio de los productos agrícolas sea acompañado por un programa definido y coherente de inversiones y asistencia técnica, porque sin una diversificación agropecuaria y desarrollo de sistemas de agro-negocios para que los agricultores puedan aprovechar directamente de las ventajas de esta liberalización comercial, este proceso no tendrá beneficios para los países como Bolivia.

**Pinit KORSIEPORN (Thailand)**

As a food-exporting developing country, my delegation fully supports the statement made by Brazil especially on the elimination of trade-distorting matters. My delegation also agrees with the recommendation made by the Committee as stated in paragraph 20 of the Report. The Secretariat of CCP should conduct the analysis of trends in the composition and direction of agricultural exports, as major factors underlying their movements are welcome.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

I wish to commend the Secretariat for the Report that has been submitted to us and for the manner in which it is articulated on most of the issues that we discussed as Members in the last session of the Committee and Commodity problems.

I associate myself with some of the comments that have been made by previous speakers on the issue of the effect of trade-distortion measures and subsidies on agriculture. The Africa Group concurs with the observation that is in the Report already, that production support export subsidies by developed countries combined with high protective barriers are the main cause of low and variable prices in certain international markets. That certain regions are looking at reviewing their subsidy regime is welcome to us, but we feel that the approach is not going far enough to attack the real problem because it is as if we are just shifting subsidies from one group to another. What the Report is calling for, however, is for a thorough review to make sure that the subsidy regime does not continue to negatively affect international trade. We appeal for the removal of direct subsidies by developed countries to their agricultural sectors and to enable our products to enter their markets. High tariffs imposed also make products from our continent fail to penetrate their markets.

With respect to genetically-modified organisms, the regions reiterate their call on FAO to assist in capacity-building to assess the impact and development of regulator systems regarding biotechnologies. The SADC region has established a Sub-Committee to assess the effects of GMOs because in the past year, you all realized we were under drought and found ourselves using GMO products, so we needed to know about them. FAO technical assistance is welcome to enable us to implement informed policies by Member Nations. The Africa Group commends the FAO medium-term projections, but failure to assist Member Nations to combat menaces like HIV/AIDS would greatly compromise the outcome of these projections, and we would urge that due consideration be given to this problem.

The region heavily depends on the export of raw agricultural commodities to encourage high return, for our products and to ensure food security for Member Nations. We reiterate our call for FAO technical assistance and value addition and technologies. To this end, we would like to urge FAO to assist us to develop agro-industries in our economies. The pilot projects that have been carried out in a few countries have borne fruit and we feel that they are now ready for application in other countries. We would like that the lessons learned to benefit the rest of the continent regarding food security at family level and participation in commercial agricultural trade.

The internationally-recognized food safety and quality standards at times are too stringent for the low-income countries and we have registered our concern and that we would require capacity-building to enable the poor farmers to participate in agricultural trade. We look with hope when we see these issues being tackled in the normative functions of FAO and we hope that TCP projects that would help the implementation would then be adequately provided for in resource terms. The need to strengthen domestic and regional institutions to give the required technical assistance needs to be underscored in this Report. This will help the development of regional markets and also enhance the participation of farmers in international markets.

While we have endorsed this Report, our concern is that the needs of the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, Small Island States and Landlocked States have not been fully articulated in the recommendations. For instance, we all know that Landlocked States have got higher expenses in trade terms, in terms of tariffs and transport, and we feel that these concerns should be adequately reflected in our reporting.

## LE PRÉSIDENT

La liste étant épuisée, je vous remercie de votre contribution à ce débat. Monsieur de Haen, souhaitez-vous répondre aux questions soulevées au cours des débats et présenter ces conclusions au Conseil?

### Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)

I wish to express the thanks of the Secretariat for the many comments and suggestions made. Before addressing some of them I would like to correct an omission from my introduction, that is, that I want to remind the Council that to my right is Mr David Hallam, Secretary of the Committee on Commodity Problems who, of course, was very instrumental in helping and facilitating the conduct of that Committee. If it was considered to have been successful, I think that merits go very much also to his role in it.

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you the new Director of the Commodity and Trades Divisions who was not yet present at the time of the Committee on Commodity Problems, who is seated here on the podium, Mr Alexander Sarris, who you will get to know in the course of the next month or years, I hope. There have not been many questions, if any, but a number of suggestions and we have taken due note of them. You have highlighted a number of areas in which you requested the Secretariat to continue its analyses, and I would not list them in detail, but I have noted that the impact on food security was mentioned by many of you, as was the study of winners and losers. I want to assure especially the United States of America that, as far as the Secretariat is conducting such analyses of winners and losers, we would certainly continue in our efforts to be as objective and as impartial, neutral and science-based as we can be in this regard. There is often a lack of completeness and data and documentation and these assessments of winners and losers and impacts requires certain assumptions in our quantitative measurement, but please rest assured that the Secretariat will do this in the most objective way possible.

I have noted the several request for more analysis on value-added production and on processing agriculture commodities for which many of the developing countries have an under-exploited potential. This potential is not fully developed due to various factors, domestic constraints as well as tariff escalation in the importing countries and the Secretariat will certainly take your guidance very seriously and intensify work in this regard. This will also be the case for the particular impact of trade and trade policies on the situations of Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Countries and Small Island Developing States.

I use this occasion to draw your attention to an information document, of which I do not have the specific number in this very moment, that reports about recent developments and work of the Organization of these three groups of countries, Least Developed, Landlocked and Small Island Developing States, and also in fulfilment of certain commitments that the Member Nations have accepted in regard to this group of countries and programmes developed elsewhere. It is the document CL 124/INF/19 entitled, "Approach and Activities of FAO in support of Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Countries and Small Island Developing States." The Secretariat has made at least some effort to give you a rather complete report about recent activities, and I draw this to your attention because it is not on the agenda for your discussion.

We have noted many references to the need for further capacity-building by the Secretariat with regard to the various WHO Agreements, the Agreement of Agriculture but also the SPS and TBT Agreements dealing with Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards. I can assure you that we have taken due note, and will continue our efforts.

With regard to the capacity-building in helping countries assess the role of the benefits or risks, if any, of GMOs or foods derived from biotechnology, we have noted that several of you requested the Secretariat to intensify capacity-building efforts in this regard. I would take this opportunity to draw your attention to next week's session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission which has on its agenda the report of the *Ad Hoc* Group on Foods Derived from Biotechnology. Personally I hope that if you find a consensus there, you may go a long way in harmonizing the risk assessment methodologies that are being applied in Member Nations.

Finally, with regard to the Secretariat efforts to respond to the request by several members with regard to the TCP and COAG to proposed options for intensification or improvement of participation of members in the sessions of CCP and options for the combinations of COAG and CCP. I reconfirm that the two Secretaries of COAG and CCP are currently developing various options and what I did not say and confirm now is that once a draft paper is ready the two Secretaries intend also to consult the representatives of Regional Groups and of countries who expressed an interest here to seek their views before finalizing that paper for the Programme Committee.

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Sans vouloir introduire l'allemand comme langue officielle de la FAO, je voudrais dire *danke schön* à Monsieur de Haen.

#### **6. Report of the 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Agriculture (Rome, 31 March-4 April 2003) (CL 124/9)**

#### **6. Rapport de la dix-septième session du Comité de l'agriculture (Rome, 31 mars - 4 avril 2003) (CL 124/9)**

#### **6. Informe del 17º período de sesiones del Comité de Agricultura (Roma, 31 de marzo-4 de abril de 2003) (CL 124/9)**

#### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous avons terminé le point 4 de l'Ordre du jour et nous passons au point 6. Le point 6 de l'Ordre du jour concerne le rapport de la dix-septième session du Comité de l'agriculture qui s'est tenue à Rome du 31 mars au 4 avril 2003. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/9. Je vous prie de noter qu'une liste des questions soumises à l'attention du Conseil est fournie au début du document. J'invite Monsieur Costa Ricky Mahalu, Président du Comité de l'agriculture, à présenter le rapport.

#### **Costa Ricky MAHALU (Chairman, Committee on Agriculture)**

I am very pleased to present to the Council the Report of the Seventeenth Session of the Committee on Agriculture, which you have before you as document CL 124/9. It was an honour for me to have been elected to chair this Session, which took place here in Rome just three months ago, from 31 March to 4 April.

The Session had a full agenda in Plenary and was supplemented by seven Side Events on related topics. The Committee reviewed and provided guidance on the Programme of Work of FAO in the food and agricultural sector and on five selected international development issues of an interdisciplinary nature. The Side Events, which were well attended, along with the informative displays in the Atrium, offered a welcome opportunity for delegates and stakeholders to interact in a less formal setting, and the Committee encouraged FAO to continue with this practice.

Throughout our deliberations, members stressed the importance of FAO's work in agricultural production and support systems, food and agricultural policy development, and contributions to sustainable development, and emphasized the need for action through capacity-building and partnerships.

The matters requiring attention are summarized in the front section of the Report and I will take this opportunity to draw your attention to the main conclusions and recommendations of the Committee. I am pleased to note that several of the recommendations have already informed the deliberations of the Eighty-ninth session of the Programme Committee last month and our discussion of the Summary Programme of Work and Budget this Session of the Council. In its review of FAO's Programme of Work in food and agriculture, the Committee noted the increasing demands for FAO's services in this sector and called for a more active role by the Secretariat in guiding the Membership in setting priorities.

As already highlighted by several delegations in the Council, the Committee called for full funding of the IPPC and the full implementation of the recommendation of the Codex evaluation.

It also noted the important role of FAO in responding to emergencies, and called upon the Secretariat to examine closely the linkages between rehabilitation and development. While generally supporting FAO's endeavours to address a food chain approach to food safety, the Committee, after a lively debate, requested that the draft framework document be revised and further improved for consideration at the next COAG Session. Guidance was also provided on how the Secretariat's initial work on a Good Agricultural Practices approach should be continued within existing programmes, focusing on the needs of developing countries and request a Report back to our next Session under the standing item on SARD.

Following on recommendations at its previous session, the Committee was informed of the consultation process that had taken place on bio-security in food and agriculture. It recognized the need for a common approach to capacity-building among various sectors involved in bio-security at national level, based on the work of the relevant standard-setting bodies. The Committee endorsed the concept and further work on the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health, in cooperation with the relevant international organizations, and requested a Report on use, resource needs, costs and usefulness of the Portal at our next session.

The Committee agreed that FAO should continue to support the development of sustainable rural livelihoods and request FAO to identify and document specific examples where application of the rural livelihoods' approach had led to success in reducing rural poverty. It also endorsed the proposal that FAO intensify efforts, within existing resources, to transfer environment information systems and decision-support tools to developing countries, to work toward formalizing its cooperation with other regional global data institutions, and to strengthen partnerships between data providers and data users at the national and international levels.

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to two issues discussed in the session under "Other Matters" that will need the attention of Council.

Firstly, it was agreed that members would meet as soon as possible to review the Report of the Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation on Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. I have been informed that the Director-General has initiated action to convene a Special Session of COAG on this matter in early 2004.

Secondly, the Committee requested the Secretariat to examine the possibility of combining meetings of COAG and CCP in order to achieve efficiency saving and improved participation, and to prepare a paper on alternative arrangements for the Programme and Finance Committees and Council later this year.

These are the main highlights of our recent meeting. I commend you on the Report of the Seventeenth Session of COAG, and look forward to the debate on its conclusions and recommendations.

#### **Jugdish BUNDHOO (Mauritius)**

Mauritius endorses the Report of the Committee on Agriculture. With regard to the Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation, we are very happy to learn that the COAG meeting will be held early next in 2004. We would also like to refer Council to the Report of the Twenty-ninth Session of the Committee on World Food Security, held in May 2003, where several Members had referred to the recent launch of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Report on Diet, Nutrition and Prevention of Chronic Disease, and welcome the announcement made by the FAO Director-General, that the Report together with the Secretariat proposed follow-up would be reviewed by a Special Session of the Committee of Agriculture as soon as possible. Once again we are very happy to learn that the COAG Session will be held very early next year in 2004.

We would like to express our deep appreciation and commend the need to combat the epidemic of obesity and its impact on non-communicable diseases with WHO. While we realize that the content of the Report is not on the agenda of Council for detailed discussion, we would like to take this opportunity to comment on the issues, which are of major and direct concern to Mauritius and many other countries.



Firstly, the Report has aroused considerable disagreement on the science-based evidence of the Report from several quarters of the sugar industry. We believe that the time is not for confrontation but rather for consultation. We think that the science-based evidence of the Report needs to be reviewed and clarified in order to reaching a common understanding.

Secondly, from the sugar industry perspective, we know fully well that there is no evidence that sugar in itself does not lead to non-communicable diseases. It is a well-known fact that obesity is a question of energy imbalance. When energy input is higher than energy utilized, it will result in obesity and subsequently to non-communicable diseases.

Therefore, the issue is a question of health education. The strategy should be to get the population to try and balance their energy intake and recognize that physical activity is critical to achieving a healthy lifestyle, especially for people who have sedentary types of jobs. It is also crucial to emphasize that many of the sugar-producing countries are tropical countries and are subjected to climate vagaries. Over the years, sugarcane, which is more common in the tropical countries, has been the most resistant crop to disease and climatic caprices. These climatic caprices include severe drought conditions, tropical cyclones and sometimes very heavy rainfall. These have disastrous consequences for the economies of these countries, in particular, for Small Island Developing States economies. Should WHO use technical reporting as a basis for their global strategy for diet, physical activity and health, it is inevitable that this will have a severe impact on countries where the economy is sugar dependent or heavily dependent on sugar.

Consequently, we emphasized that these issues need to be given consideration and we look forward to the Organization of the Forum as mentioned by the Chair to be held early in the year 2004. We also wish to indicate that as there is a time constraint we count upon your indulgence for the review of the Report before the content is used for a global strategy on diet, nutrition and health. Our main concern is that the report would impact the life of millions of people either directly or indirectly.

**GUO HANDI (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The Chinese delegation, in principle, endorses the Report of the Seventeenth Session of COAG, but would like to elaborate on the following points.

We commend FAO's normative work to protect consumers' interest and public safety in the changing new situation, namely, the food chain approach for food safety and quality and the good practices for agriculture. At the same time, we also hope that FAO will consider the successful experience in the developed and developing countries.

In the developing countries, they are faced with problems of organization and human and material resources. They have problems in adopting new technologies, which must be taken into consideration. Therefore, capacity-building in the developing countries is a key priority for such a framework. We support FAO in promoting this framework and also the good agricultural practice. However, we must be vigilant that we do not change such work into a new obstacle of trade, the so-called "green tariff".

The Chinese delegation believes that poverty, food insecurity and a rural livelihood are interconnected in the agriculture and rural economies. Poverty is the root cause, and we commend FAO for the new way in thinking for solving such problems. We believe agricultural production alone cannot solve these problems. We must find concrete solutions, in agriculture, rural areas and the farms. We must take these into consideration if we are taking an integrated approach which could provide a lasting and effective solution.

**Elías REYES BRAVO (México)**

Mi delegación apoya la aprobación del informe de este Comité y desea solamente agregar algunas cuestiones adicionales las que se hicieron en ocasión del último período de sesiones del COAG.

El tema de informaciones agro-ambiental es de especial interés para el sector agropecuario, por lo que mi delegación expresa el apoyo a las iniciativas para las cuestiones de métodos e instrumentos

analíticos, así como las aplicaciones de información sobre biodiversidad, tierra y agua, sistemas integrales de producción y agricultura orgánica. Asimismo, reiteramos la importancia de que se fomenten las asociaciones para beneficiar de las redes de datos relativos al cambio climático, la desertificación y la biodiversidad. Por otra parte, es indispensable establecer mecanismos de coordinación para la realización de los foros adecuados para la participación de los grupos interesados en los temas de bioseguridad. Considerando importante esta materia, mi delegación reputa fundamental analizar las necesidades institucionales y técnicas para asegurar que se adopten correctas medidas de acción.

Como experiencia propia, mi delegación desea manifestar que mi país, a través del Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias, está realizando proyectos de investigación para el desarrollo de modelos de análisis del riesgo, que permitan evaluar las posibilidades de transmisión de diferentes enfermedades infecciosas. Por otra parte, en el medio pecuario, es cada vez mayor el número de productores, especialmente en las áreas avícola y porcícola, que incluyen en su sistema de producción los principios básicos de la bioseguridad. La posición de México sobre este tema en particular, es de apoyar las políticas internacionales sobre bioseguridad.

**M. Jafar HAFSAH (Indonesia)**

The delegation of Indonesia acknowledges the Report of the Committee concerning Major Policy and Strategy Issues which FAO should take into consideration. Noting the importance of these issues within the old framework, we propose that FAO take a leading role on the initiative of assisting developing countries to respond and actively participate in the WTO negotiations.

With regard to FAO's strategic approach for food safety and quality, Indonesia supports the initiative towards implementing the approach to protect consumers from hazardous food. However, in implementing the strategy, we also need to consider the interest of small-scale producers in developing countries.

We also support the good agricultural practices, to be used as standard farming practices in the future. However, it is necessary to ensure that the implementation of this protocol does not lead to the new kind of no-tariff barriers, particularly for developing countries, in obtaining access to international trade.

The Indonesian delegation acknowledges FAO's Secretariat for preparing a comprehensive Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, which we support and are willing to participate, in particular, the programme on enhancing the ecological process; strengthening national seed production and security systems; strategy and technology of sustainable crops and production systems; conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources, as well as the use of biotechnology and seed sector development.

In view of the importance of these FAO programmes, we need support and human resources development, to promote methods and standards and implement the programme framework. Consequently, FAO's support for these programmes is highly acknowledged.

**Noah M. NKAMBULE (Swaziland)**

May I, on behalf of my delegation, express our satisfaction as to the efficient manner in which you are conducting this meeting. I wish to commend the FAO Secretariat and the Committee on Agriculture (COAG) for preparing and providing a very good introduction to document CL 124/9.

My delegation is generally in agreement with the observations and recommendations contained in this document. However, may I refer to paragraph 59 which deals with the Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation on Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to FAO through its Director-General for sponsoring this Expert Consultation.

We also wish to say in advance that my delegation fully acknowledges and respects the professional integrity of the experts who undertook this exercise. Having said this, my delegation

wishes to express its serious concern particularly with respect to the recommendations to limit the intake of free sugars from 15 to 20 kilogrammes *per capita* per annum or roughly 6 to 10 percent of daily energy intake.

Our specific concerns relate to the situation and circumstances of my country as follows: Firstly, due to low incomes, sugar is one of the least expensive sources of carbohydrates and energy.

Secondly, sugar has been identified by the Swaziland Government and other stakeholders as a viable vehicle for reducing vitamin A deficiencies in the Swazi population. To that end, a process of investigating the viability of fortifying sugar with vitamin A has begun.

Thirdly, the sugar consumption target would have a negative effect on the sugar industry in Swaziland which would effectively mean curtailing the pace of poverty alleviation amongst the rural population and smallholder sugarcane-producing farmers. This is serious, as due to the relatively large size of the sugar industry in my country, a slowdown in its performance would adversely affect the entire economy of Swaziland.

It is our understanding that this Report is yet to be discussed in detail at COAG level before being brought again to Council. However, my delegation believes that we need to table our concerns prior to the COAG meeting scheduled for early 2004. Otherwise, we generally support this initiative.

**Flavio Célio GOLDMAN (Brazil)**

I ask you to give the floor to the representative of the Dominican Republic who is going to speak on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

Antes de referirme a los dos puntos en nombre de los países del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe sobre el tema que nos ocupa ahora, les ruego me permitan hacer una pequeña clarificación. Los países del GRULAC han recibido una invitación para hoy, 26 de junio a las 12.00 horas en la Sala de Etiopía. Deseo informarles que se trata de una convocatoria de aquellos países de la Región interesados en temas sobre el Fondo Internacional de Desarrollo Agrícola y esto en miras a una reunión a la cual están invitados todos los Miembros de la Organización mañana 27 a las 10.00 horas en la Sala de Filipinas para el tema: *The Structure and Operation of a Performance Based Allocation System for IFAD*. Dicho esto paso al tema en discusión.

El GRULAC estará pendiente de los resultados del examen, que en un período extraordinario de sesiones del Comité de Agricultura se hará, del informe conjunto de expertos de la FAO y la Organización Mundial de la Salud sobre el tema "Dieta, nutrición y prevención de enfermedades crónicas" ya que dicho informe puede significar una repercusión directa en el consumo de azúcares libres y otros productos provocando en consecuencia un impacto en el mercado libre de los mismos. Esos resultados serán presentados a la 125ª Período de Sesiones del Consejo. El GRULAC entiende que esos estudios no deben transformarse en nuevas barreras al comercio.

El GRULAC desea enfatizar la necesidad de financiar de manera efectiva el Codex Alimentarius y la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria para el establecimiento de normas internacionales basadas en la ciencia, además de permitir la plena participación de los países en desarrollo en dichos foros.

**Govindan NAIR (India)**

At the outset, I must compliment the members of the Committee and the Secretariat on the meaningful discussions on the wide-ranging issues that fall within the ambit of the Committee, whose mandate, in our view, defines the very core of FAO. We are conscious that the diversity of problems and variety of interests dictated by geography and other factors require extraordinary efforts to bring consensus on some of the most burning issues concerning the state of world agriculture.

It is not surprising to find that considerable concern was in evidence with regard to inadequate availability of financial resources. Due to this crucial constraint, the manner and extent of involvement of the Organization in dealing and mitigating the rigours of natural disasters needs special consideration. While humanitarian issues should never be far from the agenda of an Organization like FAO, whose prime concern, no doubt, is to prevent deterioration in the quality of life of farmers, a broader perspective is needed to ensure that the long-term goals of FAO are not compromised. With the emergence of a number of agencies, whose mandate is even more directly relevant to the imperatives of crisis management, a *modus vivendi* needs to be worked out in this behalf in FAO.

We had occasion to share our deep concerns about the implications of the draft framework on food chain approach in the context of our system of agriculture wherein out of more than 100 million farmers, 97 percent have holdings of less than 5 hectares. The proposed formulations had very deleterious implications for the smallholder as the economies of traceability clearly works to his disadvantage. We strongly hope that the revised formulations to be brought about before the next Session of the Committee on Agriculture will take adequate cognizance of the existence of the smallholders, which almost exclusively define agriculture in most parts of the developing world.

While we are strongly supportive of FAO's initiatives in the field of rural livelihoods. We urge that given the Organization's *forte* of providing normative guidance as also chronic resource constraints which have unfortunately become a continuing phenomenon, the emphasis should chiefly be on demonstrating working models instead of going in for comprehensive programmes.

For similar reasons we would also strongly urge that the framework for good agricultural practices should primarily be pursued with propagation of success stories tried and tested everywhere. It will suffice to mention here, for instance, that much of our own self-sufficiency in food production is the result of engendering good agricultural practices through schemes and programmes which our resilient farmers have put to such demonstrable effects.

We are sure that the present deliberations as also the proceedings in the next Conference will benefit immensely from the spadework carried out by the Committee in its deliberations.

**James BUTLER (United States of America)**

The United States of America supports the adoption of the COAG Committee Report, but I would like to reiterate comments which were emphasized by the United States of America during the COAG.

Firstly, under the discussion on the Medium Term Plan 2004-2009, the preliminary proposals on the Programme of Work and Budget 2004-2005, we continue to emphasize the importance of FAO using its limited resources efficiently in support of global food security and assisting poor farmers through productivity and incomes.

Secondly, we appreciate FAO's revision of the Programme Implementation Report to provide Members with an improved format based on new result-based programming model which will enable them to better assess performance and understand the linkages between activities and achievements and programme priorities.

Thirdly, we welcome the opportunity to examine the budget proposals in advance of the FAO Council. The United States of America supports a Zero Nominal Growth budget. We recognize that this entails improving efficiency, prioritization of programmes and sun-setting of low priority activities. To that end, the United States of America has insistently suggested ways to accomplish that goal. We have suggested streamlining meetings by holding the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Commodity Programmes back to back. We have suggested that FAO ethics programmes, its meetings, its publications, its priority area of interdisciplinary action are not high priority activities, and that, on inspection, do not advance FAO's Strategic Framework or support agreed conclusions of FAO's standard-setting or policy-making bodies.

On the issue of FAO's strategy for food chain approval and food safety and quality, we still feel that FAO paper significantly enlarges and alters the original CFS request and look forward to a new redraft of the document. We continue to disagree that the ethics and the so-called precautionary principle should be included in the food chain approach. We also strongly believe that any proposed budget allocation for this work needs to be reviewed.

We look forward to the next COAG review of FAO's proposed framework for good agricultural practices. We believe that there are diverse ways to approach good agricultural practices and that a GAP approach should be voluntary, non-regulatory, not imply a global standard and not create new barriers to trade. We support FAO's work on rural livelihoods where FAO has a comparative advantage to foster partnership for greater efficiencies and to collaborate in empowering real communities and individuals to diversify rural incomes, support good government activities and build capacity of small farmers and rural businesses.

Regarding the topic of biosecurity which was raised for a second time at COAG Session, we continue to express concerns about the vague and wide-ranging nature of this agenda item and the definition of biosecurity. The United States of America appreciates the Secretariat's acknowledgement of the United States of America fund International Portal on Food Safety Animal and Plant Health, and look forward to its official launch in early 2004. We believe that Portal will permit authoritative search for current standards-regulations of other relevant materials for a single access point for sanitary and phyto-sanitary information. We are pleased to see it as an information document at the June Codex Commission meeting.

With regard to WHO/FAO study on Diet Nutrition and Prevention of Chronic Diseases, the United States of America believes the best possible scientific and public health evidence should be the cornerstone of the 2004 Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health. We look forward to discussing this topic in early 2004.

Finally, We appreciate the various Side Events, particularly the balanced and positive Biotech Side Event.

**Jorge DE LA CABALLERÍA (European Community)**

I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

The Report from the Seventeenth Session of the Committee on Agriculture held in Rome this April, and reproduced in document CL 124/9 can be endorsed by the European Community and its Member States. In this context we refrain from repeating our comments made at the said Committee which are still valid.

**Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)**

In general, the Philippines endorses the Report of the Seventeenth Committee on Agriculture. We would also like to extend our commendation to the Secretariat for the conduct of seven Side Events. We would encourage the Secretariat to continue this practice because they contribute to an active and meaningful exchange of ideas with various stakeholders.

On a more substantive issue, we would like to reiterate our previous statements on increasing the budgets of the Codex Alimentarius, the International Plant Protection Convention, as well as the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture acting as the Interim Committee for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

There have been some activities that impinge on the work of the Codex, such as the Food Chain Approach for Food Safety and Quality. We do believe that the focus should remain with the Codex. In terms of funding and attention, activities which are potentially burdensome to developing countries should be minimized.

Finally, as a small sugar producer, the Philippines expresses its concern on the Information Note on a joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation, on Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. We are pleased to know that the special COAG Session is being called for this purpose.

**Ms Rahma MSHANGAMA (Tanzania, United Republic of)**

On behalf of my delegation, I wish to express our delight for seeing the Chairman of the Committee of Agriculture presenting this Report. We thank him again for the well-presented report. My delegation would like to comment briefly on two issues.

Firstly, we support the proposal for examining the possibility of combining meetings of COAG and CCP in order to achieve efficiency-savings and improved participation as proposed by Many Members.

Secondly, we strongly recommend that capacity-building at national level should be continued for sustainable agricultural and rural development. In particular, we request GMO-producing countries to declare them, and train and equip our personnel on how to satisfy GMO products for consumer safety and satisfaction.

My delegation would like to endorse this Report.

**Pinit KORSIEPORN (Thailand)**

Thailand did attend the Seventeenth Session of the COAG, and endorsed this Report, I only want, therefore to highlight a few points.

Firstly, on paragraphs 17 and 18, my delegation appeals, once again, for extra-budgetary resources to support the International Year of Rice 2004 and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Secondly, modern biotechnology becomes a daily debate on the benefits and which to human and environment. The implications are enormous, including investment in biotechnology programmes and trade on agricultural biotechnology products. In this connection, FAO should provide advice to Member Nations as early as possible.

Thirdly, it is the policy of our countries, both importing and exporting countries for the need to protect their consumers from eating unsafe foods. Several measures have been implemented in order to ensure the productivities of their food. These measures include food chain approach and TAP approach. These approaches must not create new barriers to trade but be consistent with SPS, WTO agreements.

My last point is on the information note on a Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation on Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases as appears in paragraph 59. My delegation's concern is the recommendation on the level of free sugar intake in this study. The Report must be based on scientific evidence from various institutions. I believe some of the recommendations could have adverse impacts on both agricultural and industrial sectors. It is what was agreed in the COAG Session that Members of the Committee would meet as soon as possible to review this Report.

The Secretariat may provide more information on how soon this meeting will be held. Will the meeting be limited only to Members or include the private sector as well? In our view, other stakeholders should be invited, both from government and the private sector.

**Anton KOHLER (Switzerland)**

The Swiss delegation would like to express its compliments for the way in which Excellency Ambassador Mahalu, was guiding the last COAG Session introducing this agenda item in a concise manner today.

The Swiss delegation would like to make one brief comment and raise one issue with regard to the agenda of the COAG in general.

The COAG meetings are of great interest to us and important discussion fora to define especially the contents of sustainable agricultural practices. Many topics come up which are also vital in defining the way towards achieving better food security. However, some topics being dealt with are often missing continuity. In the last COAG, agenda items like the food chain approach, a good

framework for good agricultural practices and sustainable rural livelihood were very relevant to us all.

Once upon a time, other important items were discussed like peri-urban agriculture and others. Ever since, there has been no follow up on such topics, thus Switzerland's question is the following. How does FAO assure that important items are not lost, and follow-up is assured in succeeding COAG Sessions on items of central importance like the framework for good agricultural practices, sustainable rural livelihood and peri urban agriculture?

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

The Africa Group commend the Report that has been tabled to us by Ambassador Mahalu on the deliberations of the last COAG Session.

We have a few comments to make.

On the linkages with international programmes, such as, the linkage between FAO and WFP, FAO and IFAD, we feel, and we continue to recommend that, FAO programmes should be there to take over from WFP programmes so as to prevent the causes of food insecurity to reappear when the WFP programmes come to an end. You will remember that even in our debate for the budget, we felt that they should be adequately resourced.

We strongly recommend the support of small farmers as articulated in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the COAG Report, and to that extent we endorse the intentions that we agreed to in the meeting.

While we concur with the sentiments that have been raised on Good Agricultural Practices, we feel that this approach would address the goals of sustainable agriculture, but only if its application does not place extra-budgetary demands on Member Nations because most of us cannot afford the extra demands, particularly when it gets down to the poor farmer.

We note the recognition of organic agriculture making a contribution to good agricultural practices. We believe that with technical support, many of our rural producers will be able to buy into this programme.

With respect to paragraphs 43, 44 and 47, we continue to call on FAO for it, following the clear evaluation which was undertaken of the Special Programme for Food Security, to ensure sustainability in these programmes by having them incorporated into the national programmes. If they remain as stand-alone projects, they will lack sustainability and will not benefit from the other support mechanisms that are already built within our national systems.

Livelihoods cannot be separated from agricultural development because, in rural areas, agriculture is the major employer. Therefore, the promotion of economic growth requires the creation of employment opportunities, improvement of product markets and distribution and improvement of product preservation and value addition – issues that we have placed before FAO to help us in developing capacity. In this regard, we also look to our partners to help us in developing agro-industries to benefit the small rural agro-processors.

On agri-environmental information, it is important that FAO should continue to complement country and regional initiatives to improve information access, interpretation, planning and handling any eventualities that may arise.

In Biosecurity in Food and Agriculture, we feel that there is a need to continue to marry FAO initiatives with the existing standard setting bodies, in order for us to harmonize what already exists in biosecurity.

On the Report of the Joint WHO/FAO Expert Consultation, we appreciate the fact that consultations are in progress at WHO and that we will be able to discuss the issue through COAG. We await the evaluation of this Report by WHO. We believe that a report of such major importance to agriculture should be evaluated thoroughly by scientists of varying convictions. We hope that the preliminary Report will not be the basis of phasing most of us from the one and only livelihood we know, simply to satisfy some business considerations. We hope that the issue will

be thoroughly considered and that following any shift that takes place in agriculture, the poor farmers will be adequately assisted to adjust to new forms of livelihoods.

Regarding the Food Chain Approach, we feel that we should fully explore the needs of the producers; otherwise it will block farmers from participating. Therefore, we hope that in the process rural farmers will be adequately empowered to participate, otherwise they will not benefit from this initiative.

Because of the complementarity of issues, in COAG and CCP, we are convinced that if we find a way of combining their work, we will make some savings in the process. So with that, we endorse the recommendations in the Report, document CL 124/9.

### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Comme il m'a été signalé que la traduction ne passait pas à tous les Membres du Conseil, j'ai fait cette interruption et je vous prie de m'en excuser.

Je voudrais faire une deuxième remarque. Nous avons la traduction assurée jusqu'à 12 h 45 au maximum. La Présidence vous serait donc très reconnaissante de bien vouloir faire des interventions aussi brèves que possible afin de terminer l'ordre du jour prévu pour ce matin.

La délégation du Japon a demandé la parole.

### **Michihiro TAMURA (Japan)**

First of all, my delegation is pleased to endorse the document CL 124/9, Report of the Seventeenth session of the Committee on Agriculture.

I would like to make some comments on new initiatives of a Food Chain Approach and a Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) approach, which my delegation supports.

Concerning the Food Chain Approach, my delegation would like to stress the importance that food safety be ensured at every stage. Related to this notion, the Food Safety Basic Law was enacted in Japan in May 2003. In the law respective responsibilities concerning food safety for the national government, local governments, food industry and consumers were clearly described and also the basic policies concerning food safety were established. In this regard, my delegation expects that FAO continue preparatory activities and that the strategy will be formulated in order for developing countries to adopt the strategy and apply it in practice to ensure food safety without unnecessary burden.

As regard to Good Agriculture Practice, my delegation believes that the GAP approach is highly valuable for the purpose of sustainable agriculture and rural development. In particular, my delegation would like to refer to the importance of paragraph 38. Needless to say, there are various types of agriculture in various areas. Accordingly, in order for the GAP approach to contribute to the development of developing countries, GAPs will have to be formulated that are conducive to such various types of agriculture.

Furthermore, my delegation believes that priority should be placed on poor small-scale farmers in developing countries.

I would also like to touch upon the International Year of Rice 2004. My delegation would like to thank FAO for its preparatory activities for the International Year of Rice, including the preparation of the roadmap, its beautiful logo and appealing slogan "Rice is Life". Needless to say, rice is the staple food in Japan and we expect that the International Year of Rice will attract broad support from various sectors in Japan. Therefore, in order to prepare for, and promote, the International Year of Rice, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries established a Task Force in which a Vice-Minister is acting as chief and is planning various events using existing budgets to celebrate the International Year of Rice, such as Symposia, Seminars and commemorative stamps. At the same time, the Ministry has started dialogues with the private sector to disseminate and promote the International Year of Rice. Some private sector companies expressed their interest in the International Year of Rice and in using the logo in their material,



such as flyers. In addition, we expect that the National Committee will be established through the private sector's initiative by the end of this year.

We believe that in order to commemorate the year with the utmost global success, concerted activities in Member Nations will be highly important. In this regard, we would like to ask FAO to provide Member Nations with updates of its preparatory activities and, if feasible, a brief summary of arrangements in Member Nations that actively support the International Year of Rice.

Finally, but not least, I would like to convey our sincere gratitude for the valuable effort and cooperation of the Director-General, Assistant Director-General and other FAO staff in coorganizing the Ministerial Meeting on Water for Food and Agriculture with our Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries on the occasion of the Third World Water Forum held in Japan in March 2003. More than 40 Ministers and officials responsible for water for food and agriculture gathered from around the globe. At the meeting, the Ministerial recommendation was successfully adopted which consisted of 16 recommendations related to the three challenges, namely, food security and poverty alleviation, sustainable water use and the partnership. The recommendation was submitted to the World Water Forum as an input from the meeting.

Regarding this, as a follow-up of the outcome of the meeting, the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries proposed a formulation of an international consortium whose primary objective is to promote research activities and experience exchanges, mainly concerning irrigation systems of paddy fields. Our Ministry is now undertaking preparatory activities to launch it in mid-2004. While details of the consortium are still under consideration, we hope that the consortium will have a broader participation, including that of NGOs.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

I am speaking on behalf of countries acceding the European Community represented at this meeting, namely Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

We are pleased to express our association with the endorsement of the Secretariat's report, as expressed in the statement by the European Commission speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia supports the adoption of this Report. We would, however, like to make a few brief comments.

We particularly welcome the strong endorsement of COAG on funding of IPPC and the Codex Alimentarius, which we think appropriately, reflects the highest importance attached to these bodies by the Members.

We also support the conclusions and guidance on Food Chain Approach and the recommendation to review the development of GAP be undertaken based on the guidance provided by COAG.

While Australia is supportive of some of the ideas in these two areas of work, we considered that the conclusions of COAG reflected the significant concerns that Members had with these proposals. It will, therefore, be critical that COAG's guidance is adhered to in the further development of this work, if we are to see these areas of work meaningfully progressed.

We would also wish to reiterate our earlier comments. We consider FAO should be focussing on what it currently does and what Members have already identified as the highest priorities first, before embarking on the application of scarce resources to new and divisive proposals.

Finally, we would wish to endorse the United States earlier comments on food chain and ethics work.

**Majid DEGHANSHOAR (Iran, Islamic Republic of)**

I should like to express the appreciation of the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran and thanks to the COAG for producing a very transparent and excellent paper.

However, we have some recommendations on these issues. Other many important issues can be seen in the paper, particularly food safety issues with agriculture practice and others. However, a few important issues should also be clearly looked at in the Report, particularly in the programme.

All Member Nations know about losses, pre- and post-harvest losses. If we are going to reduce the number of hungry people by half, we should not evaluate our programme and progress in the issue of losses. The database of FAO and other organizations show an approximate 20 to 30 percent of their produce -- in some countries more even more -- is lost because of technology. Where are the technologies? The assistance to the countries is not just money, another aid is technology. Capacity building in agro-industry is one of the things we should look at very very carefully.

Attempts by FAO to impose full use of the synergies, among the relevant organizations, particularly, the other United Nations Agencies, for capacity-building in agro-industry so to gain a real added-value for the producer, particularly those small landholders, is requested.

Secondly, seed and planting material are the base for sustainable agriculture development. As the Member Nations of the Near East Region at the last Regional Conference in Tehran requested and emphasized the need for capacity-building on seed and planting, particularly for cultivar registration seed and planting material certification. We would like to see the programme looking at these two issues, to arrive at sustainable agriculture development. All the proposals in the paper are excellent and we should work together. However, I believe the items I have mentioned are the basic needs. We wish to see this important issue in the programme, and I should like to mention that the the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran agrees with the whole paper.

**Sra. Delia RODRÍGUEZ PARRA (Cuba)**

Mi delegación agradece al COAG el informe presentado y, como país productor de azúcar, queremos apoyar la declaración que realizara el Representante de la República Dominicana a nombre del Grupo de Países de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Mohamed Mahmoud El Hanan EL HASSAN (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)**

The delegation of Sudan is in favour of adopting this excellent Report from the Committee on Agriculture, and we would like the Secretariat to implement the various proposals that feature therein.

We are very concerned by something which has appeared in one of the WHO reports: the question of the link between sugar and chronic diseases. Now, this is something which will have catastrophic repercussions on the state of health of millions of people, particularly in developing countries and in least developed countries. Sugar is the cheapest source of energy for our populations and, in Sudan, sugar is the driving force behind the service economy production and distribution of sugar, is one of the main sources of income for financing all our activities, education, health, etc.

All agricultural production, if consumed to excess, can have severe repercussions on health.

We would like to have awareness raised in our country about this and other products, and this is why we have to ensure that awareness raising campaigns on sugar consumption are put in place when raising campaigns on sugar and other alternative products. That is the role of the World Health Organization. Sugar is not a danger *per se*. Obviously, we do not want that to be the case. This is why we need cooperation and better information on the possible repercussions of over-consumption of sugar.

That being said, obviously any input is useful to ensure that systems work. Sugar is a driving force for the economy. We can not do without it. But nonetheless, if we use too much of it, we would create an imbalance in energy intake, and that is problematic. We have to know how much to consume and how much to avoid.

We are a country that has great capability. We have land, water, sunshine and manpower and, despite all this potential, we have chronic poverty in our country. During the first three days, we have felt your support and we have heard of your worthy intentions that will help us in our fight against poverty and hunger.

Today, however, we feel that our main production is threatened.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

La liste des orateurs étant épuisée, je vous remercie de votre contribution aux débats. Monsieur Costa Ricky Mahalu répondra aux questions qui ont été posées au cours des débats et nous fera part de ses commentaires. Monsieur Mahalu vous avez la parole.

**Costa Ricky MAHALU (Chairman, Committee on Agriculture)**

I would like to thank the Members for their quiet and reaching contributions. Most of the interventions have been in the form of very useful comments. However, with your permission, allow me to extend the floor to Mr de Haen, Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department, to respond to issues that the Secretariat might wish to clarify.

**Hartwig de HAEN (Assistant Director-General, Economic and Social Department)**

I would like to thank the Council Members for the comments made on the part of the overall programme that was discussed by the Committee on Agriculture for which my Department is responsible, which is the Major Programme 2.2, Food and Agriculture Policy and Development. We have noted your comments regarding areas that we should strengthen and areas that we should perhaps reconsider and we have, in particular, noted those remarks that refer to the framework document on food safety within a Food Chain Approach. We are working, as advised by COAG, on a revision and proposing a reduced budget allocation in the next Programme of Work and Budget that is devoted to this work.

I will not go into detail regarding the expert's report on Diet Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. I think it is enough to repeat that we are planning to discuss these matters in a Special Session of COAG early next year.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Avant de donner la parole à Madame Fresco, il y a encore la délégation de l'International Federation of Agricultural Producers qui a demandé la parole. Je m'excuse de ne pas la lui avoir pu donné avant.

**Nils FARNET (International Federation of Agricultural Producers)**

I speak of behalf of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers. We are a Federation of 500 million farming families in the World. I shall be very brief. We will be more eloquent at the Session where the review of COAG is discussed.

My main message now is that the Report 916 so much discussed is not only hurting the sugar farmers, it is hurting many, many more farmers by the unfriendly remarks against such products, take meat, fats and oils and, even in some respects, rice. It will of course, hurt farmers all over the world. The distinguished delegate from Mexico said that the Report holds up food production in the developing countries. That is also our main concern. The distinguished delegate from Zimbabwe later indicated about having food on the table for the hungry. In our opinion, the Report 916 does not help them.

I will only raise another point. To understand the Report, one must take into account that it is written as it stands for the developed countries, for the rich countries. It does not take into account undernourished people. Undernourishment also causes severe chronic diseases.

When one reads the Report, one gets the impression that everybody in the world has a great choice of products, to choose from all sorts of products. But for those almost one million undernourished people and perhaps 2.5 million without necessary intake of vitamin and minerals, there is no choice. They have to take what is on the table in order to survive.

In summing up, we have the impression and the feeling that this Report will be very harmful, especially, to the poor farmers in the World. Our Federation received considerable assistance from FAO and we are willing to collaborate in all respects possible. But when there is a question which will harm our members, we have to speak up.

I hope you understand that.

**Ms Louise O. FRESCO (Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department)**

Let me first thank you for the very rich discussion and the comments you have made on the various items related to COAG. Rest assured that even if we do not reply in detail, we will certainly take account of them in our further preparations for future meetings.

There are two specific items on which I would like to react. One is the International Year of Rice and the other one is the specific comments made by Switzerland with respect to the continuity of the subjects tabled at COAG.

Maybe to take that last point first. I think there are various follow-up mechanisms that the COAG Members themselves might consider and that the Secretariat is promoting in its work and in proposing the Agenda to you. First of all, you will have noted that we are reporting back to you on various subjects that were on the table in previous meetings. For example, there are also some specific mechanisms that you yourself have requested, where we are supposed to report even with a great regularity, sometimes at every meeting. This is, for example, the case of the work we do on sustainable agriculture and rural development. Therefore, there is large number of information papers that in fact takes up the points of the previous meetings.

Then, of course, there is the Programme of Work and Budget where you will see how we have translated your recommendations in specific allocations to programme entities and that should give you a sense of the continuity, as we see it in our daily work.

We also, of course, have the possibility to raise some of the issues you have discussed at various other meetings at which the Secretariat is involved. Particularly, of course, the meetings coming out of the Johannesburg Summit and various other fora on agriculture. You are informed in various ways, not just through COAG, of our activities there.

Last but not least, of course, the Members have the possibility of asking the Secretariat for specific subjects and specific items, certainly when it comes to these cross-cutting subjects that I know you have a great interest in and the Secretariat is, of course, also very actively promoting.

If the COAG Members would, at one stage, have a specific request for one of these cross-cutting areas or, on the contrary, sub-sectorial areas related in particular to crops or animals or other sub-sectors that you see, we would of course be very happy to consider those as part of our proposal to you of the Agenda.

I hope that satisfies your concerns. We are very much aware that the subject of agriculture and rural development has been around for a long time, and that sometimes subjects come back even if they have new headings and new names.

I think it was at least 35 years ago that we all had a very famous book on our desks called "Getting Agriculture Moving". We are still in that process, as you have noticed.

With respect to the International Year of Rice, you are probably aware that we have created an informal Committee for the preparations of this year. It now looks as if some launching event will take place towards the end of the year in New York. As you will recall, this was a decision of the General Assembly. We have an informal group of an International Planning Committee that is working on a very large and comprehensive set of proposals, both at an international level and at the national level in bilateral contacts with a large number of countries. As Japan rightly mentioned, we have been discussing this specifically with some of the large rice producers.

We will be putting all our proposals on the Web, and we can certainly make sure that whatever is known on activities at the national level be communicated to the Membership of FAO so that we

can make sure there is sufficient coordination and sufficient possibility of exchange. We are currently finalizing various information materials that will come to you in due course. If you have any specific requests on support for the International Year of Rice, we will be very happy to do all that is within our means. There is already a Communication Plan. We have been working with the UN in New York and elsewhere to do that.

Lastly, I would like to mention that the International Year of Rice is an Agenda Item to be discussed at the FAO Conference. Therefore, you will have a chance to review the preparations when the Conference meets later this year.

**John MONYO (Assistant Director-General, Sustainable Development Department)**

I would just like to say that we appreciate and are grateful for the comments made by many delegations on the activities on rural livelihoods. We are also taking note of the cautionary remarks made and comments on the links between rural livelihoods, poverty and agriculture. These are inter-connected issues and these were, in fact, mentioned and highlighted in the paper which was presented to COAG. We will take them into account.

I would also like to add that we are moving fast and steadily in following up on the recommendations of COAG, for instance, in trying to identify and document the impact of the sustainable rural livelihoods approach. On the issues relating to agri-environment information, we are already working fast and moving to collaborate with other international and national institutions involved in this area. There is also a major Summit coming up later in July at which FAO will be represented at a high level.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Ceci conclut le point 6 de l'Ordre du jour de notre matinée de travail mais avant de lever la session, j'ai une annonce à faire: nous reprendrons nos travaux à 14 h 30 précise. La séance est levée.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 hours*

*La séance est levée à 12 h 45*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas*



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 - 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING HUITIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE OCTAVA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>26 June 2003</b>

The Eighth Plenary Meeting was opened at 16.45 hours  
Mr Aziz Mekouar,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La huitième séance plénière est ouverte à 16 h 45  
sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,  
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la octava sesión plenaria a las 16.45 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Je suis désolé du retard et de vous avoir fait attendre, mais nous étions en train de négocier pour que cette session du Conseil se termine très vite.

Nous allons aborder cet après-midi la huitième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil et nous allons d'abord examiner le point 3 de l'ordre du jour: Rapport de la vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches, qui fait l'objet des documents CL 124/7 et CL 124/7-Add.1. La vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches, qui s'est tenue à Rome du 24 au 28 février 2003, a réuni cent vingt-quatre États représentés par 516 délégués, dont huit ministres et 22 directeurs généraux des pêches. L'importance des thèmes traités, et les résultats obtenus par le Comité lors de sa vingt-cinquième session, ont confirmé son rôle de forum technique mondial au sein duquel sont définies les grandes politiques internationales relatives à la pêche et à l'aquaculture. Le Comité, une fois de plus, a joué son rôle d'organe permettant l'évaluation des pêches au niveau mondial, l'identification des lacunes, les problèmes et défis, la recherche de solutions et la promotion de la collaboration entre les différents acteurs du secteur des pêches.

J'attire votre attention sur la liste des questions soumises à l'attention du Conseil qui se trouve au début du rapport du Comité, document CL 124/7. J'invite Monsieur Nomura, Sous-Directeur général, chargé du Département des pêches, à présenter le rapport du Comité. Monsieur Nomura vous avez la parole.

**3. Report of the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Fisheries (Rome, 24-28 February 2003)**  
(CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)

**3. Rapport de la vingt-cinquième session du Comité des pêches (Rome, 24-28 février 2003)**  
(CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)

**3. Informe del 25º período de sesiones del Comité de Pesca (Roma, 24-28 de febrero de 2003)**  
(CL 124/7; CL 124/7-Add.1)

### **Ichiro NOMURA (Assistant Director-General, Fisheries Department)**

The Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries was chaired by Mr Jérónimo Ramos Saenz Pardo (Comisión Nacional de Pesca y Acuicultura, Mexico) and Mr Glenn Hurry was elected First Vice-Chairperson. The Session reviewed the Programme of Work of FAO in capture fisheries and aquaculture and undertook an exhaustive appraisal of key issues of an international character in fisheries sector and identified remedial actions.

First, the Committee approved the draft strategy for improving information status and trends of capture fisheries and recommended its further approval by the FAO Council.

Second, it recommended that the Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated, (IUU) Fishing be included in the Agenda of the Thirty-second session of the FAO conference with a view to calling attention to members to this issue.

Third, it agreed that the Director-General of FAO should enter into consultation with the United Nations Secretary General with a view to defining practical modalities for the implementation of Part VII Trust Fund to facilitate the implementation of the 1995 UN Fish Talk Agreements. The Council is invited to endorse these actions of the Committee on Fisheries.

The Committee also recommended that monitoring of the implementation of the strategy for improving information status trends of capture fisheries constitutes an integral component of monitoring the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

The Committee reaffirmed the need for global implementation of measures against IUU Fishing, and recognized the need for international cooperation in making this monitoring system more effective as part of the MCS tool kit, particularly for dealing with a serious and growing problems of IUU Fishing. The Committee urged FAO to accelerate its work in relation to the import of subsidies on fisheries resource sustainability and sustainable development.



With regard to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, the Committee recognized the crucial importance of the Code of Conduct and its related international plans of action in promoting long-term sustainable development of fisheries and encouraged members to establish and implement national plans of action to put into effect the international plans of action on capacity, IUU Fishing, sharks and seabirds.

It noted with concern the relative stagnation of funding for Fisheries and requested the Organization to consider the feasibility of increasing its budget allocation to this important major programme from FAO Regular Programme sources.

The Committee welcomes the decision of the Government of Mexico to provide additional financial resources to the Trust Fund that has been set up to help FAO award the Margarita Lizárraga Medal in this respect. I wish to express the gratitude of FAO to the Government of Mexico which has already made a contribution to the Trust Fund. I take this opportunity to reiterate the call by the Delegation of Mexico at the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI that all Member Governments of FAO should join this initiative and thus provide additional funds to this Trust Fund.

Concerning aquaculture and small-scale fisheries, the Committee highlighted the importance of these sectors as a means to increase fisheries production, to generate income and foreign exchange, to alleviate poverty, to increase food security and provide for diversification of employment.

It also acknowledged that the expertise of FAO would be crucial in developing science-based standards for the responsible development of aquaculture from culture to the finished product.

The Committee identified key priority areas of work for the FAO's Fisheries Department during the biennium 2004 and 2005, as detailed in paragraph 104 of the Report and the areas of work for its Sub-committee on fish trade and aquaculture.

The Committee agreed to the convening of a number of technical and expert consultations on specific areas of fisheries including review of progress on promoting the implementation of IPOA, IUU, and IPOA capacity on port state measures to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU Fishing, on sea turtles interactions, conservations on subsidies and on CITES related issues for commercially-exploited aquatic species.

FAO has taken concrete steps to ensure these consultations will be held as directed by COFI.

The Council is invited to review the conclusion of the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI and provide guidance to enable FAO to maintain its capacity to carry out the Fisheries Programme.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

Quisieramos que se le de la palabra a la Delegación de la República Dominicana que va a hablar a nombre del Grupo de los Países de América Latina y el Caribe.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

Voy a hacer uso de la palabra en representación del Grupo de los Países de América Latina y el Caribe.

Durante los trabajos del 25° Período de Sesiones del Comité de Pesca, el Grupo de los Países de América Latina y el Caribe señaló que los recursos, en particular aquellos destinados a proyectos de desarrollo y de generación de alimentos, requerirían una distribución equitativa para atender las necesidades y prioridades de todas las regiones del mundo. Hoy reiteramos la necesidad de fortalecer el apoyo de la comunidad internacional y de la FAO en particular, para promover el desarrollo de una pesca sostenible, teniendo en consideración la importancia de que la Región de América Latina y el Caribe cuente con los recursos necesarios para aplicar efectivamente el Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable y los planes de acción internacional conexos. Solicitamos que se aplique el principio de equidad de asignación de recursos en el programa de mediano plazo de la pesca en particular y de la organización en general.

En el año 2001, mi Grupo Regional sometió a la consideración del COFI una propuesta destinada a que la FAO realice un seguimiento a la supuesta vinculación de la harina de pescado con la Encefalopatía Espongiforme Bovina, tomando en cuenta nuestra preocupación por las restricciones a la comercialización de productos pesqueros que habían impuesto algunos países.

Esta propuesta fue acogida y el informe respectivo fue presentado por la FAO a la reunión del Subcomité de Comercio Pesquero que se realizó en Bremen, en febrero de 2002. En dicha ocasión el mencionado Subcomité expresó: "...refrendo firmemente la opinión técnica e imparcial de la FAO en el sentido de que no hay datos epidemiológicos que demuestren dicha supuesta vinculación ...". Al mismo tiempo, se solicitó a la FAO que siguiera informando periódicamente a los Estados Miembros sobre este asunto.

En esa misma reunión, tal como consta en el párrafo 45 del respectivo informe, la Comisión Europea reiteró su posición de que esta prohibición era temporal y que la situación sería evaluada desde dos puntos de vista: a) la aprobación de un proyecto de reglamento comunitario en el que se establecen normas sanitarias aplicables a subproductos animales no destinados al consumo humano; y, b) la elaboración de un método que permita detectar la presencia de harinas de carnes y huesos de mamíferos en piensos para rumiantes, incluida la presencia de harina de pescado en esos mismos piensos.

La primera condición se ha cumplido. La Comisión Europea aprobó el 3 de octubre de 2002 el Reglamento 1774/2002, estableciendo una serie de requisitos para la captura, procesamiento y transporte de la harina de pescado a la Unión Europea. Como lo hemos demostrado en los foros pertinentes, los países de nuestra región cumplen con los mismos.

Con relación a la segunda condición, el Laboratorio Rikilt, Instituto para la Seguridad Alimentaria de los Países Bajos, ha presentado hace unos meses un examen que permite detectar la eventual contaminación de piensos hasta un límite de 0,1 por ciento, es decir un kilogramo en una tonelada métrica. Su certeza deja de lado cualquier interés económico en contaminar harinas limpias con productos prohibidos en el territorio europeo. Este método científico es de conocimiento de la Comisión Europea y de la FAO.

Sabemos que los órganos técnicos y políticos de la Comisión Europea, vienen evaluando en estos días esta injusta situación y aspiramos a que se eliminen las restricciones a un producto como la harina de pescado que es comprobadamente inocuo. Nos constan las buenas intenciones de la Comisión Europea las cuales quedaron, además, reflejadas en el informe del último COFI cuando anunciaron buenas noticias para el 1 de mayo que concretamente, aún no llegan. En ese marco, reiteramos nuestra preocupación por el uso indiscriminado del principio de precaución sin base científica, el cual, en este caso, tiene un efecto directo en el libre comercio de los productos pesqueros y particularmente en las economías de los países latinoamericanos exportadores de harina de pescado.

Finalmente, el GRULAC considera muy apropiado y apoya firmemente la decisión del 25º Período de Sesiones del Comité de Pesca con el fin de que se incluya nuevamente el tema de la supuesta vinculación de la harina de pescado a la EEB en la agenda de la próxima reunión del Subcomité sobre Comercio Pesquero que se realizará en febrero del 2004, ocasión en la cual la FAO deberá presentar un informe actualizado sobre esta materia. En tal sentido, solicitamos que lo anterior quede también registrado en el informe final de esta reunión.

**Mme Clémentine ANANGA MESSINA (Cameroun)**

Une fois de plus, je saisis cette occasion pour exprimer toute la satisfaction de la délégation camerounaise au Secrétariat pour la qualité du rapport présenté, l'analyse qu'il contient, ainsi que les stratégies proposées. Nous vous présentons également nos félicitations pour la manière dont vous présidez ces séances.

Il ne fait aucun doute que, surtout pour nos pays, de bonnes statistiques sur les pêches revêtent une importance capitale pour l'élaboration de politiques efficaces et la gestion des pêches et qu'elles sont également essentielles à la mise en application du Code de conduite pour une pêche

responsable, d'où leur caractère hautement prioritaire pour nous. A cet égard le Cameroun appuie le projet de stratégies visant à améliorer l'information sur la situation et les tendances des pêches de capture. Par ailleurs, le Code de conduite pour une pêche responsable et les plans d'action internationaux connexes jouent un rôle crucial dans la promotion d'un développement durable à long terme des pêches et de l'aquaculture commerciale, surtout dans les pays comme les nôtres qui disposent d'un potentiel important pas encore suffisamment exploité. C'est pourquoi le Cameroun approuve la stratégie sur la Pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée.

Je voudrais donc réaffirmer l'adhésion de mon pays aux principes énoncés dans le Code de conduite pour une pêche responsable et les plans d'action internationaux connexes. Nous pensons que la communauté internationale devrait coopérer pour son application effective ainsi pour que la mise en œuvre des plans d'action internationaux.

Pour finir, nous lançons un appel pressant pour qu'une attention accrue soit accordée à la pêche artisanale et à sa contribution à la sécurité alimentaire et à la réduction de la pauvreté au sein des communautés rurales.

**Rafael TOVAR Y DE TERESA (México)**

Aprecio el excelente informe escrito y la presentación realizada esta tarde sobre este importante tema de nuestro Consejo. Apoyo la declaración del Presidente del GRULAC.

Deseo expresar asimismo, el agradecimiento de mi Gobierno por el apoyo brindado para que México presidiera los trabajos del 25° Período de Sesiones del COFI, así como reconocer el apoyo brindado por la Secretaría de la FAO al Dr. Gerónimo Ramos y, de manera particular, el trabajo realizado por el Sr. Ichiro Nomura. El COFI se caracteriza por el gran interés y la fuerte participación de sus Estados Miembros. Se ha constituido en un eje fundamental para el diseño de políticas y normas internacionales en la materia. Creo que todos podemos estar ampliamente satisfechos por la labor que realiza este órgano subsidiario del Consejo, por ello mi delegación apoya la aprobación del informe que en esta ocasión se nos presenta.

Deseo hacer un par de puntualizaciones sobre el contenido del informe. Primero en relación con la propuesta para convocar a una Consulta Técnica que aborde las principales cuestiones relacionadas con la función del Estado rector del puerto con miras a prevenir, desalentar y eliminar la pesca ilegal no declarada y no reglamentada. Dicha consulta no debe ser motivo para reabrir las discusiones sobre lo que ya está acordado en relación al Estado rector del puerto en el Plan de Acción Internacional de la Pesca INDNR.

Por otra parte, si bien el Comité acordó que un grupo informal de composición abierta seguirá trabajando sobre el Memorandum de Acuerdo entre la FAO y la CITES en los momentos oportunos, incluida la novena reunión del Subcomité de Comercio Pesquero, mi delegación estima conveniente que los trabajos encaminados a la conclusión de dicho Memorandum no deben retrasarse más. Su pronta conclusión permitiría avanzar en la definición de competencias sobre el manejo de recursos pesqueros.

Deseo llamar la atención del Consejo sobre un asunto que me parece particularmente importante. Hace un par de semanas, la FAO convocó a una reunión informativa en la que dio a conocer el extraordinario ambiente de cooperación entre esta Organización Internacional con las organizaciones no gubernamentales y con las organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Mi Gobierno aprecia los esfuerzos que realiza la FAO para coordinar tareas y apoyarse de manera recíproca con este tipo de instancias. Sin embargo, también hemos notado, que no en todas las áreas de la FAO se cumple esta tarea con igual empeño. Hace mes y medio el WWF con el apoyo de Greenpeace, convocó a una reunión informativa sobre el Acuerdo para el programa internacional sobre conservación de los delfines AP, asistieron representantes de la sociedad civil, de la industria pesquera de diferentes países y representantes gubernamentales de naciones de varias regiones del mundo. Fue una reunión importante y provechosa. También fueron invitados, de manera muy oportuna, diferentes funcionarios de la FAO que atienden este tema. Sin embargo, fue notoria la ausencia total de la Organización en este evento que era de suma importancia para la FAO, ya que se trató una de las iniciativas más sólidas para la aplicación del Código Internacional de Conducta

para la Pesca Responsable, referencia angular de las acciones que efectúa la FAO. Esperamos que en el futuro todas las instancias de la FAO se sumen con el mismo empeño a las tareas que emprende la Organización para tener un mayor acercamiento con las ONG y las OSC.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

Australia would like to lend its strong support to some of the most important matters which were discussed at the COFI earlier this year and to seek the endorsement of Council Members for these COFI recommendations. In relation to IUU Fishing, Australia notes the Committee's expressed concern about the continuing high and growing incidence of illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and the lack of effective implementation of the IPOA/IUU.

We would also note reaffirmation of the need for the global implementation of measures against IUU fishing and strongly support the Committee's recommendations that IUU Fishing be included in the agenda of this year's FAO Conference. We also endorse Japan's suggestion of a technical consultation to be held in Rome on IUU in early 2004, to review progress and promote the full implementation of the IPOA/IUU and IPOA Capacity. However, Australia believes that a technical consultation must have a broad agenda.

Australia also notes the OECD Ministerial Meeting on Sustainability and IUU Fishing and believes we should try to capitalize on the political will from the meeting to deal with these issues.

Australia notes, in relation to the Programme Committee's consideration of CITES issues, that the Programme Committee Report, paragraph 26, CL 124/14, indicates that the involvement of the Fisheries Department in CITES-related activities must be kept to a bare minimum. We note, however, that we cannot ignore the fact that there is a body of work to do here that must be completed. For example, there are a number of aspects of CITES legislation that relate to marine fin fish that needs to be improved.

Australia also supports the ongoing role of regional fisheries management organizations in fisheries management but notes, as we did at the COFI Meeting, that there needs to be a stronger legal base to be able to deal effectively with emerging issues such as real interest, flag stay control over vessels, over-capacity and IUU fishing. A good example are the difficulties in reducing catch and effort on big eye in the Indian Ocean and the problems associated with KAMLA in dealing effectively with IUU Fishing for tooth fish.

In relation to aquaculture, Australia notes that aquaculture is now a third of world fisheries production. We seek to have the FAO budget allocation for aquaculture related programmes reflect this importance by providing a far stronger budget refocus to this key industry. Australia recalls the growing importance of aquaculture and its role in food security in developing countries, in Asia and the Americas. We also recall the successful FAO Sub-committee on Aquaculture held in Beijing, China, in April 2002.

Finally, we would also endorse the Programme Committee's conclusions on funding for the Fisheries Programme in the Programme of Work and Budget.

**Mooneshwar RAMTHOHUL (Mauritius)**

I would like to congratulate the Secretariat on the Report of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries. We would like to endorse the Draft Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trends of Capture Fisheries. We also recommend that the IUU fishing be included on the agenda of the Thirty-second Session of the FAO Ministerial Conference.

It would be worthwhile here to recall that Small Island States like Mauritius find it very difficult to control and monitor Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing in our Exclusive Economic Zone. Given the present situation, it becomes almost impossible to sustainably manage our fish stocks.

With regard to paragraph 27 of document CL 124/7, we support the initiative for the Director-General of FAO to enter into consultation with the UN Secretary-General with a view to defining practical modalities for implementation of the Trust Fund.

The Mauritian Government is fully aware of the high risk faced by small-scale fishing communities when they venture at sea. These small scale fishermen contribute to food security, they are self-employed and they face tremendous challenges in the offshore fishing activities. For their benefit, we have created a Fishermen Welfare Fund to cater for the welfare of the fishermen and their families as well as an insurance scheme to reduce risk and an incentive scheme for making provision for bad weather conditions when they cannot go fishing.

We also appreciate the contribution from various donor agencies in terms of technical and financial assistance in support of the small-scale fisheries sector. We are also looking forward to the forthcoming Technical Cooperation Project with FAO for our stock assessment.

**Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

In adopting the Report of the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI the United States of America would like to reiterate its support for three important recommendations before Council.

Firstly, the United States of America strongly supports the initiatives to improve information on status and trends of capture fisheries. Our scientists are actively involved in identifying this issue and in framing the solution recommended by COFI. We urge that FAO give all possible budgetary and technical support to the implementation of this recommendation.

We further recommend that all FAO Members who can make extra-budgetary support available to assist in the implementation of this initiative do so. We believe it is important to give the highest possible priority to establishing the infrastructure necessary to provide the essential fisheries status and trends information sought through this initiative.

Secondly, on the issue of IUU fishing, we look forward to seeing this as an agenda item at the Thirty-second FAO Conference. The international community has identified bringing an end to IUU fishing as its highest priority. We support the idea that a presentation on the topic be made at the Thirty-second Session of Conference so that policy makers outside the fishery sector may be made aware of the threats posed to fish and food by IUU fishing.

Finally, we agree that the Director-General of FAO should enter into consultation with the United Nations Secretary-General with a view to defining practical modalities for the implementation of a Trust Fund for the implementation of the 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement.

**Flavio Célio GOLDMAN (Brazil)**

Brazil would like to support the statement made by the Dominican Republic on behalf of GRULAC. We also support the comments made by Mexico, particularly regarding the importance that future meetings do not re-open what we have agreed in the International Plans of Action and other international instruments.

Brazil endorses the decisions and recommendations made by the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI. We know that their implementation will lead to the realization of a considerable number of meetings during the next two years. Besides the regular meetings of the Sub-Committees on Fish Trade and Aquaculture, as Mr Nomura has indicated, there is a call for technical consultations on implementation of the IPOA as on Capacity and IUU Fishing, on subsidies in the fishing industry and on the conservation of sea turtles as well as an Expert Consultation on the role of the port state to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU Fishing.

Brazil considers fundamental to ensure that developing countries can participate actively in all those meetings. My country highlighted in COFI that debates and negotiations on fisheries have to encompass points of view of the broadest number of participants possible. The multiplication of fisheries meetings poses clear difficulties for the participation of developing countries.

The negotiation of the Memorandum of Understanding between FAO and CITES, for instance, held in parallel to the last COFI Session involved a very limited number of participants in meetings where no interpretation was provided. We hope that the Secretariat will work actively to ensure that the follow-up of these negotiations and an accession of the Sub-Committee of Fish Trade can involve an increased number of interested parties.

In conclusion, we request the FAO Secretariat, as well as donor countries, to develop ways and means to ensure that the results of the meetings foreseen in the COFI Report be representative and reflect the variety of views that characterize the Membership of this Organization.

**Hideki MORONUKI (Japan)**

As you are fully aware, there are growing concerns over world fisheries, within which over-exploitation of marine living resources; persistent IUU Fishing activities and environmental concerns related to fishing practices are major issues to be highlighted. Under this situation, my delegation would like to remind you that some environmental conservation groups are currently advocating radical actions against world fisheries and denying even the sustainable utilization of marine living resources and the livelihood of coastal communities. For example, they are proposing to the United Nations General Assembly, adoption of a moratorium of some fishing activities such as deep sea trawling.

I have to underscore that the many allegations made with reference to world fisheries were not well reasoned and not fully evidenced in terms of science and the reality of fisheries management. However, Mr Chairman, notwithstanding the credibility of these allegations on anti-fisheries, we need to take into account these movements as serious alarming messages, with which we may have to work for in obtaining better fisheries management.

In this context, Japan attaches great importance to the role of FAO, as the Specialized UN Agency responsible for fisheries. FAO has been actively involved in the establishment of normative frameworks for responsible fisheries and also supported Member Nations to implement these international commitments. The Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, the Kyoto Declaration and its Plans of Action, and the series of International Plans of Action are the examples developed by FAO. Japan is of the view that FAO should continue to be the leading international forum in world fisheries and deal with the series of "homework", for example those presented by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). As we already expressed on several occasions, Japan promises to support FAO's activities in this sense.

My delegation recognizes that, as a whole, the Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries was quite successful. A variety of items ranging from high-sea fisheries to small-scale fisheries and aquaculture were discussed, which consequently brought us quite positive outcomes with global and holistic perspectives.

In particular, I would like to highlight the commitments made by members at the Twenty-fifth Session to tackle the issues of world fisheries, namely, over-capacity issues, IUU Fishing, fisheries subsidies and sea turtle conservation. These are the issues of utmost priority, which require urgent action to respond to the anti-fisheries movements currently spreading in the world. The Twenty-fifth Session of COFI already agreed to convene governmental consultations on these issues respectively in 2004. Japan sincerely hopes that positive steps would be taken in these meetings towards sustainable and responsible fisheries and it is more than happy to support FAO's activities in this regard.

**Ms Rahma MSHANGAMA (Tanzania, United Republic of)**

My delegation would like to commend the Committee for their excellent work. My delegation recognizes the importance of correct fisheries information and planning. In view of this I am delighted to inform the Council that our proposed fisheries legislation is in line with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

The United Republic of Tanzania recognizes the importance of monitoring control and surveillance as an executive tool in fisheries management. As we all know that effective MCS

requires an appropriate management plan, enforceable legislation, data collection system and, above all, political will of distance fishing nations. Bearing in mind the high cost of equipment required for efficient and sustainable MCS, my delegation would like to urge FAO to provide guidance to developing states on suitable communication equipment.

My delegation supports the recommendations put forward by the COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade. Further, we would like to emphasize the need for FAO to develop guidelines on equal labelling in order to have a fair game between the developed and developing nations whereby the latter should be assisted in capacity-building in order to implement the guidelines.

My delegation appreciates and commends Japan for their offer to create a Trust Fund for aquaculture development. We believe such a fund, once established, will assist in acquiring appropriate technology and capacity-building in developing countries.

On subsidy in fishing industry, my delegation appreciates the good work undertaken by the Secretariat on this issue. However, we would like to advise that subsidies should be introduced after a thorough study on their impact to fishery resources. The level of exploitation in the concerned water body should be given due regard. Subsidy aimed at poverty alleviation among fisherfolk through increased exports of fisheries products should be weighed carefully against existing food security policies.

My delegation recognizes the contribution of small-scale fisheries in the economy and food security. For example, 95 percent of the fish produced in my country comes from occasional fishing. In view of their contribution, our national fisheries policy has stipulated clearly, strategies for developing and sustaining these fisheries.

We support and endorse the Report of the Committee on Fisheries.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

The Czech Delegation is speaking on behalf of the countries acceding to the European Community and present at this meeting, let me please enumerate them once again: Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

We wish to endorse the Report of the Secretariat and, refraining from any other comments, we would like to associate ourselves with the statement of the European Community to be pronounced during this discussion on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

**Ms Maryam Ahmed Moustafa MOUSA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)**

My delegation approves the contents of the Report of the Twenty-fifth Session of the COFI, as well as the recommendations included therein, in addition to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, insofar as being an important reference point for capture fisheries and aquaculture. In very much the same sense it is necessary to resolve a problem which impedes the actual implementation of the said Code.

As you know we also have to develop aquaculture, in order to satisfy what are the food security requirements of our populations, to respond to the need of restoring and providing material support to the Committee on Fisheries, especially within the framework of improving information handling and processing.

We would also like to voice our support to a project for the development of human resources and also highlight the social scope of such programmes in developing countries.

**Jorge DE LA CABALLERÍA (European Community)**

I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States.

The Report from the Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries reproduced in document CL 124/7 is important for the European Community and its Member States as it stresses the need to continue curbing Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fisheries. The Report is also welcome as

it foresees that deep seas species will be on the agenda of the next Committee on Fisheries. In addition to the above, we would also like to express our satisfaction that COFI, as well as other Technical Committees, regain the possibility of fulfilling the basic task of reviewing the work programmes, COFI and other substantive bodies constitute the cornerstones of FAO and for them not to be able to discuss their own work programmes would seriously undermine the credibility of the Organization as a whole.

More detailed draft work programmes are expected from the Secretariat in the future in order to enable a more detailed discussion and make sharper priorities. In that sense, we would like to stress the need to have the guidelines on the ecosystem approach to fisheries in order to express our views and opinion on the subject.

Finally, concerning fish meal for animal feed, we are very well aware of the concern expressed by GRULAC. This matter is still in progress but we can once again confirm that we expect a very positive outcome soon.

**Mrs Josephine GICHUCHI (Kenya)**

The Kenya delegation wishes to thank the Committee on Fisheries for the excellent work.

My delegation supports the promotion of aquaculture and inland fisheries in food security. Fisheries in my country plays an important role in the economy, as it provides food, income and employment to our people. In this regard, my delegation supports and calls for increased technical and financial assistance as well as training in support of the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, especially in improvements in the quality, safety and trade of fisheries products.

We recognize the support of European Community and FAO in the support they have given to my country in this important sector. In Kenya, fisheries' development was given high priority in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and also in the recently-prepared Economic Recovery Strategy for the year 2003-2004. My Government has also allocated additional resources to this sector as it contributes to poverty reduction.

My delegation therefore calls for the increased budgetary allocation by FAO to support Government initiatives as proposed in paragraph 11.

Expertise of FAO is required by developing countries for the development of aquaculture and also for inland fisheries. In addition, availability of financial services is critical to the development of fisheries. We therefore welcome and support the proposal to create a Trust Fund for Aquaculture Development. This, in our view, will enable developing countries to exploit the rich and abundant fisheries resources within their boundaries and also within the Exclusive Economic Zone. We also support the equal labeling as proposed.

We support the Report of the Committee on Fisheries.

**Ángel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)**

Deseo apoyar la declaración del Grupo de los Países de América Latina y el Caribe con respecto a la situación que afecta el comercio de la harina de pescado. Estamos en presencia de obstáculos al comercio sin base científica, atribuyéndole, como se ha dicho, responsabilidad epidemiológica a ese producto en la presentación de casos de encefalopatía espongiforme bovina. No hay antecedentes ni científicos ni epidemiológicos que relacionen causa y efecto entre la harina de pescado y esa enfermedad.

Deseo reiterar el apoyo a la declaración del GRULAC y al mismo tiempo deseo agradecer al Departamento de Pesca de esta Organización por la cooperación con respecto a la situación mencionada anteriormente.



**Govindan NAIR (India)**

We would like to commend the members and the Secretariat in producing this excellent Report. We are happy to note FAO's efforts to develop fisheries and aquaculture on a long term sustainable basis within the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

While this would promote long-term sustainable development, developing countries would require technical and financial assistance in implementing the Code. We are concerned that there is relative stagnation in funding for fisheries FAO should consider increasing its budgetary allocation to this important major programme from Regular Programme resources.

We urge FAO to impart training in support of the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, with reference to fisheries management, sustainable aquaculture and improvements in the quality safety and trade of fisheries products.

Increased attention is also to be given to small-scale fisheries as they make a significant contribution to food security and poverty alleviation. Simultaneously, efforts are required to check Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing and control fleet capacity, particularly that of large-scale fishing vessels and to mitigate over exploitation of fishing grounds. Similarly, with regard to trade related activities, FAO should develop guidelines on equal labelling, FAO will also have to take the leadership in capacity-building and institutional strengthening in developing countries in the field of WTO multilateral trade negotiations.

There is also need for strengthening regional cooperation in improving information status and trends in fisheries.

My delegation therefore urges FAO to provide technical support in areas such as fish quarantine, monitoring systems, data collection, etc. FAO Investment Centre could also assist in formulating projects for the development of fishing harbours and fish processing utilities.

With this we endorse the Report and recommendations of COFI.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

My delegation welcomes the Report of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries in document CL 124/7. In supporting this Report, my delegation also wishes to express comments and observations regarding the contents.

With regard to the Report of the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture, Indonesia proposes that FAO develop the guidance on data collection and provide a standardized and uniform format on aquaculture data and facilitate the training to develop skills on data collection analysis and dissemination to attain the quality of expected data on aquaculture. In order to achieve this purpose, my delegation proposes that FAO facilitate training in the subject particularly, for developing countries through tripartite schemes cooperated by developed countries or international donors.

We agree that aquaculture development is fairly important for the developing countries. We understand also there is a need for provisions of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in order to contribute positively on the public health, food safety and quality. However, we understand that there is a need for an additional funding for the FAO Secretariat in order to assist the implementation of this aquaculture programme, especially to strengthen the capabilities of the developing countries.

We recognize the urgency of making monitoring control and surveillance of fishing vessels more effective. Therefore, my Government has implemented instruments for the protection and prevention of the IUU Fishing and developed a monitoring control and surveillance system. In improving the implementation of the MCS, the Indonesian Government noted, with thanks, the cooperation, the bilateral cooperations of the French Government and also the collaboration of the Regional and International Fisheries Organization through the multilateral partnerships.

With regard to the decisions and recommendations of the Eighth Session of the COFI Sub-committee on Fisheries which is also reported in this Committee's Report, my delegation noted that we requested the Sub-Committee on Fisheries that the seahorse be included on the CITES listing and also support the proposal for a continuation study on identification types of sharks before they are included on the CITES listing. Related to the impact of the WTO round agreement on fish trade we expect that the developed countries take a significant effort to reduce their import tariff for the fish imported from the developing countries.

FAO should facilitate these multilateral negotiations in order to assist the possibility of reducing import tariffs and to foster the International Fair Trade for the Fish Products.

My delegation reiterates also the specific proposals on the harmonized codes of custom classifications especially for improving fish products' specification of the southern hemisphere region. We remind the Committee on the need of the technical assistance to developing countries to implement the HACCP systems, from the production point up to the consumer, in order to equal the international standards.

We repeat again the need of the technical assistance on capacity-building for the developing countries for a more rapid harmonization on fish safety and quality standards, in order to implement the Sanitary and Phytosanitary methods, the SPS as well as on the issues of the Technical Barriers to Trade, the PBT.

It is encouraged that the traceability requirements for fish products should be put into practice only for public health protection particularly, to improve the consumer confidence and it will not be used for other purposes such as the unseen non-tariff barrier.

Indonesia would also like to reiterate the need to harmonize the catch and trade documentations, and catch certification schemes to avoid duplication, similarities on those documents and most importantly to prevent the fake documentation that even promote the application of the IUU Fishing.

With regard to the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and related International Plans of Action we note that COFI has agreed on the Draft FAO Strategy for Improving Information on Status and Trend of Capture Fisheries, and we welcome this progress.

On the recommendation of the FAO's Expert Consultation on Identifying Assessing and Reporting on Subsidies in Fishing Industry, my delegation would like to reiterate the need for the accomplishment of the Johannesburg implementation plan, specifically the paragraphs related to the diminished subsidies. We suggest that FAO conduct a further study on the effects of reducing subsidies on fish products on small-scale fisheries in developing countries, dealing with over fishing. Indonesia considers that these issues cannot be reduced only by diminishing subsidies, but also by implementation of the CCRF.

COFI also documented that the small-scale fisheries communities have high sensitivity and risk coping with natural disasters and related activities on small-scale fisheries. COFI also recognized that the small-scale fisheries are often not included as a priority on national development in developing countries. Therefore, we would like to remind you that we requested FAO Secretariat to increase its resource allocation to support the development of these small-scale fisheries, particularly on the allocation resources for the post-harvest system.

In my country, Indonesia, the population of small scale fisheries are around 80 percent among the total fishing groups, and recognizing its economic and social potential, my government has taken action to support and promote these poverty alleviation activities.

With regard to the Report of the Expert Consultation to review measures to combat IUU Fishing, my delegation would like to remind that COFI recommended issues on deep sea fisheries to be included on the agenda of the Twenty-sixth Session of COFI.

We also support the recommendations that the issues on the IUU Fishing be one of the topics to be considered in the forthcoming Thirty-second Session of the FAO Conference in November 2003.

**GUO HANDI (China) (Original language Chinese)**

The Chinese Delegation appreciates very much the successful work done by the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI. We are quite satisfied with the progress made during that Session.

Regarding aquaculture, we wish to reiterate that aquaculture has a new field of development in fishery. For the developing countries, especially for the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, it should play a very important role in food security and poverty alleviation. We hope FAO could take into account the relevant decisions and recommendations of the First Session of the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture of the Committee on Fisheries, and to include its financial requirements into the normal budget of this Organization and we should also gradually increase the share for the aquaculture.

Apart from that, taking into account the fact that developing countries are faced with imminent contradictions and problems between fishing resources and environment, we suggest FAO should properly adjust its work so that a certain amount of support could be given to inland fishery resources and environment protection and utilization. It should especially strengthen its support for the protection and management of aqua-living resources and the environment of large rivers and lakes.

We wish to express our concern that this Session of COFI could not reach a consensus on the understanding between COFI and CITES. It is our hope that FAO could speed up this work so as to make progress as soon as possible, and thereby promote the protection and the utilization of resources and the realization of sustainable development.

Lastly, we hope this session of the Council could adopt the report of the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

En primer lugar me disculpo por pedir el uso de la palabra por segunda vez. Esta vez lo vamos a hacer a nombre de nuestra delegación.

Agradecemos en primer lugar el excelente informe del Sr. Nomura, que como siempre es conciso y completo; si bien nos hubiera gustado escuchar algo más sobre la limitación a nivel de comercio de los productos pesqueros. Apoyamos firmemente la declaración realizada por la República Dominicana a nombre de nuestro Grupo Regional, así como la de Chile, Brasil y México.

En relación al tema principal que orientó la declaración de la República Dominicana, nos parece que la propia solicitud a nuestra Región de incluir el tema de la presunta vinculación de la harina de pescado con la Encefalopatía Espongiforme Bovina refleja sin duda alguna nuestro convencimiento de que no existe ninguna vinculación entre ambas, y esto es absolutamente transparente, por lo cual aspiramos a que esta vinculación sea ratificada en este Consejo.

Apreciamos del mismo modo la declaración hecha por la Unión Europea sobre este tema, la cual nos alienta nuevamente, y no nos deja perder la esperanza. Esta es la segunda vez. En la primera vez, durante el COFI nos hablaron del 15 de mayo, ahora nos hablan de "muy pronto", esperemos pues, recibir muy pronto noticias positivas sobre el levantamiento de estas restricciones en la harina de pescado, las cuales deben venir de parte de ellos.

Por último, una precisión al documento CL 124/7, específicamente en lo que se refiere a las decisiones y recomendaciones de la octava reunión del Subcomité sobre Comercio Pesquero del Comité de Pesca, en la página 7 en español que es la página 6 en inglés, acápite 3. Quisiéramos llamar la atención sobre el hecho de que la decisión del COFI no fue solamente incluir el tema de la novena reunión del Sub-comité de Comercio Pesquero, sino también que la FAO prepare un informe complementario sobre el particular, y esto está reflejado en el Artículo 41 del informe del

COFI. En este sentido y con esta precisión, mi delegación desea apoyar la aprobación de este Informe.

**José A. QUINTERO (Cuba)**

Mi delegación respalda la declaración del distinguido Representante de la República Dominicana en nombre del GRULAC, y agradece a la Secretaría por este informe que hoy nos presenta.

Cuba valora altamente el trabajo que dentro del marco de la FAO realiza el Comité de Pesca. Es conocida por todos la situación crítica en que se encuentran los recursos marinos del planeta. Innumerables causas inciden en esta situación, entre ellas la Pesca Indiscriminada e Ilegal y la galopante contaminación de nuestros océanos y mares provocada por la actividad conciente o inconsciente del hombre. Como consecuencia, hoy nos enfrentamos al rápido agotamiento de grandes cantidades de especies marinas, situación ésta que no contribuye a que la actividad pesquera pueda realizar los aportes que esperamos para aumento de la seguridad alimentaria mundial.

Nuestra delegación suscribe el planteamiento acerca de la necesidad de terminar con la pesca ilegal que afecta todas las medidas regulatorias regionales. Cuba apoya los esfuerzos que realizan varios países con el objetivo de evitar la captura incidental de algunas especies marinas e insta a la FAO a cooperar más estrechamente con estas naciones en la perspectiva de considerar qué tipo de asistencia sería conveniente prestar a los Estados Miembros en desarrollo para impulsar este objetivo.

Cuba resalta la importancia creciente en el comercio internacional del etiquetado y la rastreabilidad de los productos pesqueros e insta a la FAO a continuar su labor en este campo. Sin embargo, deseamos apuntar que el eco-etiquetado nunca debería constituir un obstáculo más al comercio. Del mismo modo, la delegación de Cuba resalta la importancia de la acuicultura como medio para incrementar la producción pesquera, generar ingresos, contribuir a restaurar y reducir la presión sobre las poblaciones silvestres, mitigar la pobreza, aumentar la seguridad alimentaria y contribuir a la diversificación del empleo. Señalamos la importancia de desarrollar la acuicultura de forma sostenible ecológicamente en concordancia con el Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable. En este sentido instamos también a la FAO para que asigne recursos adicionales a esta actividad.

Con relación a las subvenciones en la industria pesquera, nuestra delegación se une al reclamo de que la FAO acelere sus trabajos sobre las repercusiones de éstas en la sostenibilidad de los recursos pesqueros y en el desarrollo sostenible de la pesca. Estamos de acuerdo en que la FAO debería realizar un trabajo más práctico, orientado a la clasificación de las subvenciones y la evaluación de éstas y sus repercusiones en el sector, reconociendo las necesidades específicas de los países en desarrollo y de los pequeños Estados insulares. Cuba apoya igualmente la importancia concebida en el informe del 25º Período de Sesiones del Comité de Pesca, a la contribución que la pesca sostenible en pequeña escala puede realizar a la seguridad alimentaria. Apoyamos la necesidad de que la FAO destine más recursos a elaborar directrices técnicas relativas al aumento de la aportación de la pesca en pequeña escala a la seguridad alimentaria y al alivio de la pobreza.

Todo lo anterior debe tener como base la consideración de criterios de ordenamiento pesquero basados en el eco-sistema como principio en las políticas para lograr la pesca responsable y restablecer los recursos pesqueros y el medio marino. Cuba apoya el reclamo del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe en el sentido de recibir un trato más justo y equitativo en referencia a la asignación de recursos para estas actividades.

Por último, la delegación de Cuba desea reconocer la extraordinaria importancia de la implantación del Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable y, del mismo modo, expresa su apoyo a la necesidad de trabajar en la aprobación definitiva del memorandum entre la FAO y la Convención sobre Comercio Internacional de Especies Amenazadas de Fauna y Flora Silvestre. Nos unimos al llamado que se realiza en el informe en el sentido de que la principal dificultad para la implantación definitiva de muchas de estas actividades radica en la escasez de recursos

financieros, por lo que instamos a la FAO, y fundamentalmente a los países donantes, a apoyar estas actividades con mayores recursos.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

First of all, I would like to state for the record that we endorse the Report of the Committee on Fisheries found in document CL 124/7 and we would like to associate ourselves with comments that have been made by a number of Member Nations that have spoken in respect to requirements that would also touch on the lives of the small fishing communities in the developing world.

From an African perspective, we would like to highlight our needs for assistance in capacity-building and strengthening of our institutions. Poverty alleviation is a priority in Africa. In promoting aquaculture in small scale-scale fisheries can assist in this aim, but we need help in developing the necessary infrastructure.

Aquaculture is increasingly showing the potential to contribute towards food security and poverty alleviation among the small fish farming communities. In this regard, we would like to support the Trust Fund that is being set up to help the development of aquaculture. We need productive resources, markets and processing technology for fishing products.

In the Committee on Fisheries we registered our concern and we now hope that Council will take seriously to approve the necessary budgetary requirements for capacity-building and financing the development of the potential, in particular, with regards to handling and processing and with regards to the maintenance of stocks.

We would also like to urge FAO to continue with its efforts to improve data collection of information and analysis thereof through training our people so that we can keep track of our fish catches and the trends, so that we may be able to monitor our stocks as we go along.

The last World Summit on Sustainable Development addressed the issue of allocation of rice to high-seas fisheries. It is important that this sensitive issue be handled carefully so that the needs of the developing states can also be taken on board.

Further, on the issue of trade, we see this as an important issue for our fish-trading communities. It is important that we are not competitively disadvantaged by industrial countries through subsidies of their fishing industries.

We also note and approve that a third of Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing is a challenge for all of us. We therefore support the proposed Code of Conduct and adherence to the International Plan of Action. The FAO strategy of improving the capacity on our part in this area will help us to be able to play our part in the Plan of Action.

With regard to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), we feel that there should be close adherence to the commitments of CITES in the fishing area. Furthermore, we wonder whether FAO would be able to consider the development of equilibrium so that export for us would not constitute a barrier for our fish products.

**Pinit KORSIEPORN (Thailand)**

In general, Thailand supports the Report of the Twenty-fifth session of the Committee on Fisheries. I only want to stress the following issues:

Firstly, Thailand is very pleased to host a Technical Consultation, as proposed by Japan, on Sea Total Interactions and Conservation in 2004. I urge all countries to participate in this important Consultation.

Secondly, with regard to eco-labelling, my delegation is of the view that FAO, the leading Organization responsible for fisheries, should develop guidelines on eco-labelling soon. The issue of eco-labelling should be voluntary, non-discriminatory and transparent. In any case, eco-labelling should not become another barrier to trade.

Thirdly, aquaculture development is very important to most developing countries, including my own country. Aquaculture is a source of food security, as well as the source of income for the

rural community. We share the view that the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture should work in harmony with the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the offer of Japan to create a Trust Fund for Aquaculture Development.

Fourth, my delegation welcomes FAO's initiatives to forecast on the small-scale fisheries sector, including the important role of women in small-scale fisheries.

Lastly, the issue of food safety and food standards on fish and fishery products. National capacity-building provided by FAO is an urgent matter, specifically for the quality control of aquaculture products. This would promote the health of the fishermen, consumers, as well as trade on aquatic products.

**Sra. Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOTTI (Guatemala)**

Guatemala agradece a la Secretaría del informe del 25º período de sesiones del Comité de Pesca, CL 124/7, y lo endosa. Asimismo agradece a la FAO todos los esfuerzos realizados en la implementación de las recomendaciones de dicho informe, especialmente en el aspecto de acuicultura.

Mi delegación manifiesta su apoyo a las declaraciones del GRULAC, de México, Brasil, Chile, Perú y Cuba.

**Mohamed Mahmoud El Hanan EL HASSAN (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)**

May I thank the Secretariat for this valuable Report, and my thanks also go to Mr Nomura and the Secretariat for all the efforts they have made and for the sound recommendations they have submitted.

Fish in my country represents a major source of food and a major source of income in order to fight poverty. As you may be well aware, the Sudan is rich in seawater and freshwater, but these water resources are not fully tapped. We have numerous contacts and cooperation with your Organization and we look forward to seeing more cooperation through the TCP, particularly now that the Sudan is approaching a period of peace.

We are launching a war in order to put an end to a long-standing war - the war launched in the south of Sudan. This is an important part of Sudan. The southern part of Sudan is rich in water, freshwater resources, and people there rely on fisheries. Therefore, we will be expecting more technical support from FAO in order to achieve peace and sustainable development in this important part of Sudan.

May I also add that there is a possibility of cooperation between FAO and the countries bordering the Blue Nile and the White Nile, in order to tap the fish resources there.

Finally, may I extend my heartfelt thanks to the Secretariat for this most valuable document.

**Carlos Alberto AMARAL (Observateur de l'Angola)**

Je voudrais, tout d'abord, féliciter le Directeur General Adjoint du Département des pêches, Monsieur Nomura, pour la présentation du rapport. En général, nous sommes d'accord avec les conclusions et les recommandations du rapport. Toutefois, nous aimerions faire quelques considérations.

Le système de suivi, de contrôle et de surveillance est un élément important du Code de conduite pour une pêche responsable. Il serait important de réaliser la Consultation prévue au point 29 afin d'harmoniser les modes de présentation des données et les procédures pour renforcer l'efficacité du système de surveillance des bateaux de pêche. Il faudrait aussi harmoniser la législation et mettre en œuvre effectivement le Plan d'action pour la lutte contre la pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée.

Je tiens à souligner l'aquaculture, pour sa dynamique et son potentiel, qui peut satisfaire de façon accrue les nécessités des populations les plus pauvres. L'aquaculture est le secteur de production

alimentaire qui augmente le plus rapidement au niveau mondial. En effet, il augmente en moyenne de 8,35 pour cent par an.

La création du Sous-Comité des pêches est la reconnaissance de cette importance. Cependant, il serait essentiel de lui fournir aussi les ressources financières dont il a besoin, à travers le budget ordinaire de la FAO, pour pouvoir concrétiser sa programmation.

L'Angola, comme la plupart des pays africains, a un grand potentiel pour l'aquaculture, mais ne l'utilise pas à cause du manque d'expérience et de connaissances. Etant donné que 91 pour cent de la production de l'aquaculture au niveau mondial est réalisée dans les pays en développement, nous pensons que la coopération sud-sud doit être encouragée.

Ma délégation félicite la FAO pour sa contribution effective au Programme du NEPAD à travers le Programme détaillé pour le développement de l'agriculture africaine.

Il serait également utile d'inclure dans ce Programme, de façon plus détaillée, la contribution que la pêche, et en particulier l'aquaculture, devrait donner pour l'éradication de la faim et pour le développement du Continent, tenant compte de la complémentarité existant entre l'agriculture et l'aquaculture dans le contexte du développement rural.

Ma délégation approuve la Stratégie visant à améliorer l'information sur la situation et les tendances des pêches de capture, mentionnée à l'Annexe H, parce que la mise en œuvre de cette Stratégie peut permettre d'améliorer la connaissance de la situation des ressources halieutiques et de la situation socio-économique, de faciliter la définition des politiques de gestion et de contribuer à un développement durable de la pêche.

Nous encourageons la FAO à continuer à déployer des efforts pour affronter les nouveaux défis qui se posent en matière de développement durable des pêches et de l'aquaculture. Nous demandons aussi un équilibre adéquat entre les activités normatives et de terrain pour qu'il soit possible à la FAO d'assister, de façon convenable, les pays en développement au renforcement de leurs capacités institutionnelles, à l'harmonisation de la législation des pêches, à l'amélioration de la qualité de ses produits, au renforcement des systèmes statistiques et du contrôle des activités de pêche, entre autres priorités.

Ma délégation espère que le Département des pêches nous présentera, à la prochaine réunion du Comité des pêches, l'étude comparative sur les coentreprises, fondée sur les contributions d'experts de différentes régions, sur l'évaluation des résultats de leur impact sur le développement des pêches dans les pays en développement, comme proposé au point 34 du rapport du Comité des pêches.

Pour terminer, ma délégation espère aussi que le Conseil approuvera ce rapport du Comité des pêches, tenant compte de la priorité qu'il faut accorder en termes de budget au Département des pêches de la FAO, comme cela a déjà été souligné par le Comité du programme au point 27 du document CL 124/4. Je cite: "Le Comité a souligné qu'il serait souhaitable d'allouer des ressources accrues à ce grand Programme quelque soit le niveau du budget".

**Mme Marième MINT MOHAMED (Observateur de Mauritanie)**

Mon pays souffre de la Pêche illicite, non déclarée et non réglementée, surtout celle pratiquée en haute mer. Nous y assistons à une pêche exaspérée et non pas à une pêche normale. C'est un épuisement total et rapide de notre richesse. La richesse halieutique doit être utilisée de façon opérationnelle pour garantir une utilisation à long terme des ressources. C'est pourquoi nous demandons à la FAO un soutien supplémentaire pour une réglementation stricte de cette pratique.

Ma délégation appuie les Plans d'action internationaux destinés à faciliter l'application du Code de conduite pour la pêche responsable et nous soutenons les efforts entrepris pour gérer la pêche de façon responsable. Nous demandons à ce que le rapport final du Conseil reflète la condamnation de la pêche illicite. Nous approuvons et appuyons ce rapport.

**Ichiro NOMURA (Assistant Director-General, Fisheries Department)**

First of all, on behalf of the Fishery Department, I would like to extend our sincere thanks for your appreciation of the COFI Report as well as our activity, and your favoured suggestion that more financial resources be allocated to this major programme.

I understand that you are happy to endorse the Report as well as various recommendations which were included in the COFI Report. Many of the delegations, in our view, stated or reiterated what was already included in the COFI Report. So for the sake of time, I will not repeat this. I heard that many delegations stressed the priority area which was included in paragraph 1.04 of the COFI Report, and further stressed the need for more efforts in the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and the various IPOA, particularly, on IUU Fisheries.

Many delegations also stressed for more increased activity in aquaculture and some delegations also included inland fishery activities as well. In particular, in the context of aquaculture, the need for more expanded activity was referred to by many delegations, with appreciation of the Trust Fund, which has been provided by Japan.

Many delegations also wanted to have us to act more on small-scale fishery and national fishery, a safety of the fisheries products and also the HASIP safety process and post-harvest and data collection. Many delegations exhorted the Secretariat to process the finalization of the MOU between the FAO Secretariat and CITES Secretariats. As we agreed, it is a pity that the Members of the COFI were not able to reach a consensus on the MOU. Again, it is not the Secretariat that initiates the consultation but the COFI Members. Therefore, we, on our initiative, cannot make the negotiation *per se*. What we can do is I will contact the Chairman of COFI to convey your views saying that the MOU finalization process be facilitated, that is the initiative of the COFI Chairman in consultation with the Chairman of the Informal Working Group.

Please be reminded that COFI mandated the continued work of the Informal Working Group Consultation with the aim, possible, for a Sub-Committee on Fish Trade which meets next February to finalize MOU. We have no different opinion from what you have suggested.

Some Members referred to the subsidies issue. I am not going to get into the substance of the discussion but some Members also sought the need for a linkage between the subsidy issue and IUU and other capacities, and some Members also qualified the granting of subsidies to small-scale fisheries.

For the first theme, it was considered necessary, so, therefore, our plan is to have a Technical Consultation on Subsidies right after the Technical Consultation on IPOA, IUU Fishing and capacity-building.

With regard to the second issue, the link of subsidies to small-scale fisheries and the different treatment to be accorded, I do not think it is our mandate, since they are technical inputs. This could be a mandate of the Technical Consultation Subsidy, which we are going to have next year.

Many members also directed FAO to take on the job of establishing guidelines, and we were on the right track.

Now, I will go to some particular questions to which I thought I should respond.

GRULAC countries represented by the Dominican Republic reiterated a statement which they made in COFI, that is to say, there should be more equitable resource allocations to many Regions. I interpret that Region includes the Latin American and Caribbean Region. We will be cognisant of the request and whatever we do, we will not forget that.

About the linkage between fishmeal and BSE, in addition to the response from the European Community, I have not much to add to what was recorded in COFI. To the particular question of our Peruvian friend, if I understand correctly, he did not need a COFI recommendation for this issue as a homework for us not only to have the agenda item. He wanted the Secretariat to have the obligation of making a Report. It is also our understanding that we have that homework and



we will make sure that the Report will be prepared in time for the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade next year.

I think Mexico asked two specific questions which should merit my response. On the Technical Consultation on both Port States as well as on IUU Fishing, the Mexican delegation wanted reassurance from us that there should be no renegotiation of IPOA. For the Technical Consultation of IPOA, I can assure you, there is a clear difference in the COFI Report that it would not be renegotiated by IPOA.

On the Technical Consultation for Port States, I am not so sure. If the Technical Consultation means you, or you mean the Government, I think there should be more need for Port State measures, then there is a possibility that you have another measure, which I agree with. So my answer is, it is again subject to the Technical Consultation of Port States. At this time, as far as the Secretariat is concerned, the main aim of the Technical Consultation of Port States is not so much for renegotiation by IPOA but rather how to make regional cooperation of Port States under the existing skills.

I think the Mexican Delegation complained about non-representation of the FAO Secretariat in a particular meeting which was sponsored by a particular NGO. We are aware of that and it is true that we were contacted by the Mexican Government with an invitation to attend. It is not true that we were not represented. We sent one responsible officer who observed the meeting and reported back to us. We were aware of what was going on.

The reason we did not send a big delegation is very simple because it was organized by a particular NGO and even though we have no objection on the theme, that is dolphin mortality reduction scheme, which we of course support, it was not discussed in COFI at all and we did not wish to make any impression to others that if we send too big a delegation it may give some prejudicial signal even though we do not have any problem with this. Even many of our staff supports that initiative. So please bear with it.

Brazil re-emphasized the need for the balanced regional representation whenever we make Technical Consultations or Expert Consultations. We completely agree. We have always made the utmost effort to represent of all regions, particularly regarding Expert Consultations, since the choice of which is our responsibility. It also true, just for your information, that for some Near East and Latin American Regions, we had some difficulty in the past to find experts. So your help would be much appreciated. As a matter of principle, we will follow your instruction.

**José Miguel BARRETO SÁNCHEZ (Perú)**

En primer lugar, cuando nosotros nos referíamos a la elaboración de un Informe por parte de la FAO sobre el tema de la supuesta vinculación entre la harina de pescado y la EEB en la próxima reunión del Sub-Comité de Comercio Pesquero, ésta no fue incluida en la parte inicial del documento referida a los asuntos que requieren la atención del Consejo. Si la praxis permite la inclusión de párrafos en el Informe, instruyen desde ya a la Secretaría para su ejecución. Esta era nuestra preocupación.

En segundo lugar, en relación al tema subsidios, compartimos lo que ha dicho el Sr. Nomura en relación a que la orientación sobre la Consulta a realizarse el próximo año sobre subsidios, tenga como ejemplo básicamente el tema de la Sobre-capacidad de la Pesca Ilegal. Hay otros asuntos que están incluidos en el párrafo 73 que también tienen que ser considerados porque así fue planteado por muchos Países Miembros durante el Comité de Pesca. Me refiero a las repercusiones de las subvenciones en el desarrollo sostenible, en el comercio de pescado y productos pesqueros, en la seguridad alimentaria, en la protección social y en la mitigación de la pobreza, etc. Es cierto que como ejemplo se tomaron los efectos de la Pesca Ilegal y de la Sobre-capacidad. Creo que es importante indicar que se deben considerar también los otros asuntos incluidos en el párrafo 73 del Informe.

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Si personne d'autre ne veut intervenir, je pense que nous avons conclu le point 3 de l'ordre du jour.

### **16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:**

#### **16. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, dont:**

#### **16. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:**

*16.2 Applications for Membership in the Organization (CL 124/18)*

*16.2 Demandes d'admission à la qualité de membre de l'Organisation (CL 124/18)*

*16.2 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organización (CL 124/18)*

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Passons au point 16 intitulé: Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques. Conformément à notre calendrier, nous allons commencer par le sous-point 16.2: Demandes d'admission à la qualité de membre de l'Organisation. Le document relatif à ce sous-point porte la référence CL 124/18.

Le Directeur général a reçu, le 27 novembre 2002, une demande officielle d'admission à qualité de membre de l'Organisation de Tuvalu. Nous prenons acte de cette demande et la transmettons à la Conférence qui examinera cette question lors de sa trente-deuxième session, en novembre 2003.

En attendant la décision de la Conférence sur cette demande d'admission, et en application de l'article 25.11 du Règlement général de l'Organisation, et des paragraphes B1, B2 et B5, des Principes régissant l'octroi du statut d'observateur aux nations, le Conseil est appelé à autoriser le Directeur général à inviter Tuvalu à participer en qualité d'observateur à cette session et à la prochaine session du Conseil, ainsi qu'aux réunions régionales et techniques de l'Organisation pouvant l'intéresser.

Le Conseil souhaite-t-il autoriser Tuvalu à participer à ces sessions et à des réunions régionales et techniques? Oui, Tuvalu sera donc autorisé à participer à nos réunions régionales et techniques.

*Approved*

*Approuvé*

*Aprobado*

### **16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:**

#### **16. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, dont:**

#### **16. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:**

*16.3 The Number and Length of Terms of Office of the Director-General  
(Article VII.1 of the Constitution of FAO) (CL 124/13)*

*16.3 Nombre et durée des mandats du Directeur général  
(Article VII.1 de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO) (CL 124/13)*

*16.3 Número y duración de los mandatos del Director General de la FAO  
(Artículo VII.1 de la Constitución de la FAO) (CL 124/13)*

## LE PRÉSIDENT

Nous passons maintenant au sous-point 16.3 de l'ordre du jour qui porte sur le nombre et la durée des mandats du Directeur général, article 7.1 de l'Acte constitutif de l'Organisation.

Je crois utile de commencer par rappeler que, lors de la cent vingt-troisième session du Conseil, réalisée du 28 octobre au 1 novembre 2002, le Conseil a pris une décision, qui a été reproduite intégralement dans son rapport et que je ne reprendrai pas ici en détail.

Le Conseil a notamment demandé au Président indépendant du Conseil et à un groupe de représentants régionaux, constituant les Amis du Président, d'examiner de manière transparente et participative, la question du nombre et de la durée des mandats du Directeur général, en gardant

présents à l'esprit les aspects suivants de la phase transitoire: la date d'entrée en vigueur de l'article 7.1 amendé de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO et les droits et obligations du titulaire. En outre, il a été notamment décidé que des réunions des Amis du Président seraient convoquées en vue de parvenir à un consensus, et de formuler une proposition détaillée concernant la modification de l'article 7.1 de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO et de la soumettre au Conseil de juin 2003, de sorte qu'une décision puisse être prise lors de la Conférence de la FAO à sa trente-deuxième session en novembre-décembre 2003.

Je voulais rappeler brièvement les traits saillants du processus qui a été mené pour la mise en œuvre de la décision du Conseil et de toutes ses composantes. Ainsi, comme prévu dans cette décision, le 9 décembre 2002, une réunion d'information ouverte à tous les Membres de l'Organisation a été réalisée. Au cours de cette réunion, le Secrétariat a fourni des informations sur l'expérience d'autres organismes des Nations Unies en matière de limitation des mandats. Par ailleurs, de copieux documents d'information ont été mis à la disposition des Membres et des Amis du Président. Comme vous le savez, le Groupe des Amis du Président comprenait deux ou trois Représentants par région selon les cas: l'actuel et l'ancien Président du Groupe des 77, le Président du Groupe de l'OCDE, un Représentant de la Présidence du Conseil des Ministres de la Communauté européenne et un représentant de la Commission de la Communauté européenne. Le Groupe des Amis du Président a tenu cinq réunions en 2002 et 2003, dont la dernière a eu lieu le 29 mars 2003. Lorsque je n'ai pas pu me rendre à Rome, le groupe s'est réuni sous la co-présidence du Président du Groupe des 77 et du Groupe de l'OCDE. Je saisis cette occasion pour les remercier très vivement de leur efficacité et du soutien sans faille, qu'ils m'ont accordé tout au long du processus.

Comme vous le savez, au cours des dernières semaines et en particulier au cours de ces derniers jours, nous avons effectué de très nombreuses consultations sur la question. À cet égard, je voulais tout particulièrement féliciter les Présidents des différents groupes régionaux qui ont fait preuve d'un remarquable esprit d'ouverture et de collaboration, que je tenais à saluer et sans lesquels la tâche aurait été impossible. Par la même occasion, je tenais à remercier tous mes amis pour le soutien qu'ils m'ont accordé dans cette tâche que le Conseil, lors de sa dernière session, m'a confiée. Le résultat des travaux du Groupe est présenté dans le document CL 124/1/22. En outre, un projet de décision du Conseil, incorporé au rapport de cette session, sous le point 16.3 de l'ordre du jour, est également devant vous et porte la cote CL 124/13. Je souligne que ce texte, s'il était approuvé, constituerait la partie du rapport du Conseil sous le point 16.3 de l'Ordre du jour.

Je voulais vous proposer de manifester votre approbation du document par acclamation, compte tenu du fait que toutes nos consultations ont donné un consensus dont je me félicite. Si vous approuvez ce document, je vous prie donc de procéder par acclamation.

*Approved*

*Approuvé*

*Aprobado*

*Applause*

*Applaudissements*

*Aplausos*

**16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:****16. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, dont:****16. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:**

*16.4 Amendments of the Statutes of the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CL 124/19)*

*16.4 Amendements aux Statuts du Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est (CL 124/19)*

*16.4 Enmiendas de los Estatutos del Comité de Pesca para el Atlántico Centro-Oriental (CL 124/19)*

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous passons au point 16.4: Amendements aux Statuts du Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est. Le document pertinent porte la référence CL 124/19. Après l'adoption par la Conférence, à sa vingt-neuvième session en novembre 1997, de la résolution 1397 intitulée: Examen des organes statutaires de la FAO, le Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est (COPACE) a entamé un processus d'examen de son mandat, de ses fonctions et de sa structure. Au terme de ce processus, le Comité a révisé son mandat, afin de prendre en compte les changements survenus dans le secteur halieutique de l'Afrique de l'Ouest.

Le Conseil est invité à autoriser le Directeur général à promulguer le mandat révisé du Comité, en vertu de l'article 6 paragraphe 2 de l'Acte constitutif de la FAO, et conformément à la résolution 148 prise par le Conseil de la FAO à sa quarante-huitième session.

Je souhaite demander à Monsieur Satia, Chef de Service des institutions internationales et de liaison et Secrétaire du Comité des pêches, de présenter ce point.

**Benedict SATIA (FAO Staff)**

The Fishery Committee for the Central Eastern Atlantic (CECAF) was established by the Director-General on 19 September 1967. Under Article VI, paragraph 2 of the FAO Constitution pursuant to Resolution 1/48 of the Forty-eighth Session of the Council, in 1967. In November 1992, at its Hundred and Second Session, the Council approved amendments to the Terms of Reference for CECAF and authorized the Director-General to promulgate their amendments. These amendments had been made necessary by a number of developments that had taken place in the fishery situation in West Africa.

Following the adoption by the Conference, at its Twenty-ninth Session in November 1997, of Resolution 13/97 entitled "Review of FAO Statutory Bodies" CECAF initiated a process of review of its mandate, functions and structure. In particular, at its Fifteenth Session held in Abuja, Nigeria, from 1 to 3 November 2000, the Committee requested that a Technical Consultation on the Future of the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic be convened. This Technical Consultation was held in Lagos, Nigeria, from 27 to 30 November 2001. The Technical Consultation recalled that amendments had been made to the Terms of Reference of the Committee in 1992 and that further changes had taken place in West African fisheries which should also be reflected in the Terms of reference.

In particular, the Consultation was of the view that CECAF should be entrusted with wider scientific and technical functions, but that these should concentrate on a few key priority areas with regional or sub-regional focus taking into account matters followings within the preview of the Regular Programme of FAO.

The Technical Consultation identified, among these priorities: resource evaluation and inventory; coordination of research activities; development and maintenance of databases and related matters, assistance in fisheries management, advice on monitoring, control and surveillance, especially, as regards issues of regional and sub-regional interests.

The Technical Consultation proposed that these be reflected in revised Terms of Reference, which it referred for consideration by the Committee.

The Council is invited to review the matter. In particular Mr Chairman, I should like through you, to request the Council to approve the revised Terms of Reference in light of the recommendations made by CECAF. Secondly, the Council is requested to authorize the Director-General to promulgate the revised Terms of Reference of the Committee under the terms of Article VI, paragraph 2 of the FAO Constitution and pursuant Resolution 1/48 of the Fortieth Session of the FAO Council.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its 15 Member States. The European Community fully endorses the proposal to review the terms of reference of the Fishery Committee for the Central Eastern Atlantic, in accordance with the results reached by the Technical Consultation and consistent with their recommendations already made by the Sixteenth Session of the Committee.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Bon, le document est approuvé.

**16. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, including:**

**16. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques, dont:**

**16. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos, en particular:**

*16.5 Composition of the Programme and Finance Committees*

(CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)

*16.5 Composition du Comité du programme et du Comité financier*

(CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)

*16.5 Composición del Comité del Programa y del Comité de Finanzas*

(CL 124/INF/21; CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1)

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je voudrais donner la parole à M. Pucci pour introduire ce point.

**LEGAL COUNSEL**

As mentioned by you, Item 16.5 on the Composition of the Programme and Finance Committees was added to the Agenda of this Session of the Council upon the request of Japan, on behalf of the Asia group, in accordance with Rule XXV paragraph 7(b) of the General Rules of the Organization.

As an attachment to the letter requesting the insertion of the item in the agenda, the Permanent Representative of Japan submitted three options regarding the nomination formulae for the Programme and Finance Committees. The letter from Japan together with the attachment is submitted to the Council as document CL 124/INF/21. The Alternate Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to FAO, in his capacity as Chairman of the Asia Group, submitted a document providing background information to be considered under this Agenda item. This document was circulated as CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1.

In relation to this Agenda Item, it may be of interest to recall that at the Hundred and Twenty-second Session of the Council on 14 November 2001, "Members of the Asia and the Pacific Region proposed the existing formula for the representation of different Regions on the Programme and Finance Committees be reviewed. The proposal was supported by Members from other Regions. The Council agreed to discuss the matter at its next Session."

Further to that, a study on the matter was considered by the Committee on Constitution and Legal Matters in October 2002. The Committee on Constitution and Legal Matters was of the view that the study prepared by the Secretariat was a very complete and comprehensive one. However, it concluded that the whole question was essentially of a political nature. While expressing its readiness to consider the matter again in the future, the CCLM indicated that it could do so only

on the basis of options, orientations and guidance provided by the Council itself and decided to present the document in full to the Council.

At its Hundred and Twenty-third Session, held in October-November 2002, the Council considered and adopted the Report of the CCLM. At that time: “one Regional Group reiterated the importance of fair and equitable representation of Regions in the Programme and Finance Committees and the need to bring the composition of these Committees in line with the ground realities. The Council agreed that Regional Groups shall consult and report to the next Session of the Council in June 2003.” On the basis of this, the Asia Group has discussed and considered the issue and has defined some preliminary options for discussion at this Session of the Council.

**Hideki MORONUKI (Japan)**

As a proposal of this Sub-item, my delegation would like to take the floor on this matter.

I am taking the floor on behalf of Asia Group comprising 20 countries, the group with the largest population and the second biggest contributor to FAO. My delegation wishes to recall the discussion at the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the Council last year regarding the proposal of the Asia Group on the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees. As described in the Report of the Hundred and Twenty-third Session of the Council, it was agreed that Regional Groups should consult and report to this Session of the Council about the progress of this important issue.

Following this agreement, the Asia Group had intense considerations and elaborated proposed options on the change of the current nomination formulae and consulted with each Regional Group through its Chair countries. Actually this consultation process started about three months ago. Although the Asia Group has received only one official comment, in written form, I believe that each Regional Group has some opportunities to examine our proposed options and to be ready for discussions and exchange of views.

The proposed options for the Asia Group at this Session of the Council are attached to the document CL 124/INF/21. A brief explanation paper on the proposed options is also distributed as document CL 124/INF/21-Sup.1 for further reference.

This is the current state on this issue, and we welcome to have comments and suggestions from other Regional Groups.

Taking this opportunity, I wish to briefly explain about the basic ideas behind our proposed options. The first point is a creation of a new nominations stage including two regions which are composed of most developed and developing countries. As you are fully aware, the Asia Group had difficulties in nominating Members of the two Committees because of the number of Member Nations in our region and the unique nature of its composition. Therefore, I believe that this idea may contribute to the solution of the problem of this unique nature.

The second point is to limit the increase of members in minimal, taking into account only the concern of Asia Group since so far only Asia Group officially states its concern on the composition. Our proposed options suggest the increase of two members in the Finance Committee only.

The problem that the Asia Group is currently facing is quite serious and the Asia Group is sincerely wishing for the earliest solution to the problem, preferably at this Session of the Council. However, having said that the Asia Group also understands the complexity of this problem and as a regional group may have better ideas to solve the problem. Therefore, if members wish to have in-depth discussion on this issue before the final decision, Asia Group would suggest establishing a working group for elaborating of a better option accommodating all the concerns, thus, making the institutional framework of this organization more fitting to date.

Finally, my delegation on behalf of the Asia Group, sincerely wishes to come back to the next session of the Council in November with widely supported concrete proposals on this issue.

**Brett HUGHES (Australia)**

As co-Chair of the South West Pacific, I have listened with interest to the proposals put forward by Japan as it is an issue that would directly affect not only the Representation of the Southwest Pacific Region on these Committees but also the existing balance of Regional Representation in FAO. We, therefore, feel the need to respond directly.

We would however wish to say at the outset that we recognize the concerns of the Asia Group and in particular that of Japan as a significant donor to FAO. This, however, does not diminish our concerns with the proposal.

I would first wish to say that the idea has not been discussed in detail by all Regional Groups but are at this stage only the views of the Asia Group in isolation. I would also emphasize that given the late inclusion of the Japanese proposals formally on the Agenda, we have not had the opportunity to consult formally within our own Region on these proposals. It has also not been considered by any formal body of the organization. However it is clear that the ideas put forward would directly affect the interests of the Southwest Pacific Region and to be frank it appears to be a proposal that only serves the interests of the Asia Region and not the other Members of the organization.

The changes suggested by Japan would ultimately diminish the voice of the Southwest Pacific Region in the Governing Bodies of FAO, and this is unacceptable.

Further, I would also emphasize that not only does the proposal not benefit our Region; it is also not a means of ensuring a balance and fair representation across the Organization, a consideration we need to keep firmly in mind if we are to consider the long-term interests of the Organization and of maintaining genuine fair representation and a diversity of views.

We have also seen nothing in the proposals that convinces us of the need to change the current arrangements, which do maintain a fair and balanced approach to Representation. The current system serves the Organization well. The changes would only appear to serve the interests of the Asia Group. The Southwest Pacific Region is also a diverse Region with a growing Membership. This makes it all the more important that the current arrangements, which enable the effective Representation of the Region's Members views to be reflected in the considerations of FAO, be maintained.

Finally I would note that in relation to Japan's proposal for the establishment of a Working Group or mechanism to relay a consideration of this before the next Council, in relation to this, we would say that we cannot support this proposal as we do not consider a case has been made to do so.

We consider this issue as an internal one for the Asia Group and we would encourage the Group to find their own internal mechanisms to manage this without seeking to undermine the established system of representation and the interests of other Regions. We would also say that we have many more pressing issues on the Agenda for the FAO Council, and we would not wish to spend further time debating this issue.

**GUO HANDI (China) (Original language Chinese)**

On the composition of the Finance and Programme Committees of FAO, the Chinese Delegation could support the proposal put forward by Japan that this Session of the Council should have a discussion on this issue.

It is known to all that according to the original distribution of FAO, at the moment the Asia Group has 22 Member Nations with a total population of 3.22 billion people and a total area of 23.58 million square kilometres. It is a Region with the largest area and with the largest population. There are six countries whose population has reached one million people. According to the statistics of FAO, there are more than 500 million undernourished people in Asian countries, which amounts to more than 60 percent of the total in the world. The countries in this area are

quite worried. There are industrialized countries belonging to the OECD Group. There are also a lot of developing countries of the G-77 Group. It is our belief that in order that the composition of the two Committees could truly reflect the principle of fair geographical distribution, then it should give full consideration to the special situation in Asia and other Regions.

The issue of the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees has to reflect the interest of the Member Nations in Asia which have over 50 percent of the total population of the world and how to fairly reflect the concerns of the developed and the developing countries in the Asia Region is a realistic problem. Therefore, we hope that the Council could give adequate understanding and consideration to the opinions expressed by the Asian countries on the composition of the two Committees, and to adopt suitable actions to carry out a study on this question, so that we can seek an optimum solution to solve this problem.

**Govindan NAIR (India)**

The distinguished delegate from Japan has very ably explained the problems encountered by the Asia Group in nominating Members to the Programme and Finance Committees. As you know, the Asian Region represent a range of diversity beyond that of any other Region. Not only does Asia have the two most populous countries of the world that together represents every fourth person on this earth. However, there are also two industrialized countries, members of the OECD, in our Group.

We support the proposal of Japan to establish a Working Group to go into the matter of amending the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees to increase the representation of the Asia Region, and to bring them in line with the existing reality.

**Veli-Pekka TALVELA (Finland)**

I ask you to be so kind as to pass the floor to the delegation of Greece.

**Evangelos-Sarantis ANDRICOPOULOS (Observer for Greece)**

This statement is on behalf of the 15 Member States of the European Community. We note the proposal by Japan on behalf of the Asia Region Group to reform the method of election of the Members of the Programme and Finance Committees. However, the paper does not make it clear why such reform is needed, nor what the implications are of the proposed reform.

We recognize the importance of having Governing Body structures which fairly represent the current regional composition of the Membership. However, we believe that this is not the unique problem of governance and representation and the question of the representation on the Programme and Finance Committees cannot be seen in isolation. Regional representation should be examined across all Governing Bodies of FAO. We do think that this is not a timely or priority proposal.

**Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)**

We listened with interest when this subject was tabled and we would like to make our contribution to this debate. The Africa Group would like to register its support for the discussion of the topic, but for the following rationale. We realize that the current composition was decided upon in 1977. It served the interests of the Organization then. As of now, there is no harm in reviewing the situation and in determining whether it still meets the needs of the Membership. We are reviewing situations within the Organization in other aspects, and indeed within the UN as a whole. So I do not see any reason why we cannot look at the Programme and Finance Committees to see if their present composition and their reach to Members still meet the needs of the Membership.

From the outset I would not support any isolation of the review of this Organization by the membership. We would like to see a review that also takes into consideration the account of the needs of the other Regions. This would provide a wide consultation base within FAO and meet the requirements of the various Sub-regions. We would, therefore, urge a comprehensive review of the Membership across the board. We are ready for detailed discussions with other Member



Nations in the other Sub-regions on this matter and we hope that we could reach a firm position by November as to how we can proceed in the future.

**Dr HERMANTO (Indonesia)**

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the intervention by the distinguished representative from Japan with regard to the necessity of elaborating some options on the change of the current formula for the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees.

Speaking after the statement of our brothers China and India, it is already a given fact of the need to discuss and consider this matter. My delegation is of the view that this current formula brings about a difficulty to the Members of the Asia Region in the nomination of the representatives to both Committees, since we are all aware that these regions consist of the developed countries as well as developing countries. It also consists of one of the largest contributors to FAO, and three out of four countries with the largest populations in the world.

On the other side of the coin, we are also aware, that there is another Region that consists of both developed and developing countries. My delegation, therefore, hopes that the new formula will accommodate all the concerns surrounding these issues and better reflect the true nature and the reality of the composition in certain regions. Accordingly, my delegation strongly supports the proposal of the establishment of this Working Group that will elaborate a better formula options for both Committees.

Let me put on record my appreciation to the leader of the Zimbabwe delegation for giving us signals of the full understanding of the issues that the Asia Region submitted to you for our consideration. Again my thanks to the leader of the Zimbabwe delegation.

**Pavel SKODA (Czech Republic)**

I would like to ask you to give the floor to the Slovak Republic wishing to speak on behalf of the Member States of the European Region Group.

**Milan PAKSI (Observer for Slovakia)**

I am speaking in my capacity as the Chair of the European Regional Group.

This proposal tackles directly the position of the European Regional Group which is represented in both Committees and I will remind you that the European Regional Group represents more than 40 countries and also represents major contributors to FAO. This, therefore, is the reason for our deep concern on this issue.

Bearing in mind that this proposal relates only to one item, that is the composition of the statement made by the Programme and Finance Committees, the European Regional Group supports the statement European Community Presidency, namely Greece, that the issue has to be analyzed in its full complexity and that we cannot deal only with the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees.

We cannot work further on this topic without an analysis of the regional representation of all regions within all FAO Bodies.

**KIM EUNG-BON (Korea, Republic of)**

My delegation would like to strongly support the Japanese proposal supported by China, India and Indonesia regarding the composition of the Programme and Finance Committees. As mentioned by the Japanese delegate, my delegation thinks that the size and composition of the two Committees should be modified considering various changes such as increased Membership after the establishment of the current composition and increasing interest of Member Nations in joining the two Committees.

I would also like to support the Japanese proposal to establish a Working Group on this issue. If the Working Group is composed of Regional Chairs, it would be very reasonable and practical in elaborating better options among our Regions.

**José A. QUINTERO (Cuba)**

Pido que le conceda el uso de la palabra al Representante de la República Dominicana que va a hablar en nombre del GRULAC.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

El Grupo de Países de América Latina y el Caribe desea hacer notar que ha llegado a conocimiento de este tema hace muy poco tiempo, por lo cual hemos apenas abordado el mismo desde una óptica muy general. Las opciones que presenta Asia son muy específicas y no las hemos estudiado en profundidad ni con la seriedad que merecen ser estudiadas las propuestas de cualquier país y de cualquier Región y, por consiguiente mucho menos podemos presentar nuestra opinión sobre las otras propuestas que se han apenas presentado en la Sala Plenaria.

Nuestra primera impresión es que el tema debe ser estudiado. No estamos presentando una posición en este momento sobre la conformación o no de Grupos de Trabajo, si debe examinarse el todo o si deben examinarse solamente los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas. Reservamos nuestra opinión sobre estos temas para más adelante, sin embargo deseamos dejar claro que nuestras dos primeras impresiones son: primero, que el tema podría ser considerado intercambiando impresiones al interno de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas y posteriormente estudiarlo tomando en consideración las opiniones vertidas, porque son los Miembros de estos comités los que mejor conocen cómo vienen trabajando. En segundo lugar es que queremos dejar muy claro que el GRULAC sostiene que sólo aceptaríamos modificaciones al número de Miembros de estos Comités si este incremento es universal, es decir debe ser igual para los siete grupos regionales representados en estos Comités y que ningún grupo debe ser perjudicado en su representación.

**Pinit KORSIEPORN (Thailand)**

My country fully associates with the statement by Japan. My delegation urges our fellow members to discuss this issue at this Session. I am not convinced that this proposal only serves the interest of the Asia Group as mentioned by Australia. Instead, this proposal is the business of the Organization. The current composition of the two Committees, Finance and Programme Committees, were adopted 26 years ago. Time has changed; Members have changed and several other things, including the work of FAO. It is time to review this. I do not understand why some countries are afraid to discuss this issue. I strongly support that the Working Group be established.

**Bashar AKBIAK (Syria) (Original language Arabic)**

In principle, any Regional Group is fully entitled to air its views and to submit the proposals it deems in its own interest. It is not fair not to listen to the proposals of any group and to try to understand the points of view of these Groups. That is why, on behalf of the Near East Group, I should like to support the idea, or the proposal of Japan, whereby a Working Group would be set up with the cooperation of experts from within the Organization, particularly those specializing in the affairs of the Programme and Finance Committees in order to establish what are the advantages and disadvantages of such a proposal and what are its implications. On that basis of the outcome of this consultation, we can reach the necessary or adequate solution.

**Mrs Maria Luisa GAVINO (Philippines)**

My delegation would like to support the Japanese statement in its entirety and I will not repeat what he had said and the rest of my colleagues in Asia. My delegation would like to appeal for the Council to consider the Asia Group proposal to at least establish a Working Group so that we have a chance to study the matter and give the proper merits it will deserve.

**Richard J. HUGHES (United States of America)**

The United States of America supports the remarks made by Australia, the European Community and GRULAC. We believe this is not a timely proposal, and we would need time to consider the proposal and its implications for the Regional Groups of FAO.

**Robert SABIITI (Observer for Uganda)**

I would like to give the Council the general feeling - I am not saying the agreed consensus - of the Group of 77 Members when this subject was discussed in their own forum. The Group, with only a few exceptions, was of the view that the countries that feel that they are not sufficiently represented on these very important operational Committees had the right to express their feelings and their observations. It is certainly in order that if befitting, this Council should undertake a study to see to what extent their complaint is actually correct and deserves looking into. So from that standpoint, I would like to say that the proposal before us from Japan, and others, I think should in fairness, be supported by us. After all it is going to be a study, a Working Group that will enable us to be able to give fair judgement to the feelings of the people of Asia and elsewhere where they may be feeling likewise.

I would like to air those views and express the support, not only the G-77 but also the Uganda Delegation we would certainly go along with the establishment of the Working Group to be able to give wisdom in these aspects to all of us.

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

I would just like to comment briefly as co-chair of the Southwest Pacific Region which is probably the Region most affected by the Japanese proposal. I would say also that, the proposal has not, as it has been obvious in discussion today, has not been discussed in detail by all Regional Groups and nor has it been discussed by any formal body of this Organization.

First of all I would like to say, that we fully understand where the Asia Group is coming from and where Japan is coming from. Japan is the second largest donor in the Organization and we can understand why it needs to be on those two Committees. I think our problem is that the proposal as it is at the moment exports the Japanese problem to another Region. There is absolutely nothing in that proposal that benefits the Southwest Pacific Region, quite on the contrary it is taking it out of our hide and I do notice that the GRULAC Group has said that in looking at this it should be to the detriment of no other Regional Group.

New Zealand is, I believe, diversity, and I should say that the Southwest Pacific Region is a very diverse Region. From very very small countries of less than 2 000 population to medium-size countries like Australia, and unlike the Asia Group it also has a diversity of developed and developing countries. So I think if changes are to be made, along the way the Japanese and the Asia Group have suggested, FAO is going to lose the opportunity to listen to that diversity. I think the other point, too, that is quite important, is that those two Committees are regional seats and so again reflect the views of the Region. With deference to my Japanese colleagues, I wonder how they would feel or be able to represent a country of 2 000 people like Niue.

In conclusion, we recognize the problem, we want to work with Japan to find an equitable solution but I must say, that the way the proposal has been directed against our Region, we would have to say no.

**Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

En mi anterior intervención especifiqué que quería ser breve en atención a lo avanzado de la hora y por eso pido disculpas a la sala por volver a intervenir pero deseo clarificar algunos puntos. Las distinguidas delegaciones de Estados Unidos y Uganda se refirieron ambas a la intervención del GRULAC, una de manera directa y otra de manera indirecta para sostener dos puntos de vista excluyentes y por eso es que debo intervenir.

El GRULAC, no está tomando partido ni a favor ni en contra de la propuesta del Grupo de Trabajo por una razón muy sencilla, o quizás por dos razones: la primera es porque no la hemos estudiado y la segunda es porque, al momento de estudiarla, surgirán sin alguna duda elementos de naturaleza política y técnica que nos obligarán a analizar esta cuestión con la seriedad y profundidad que merece. En la intervención de la distinguida Representación de Nueva Zelandia sí se reflejó con exactitud uno de los elementos que mencioné a nombre del GRULAC y es que en el momento en que se trate este argumento el GRULAC adoptará posiciones muy claras y muy

específicas, muy responsables y muy transparentes, como siempre hemos tenido, sólo aceptaríamos un cambio en la composición de los Comités bajo dos premisas: que haya un incremento para todos los Grupos y que ningún Grupo se perjudique y lo específico más aún. La próxima composición no debe reducir la representación de ninguna de las regiones tal y como está en este momento. Espero que esta intervención aclare la posición del GRULAC.

**N.F.C. RANAWEERA (Sri Lanka)**

First for the record, Sri Lanka wishes to state that it totally supports the proposal given by Japan and it also appreciates the difficulty that some regions will face, if at all, it is implemented in totality. However, I think Sri Lanka supports the suggestion that a Working Group be established in order to study the implications of such a proposal so that nobody really gets hurt in the long run. I can understand concerns expressed by some of the Regions and some of the Countries. But I think it does not preclude the need to have a study made and discuss all the considerations and all the implications of such a proposal.

**Ms Nasrin AKHTER (Observer for Bangladesh)**

I would like to extend our delegation's thanks to you as we are taking the first time the floor in this Session.

Actually, I will not repeat what on behalf of the Asia Group, Japan's Delegation has said or all other Members have mentioned. I would actually like to point that timeliness of this proposal, after 26 years forming the composition of a Committee, how come it is not timely? Having said this, I would like to thank Zimbabwe, Syria, New Zealand for just considering reviewing the proposal of Japan for there being a Working Group and for extending their support to the Asia Group. I am supporting Japan's proposal.

**Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

If there is a need for change, we should reach over from it, the question is whether there is need. If the whole Region has raised a point that ought to be considered, I think we should be at least as one of the delegates said, at least give them a chance, and I am, therefore, in line with the comment made by the Chairman of the Africa Group, that let the matter be discussed openly. At the end of the day it is possible that other issues may pop up, and it is also possible that other regions may even benefit. Let us have this matter up for discussion.

Some Members have raised the point that the matter had not been discussed at other formal bodies of this Organization. I do not know which other formal bodies of this Organization we are talking about. Are we suggesting that the matter ought to have been discussed at the Programme and Finance Committees first? Or are we suggesting that matter should go from the Conference and come down to us, the other way around? Are we suggesting that the Regional Groups should formally discuss and take a position? We have to have a starting point if we do accept, but I do not agree that the matter should be thrown out because it is not yet time. I do not think that there is anything about the Membership of the Committee that we need to do. It is when this Council decides, then it is time to look at it.

Since a Member has indicated that they want the matter looked at, I fully support the Chairman of the Africa Group that the matter should be looked at, whether it is starting at the level of the Programme and Finance Committees or it is starting at the level of the Working Group, that has been suggested, that is another matter.

**Moungui MÉDI (Cameroun)**

Nous reconnaissons la valeur de la proposition qui a été apportée par le Groupe de l'Asie, à travers le Représentant du Japon, et les propositions qui sont contenues dans le document, et le droit de faire une telle proposition leur est tout à fait reconnu. Nous pensons, comme l'a dit la Représentante du Zimbabwe, au nom du Groupe africain, qu'il faudrait essayer de tendre une oreille attentive à chaque proposition venant d'un pays qui a le droit de faire des propositions. Encore plus quand il s'agit d'un Groupe.

Mon collègue du Nigéria, qui a parlé tout juste avant moi, m'a plus ou moins pris le mot. Je pense que cette proposition qui est maintenant sur notre table nous prend un peu de court, parce que si nous avions eu le temps, dans nos Groupes régionaux, de l'examiner *a priori*, nous aurions peut-être pu prendre maintenant une position tranchée. Mais ce n'est pas le cas. L'Asie a des représentants dans l'OCDE. Je pense qu'ils auraient pu, en toute humilité, poser ce problème, en premier lieu, à l'OCDE. L'Asie a aussi des membres dans le Groupe des 77 qui auraient pu également y amener ce problème afin qu'il soit débattu à l'intérieur du Groupe de manière à ce que nous soyons déjà au courant de cette demande. Mais, nous, le Groupe des 77, ainsi que les autres différents Groupes, retrouvons cette question maintenant au Conseil et cela nous prend un peu de court, ce qui fait que nous ne sommes pas préparés à réagir. Nous sommes pourtant favorables à toute demande d'amendement et nous le restons jusqu'à preuve négative.

Ceci dit, nous aurons peut-être des difficultés au cours de ce Conseil à mettre en place un Groupe de travail et à lui donner des termes de référence. Parce que si nous acceptons maintenant de mettre en place un Groupe de travail, il faudrait, avant samedi, avoir préparé des termes de référence pour ce Groupe de travail. Quand va-t-on le mettre en place? Qui va réfléchir sur ses termes de référence? Voilà donc autant de petits problèmes qui se posent et sur lesquels nous devons nous pencher. Nous restons, cependant, ouverts à tout débat engagé par le Groupe de l'Asie.

**Michihiro TAMURA (Japan)**

I apologise for taking up the floor again but the reason is that my statement might have been a little misunderstood by some of the Members, so I would like to clarify some of the points.

Firstly, I would like to appreciate those delegations who showed the understanding and the sympathy of our issue. This is not the Japanese issue, this is an issue of the Asia Group. This issue was fully shared by the members of Asia Group and I appreciate their understanding and sympathy.

Secondly, the Asia Group has no intention of imposing our options on other Regions. We are simply taking the initiative for trying to make the system a little better, because this issue of composition, of these important two Committees, our perception is this issue is not only for the Asia Group itself but could be shared by other Regions as well. I have been experiencing similar difficulties in selecting certain limited number of Membership. We usually face this kind of problem, so our intention is to take the initiative for dealing this kind of commonly-observed problem across the Region, this is our intention.

Thirdly, concerning the Working Group, of course, nothing has been fully discussed in detail about the composition but after consultation and discussion among the Asia Group, the idea is, of course, to obtain the broad representation from every Region, so the chairs of the Regional Group could be in a position to participate in this kind of Working Group with their friends or colleagues from each Region, securing the broader representation for proceeding with this Working Group.

Fourth, again relating to our intention, what we are trying to do is to make the system of this Organization smoother and fairer. This is actually for the benefit of the Organization itself, not merely for one or two Regions. So that is our intention and again for the purpose of making progressive improvement of the Organization, we are very disappointed that some of the Members mentioned that this kind of initiative did not deserve to be considered further. We should take a positive step and this is a way we can improve our Organization.

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

I am very sorry to come back, but very briefly, just to correct a misapprehension, that New Zealand did not support. also just to say that this is not the first time this issue has come up. It has come up in CCLM time and time again. It has been studied and re-studied and are we going to be able to reach a conclusion this time. I think it is important that, as the GRULAC Representative mentioned, that any sort of decision on an issue as important on this must be on the basis of consensus.

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Nous avons donc sur la table plusieurs propositions du Japon. Nous avons une proposition pour la création d'un Groupe de travail mais je ne vois pas, pour l'instant, le consensus à cette création. Je voudrais également signaler que, si on devait créer un Groupe de travail, il faudrait en étudier la question du coût budgétaire. Manifestement nous n'avons pas l'unanimité, ni un consensus. Il y a, bien entendu, beaucoup de Régions, et notamment la Région Asie, qui y est très favorable ainsi que le Groupe Afrique. Certains groupes seraient éventuellement favorables mais souhaiteraient étudier d'avantage la question et avoir plus d'éléments. Le Moyen-Orient appuie également l'idée du Groupe de travail. Je crois que la meilleure solution serait que les Groupes régionaux continuent à se consulter pour peut-être arriver à un consensus à notre prochaine réunion du Conseil. Je vois d'ailleurs que l'idée du Groupe de travail a quand même fait son chemin, puisqu'aujourd'hui, nous avons plusieurs régions qui l'appuient. Si vous êtes d'accord avec mon interprétation des interventions des délégations, nous pourrions peut-être continuer ces consultations d'ici à la prochaine réunion du Conseil. Mais je suggère que ces consultations aient vraiment lieu afin d'arriver au Conseil avec des idées un peu plus claires et surtout avec un consensus fait.

### **Michihiro TAMURA (Japan)**

Do I understand correctly that this issue, after hearing your comments, could be one of the Agenda Items in our Council meeting next time in November?

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Cela pourrait être un des points de l'Ordre du jour de la prochaine réunion du Conseil, si tout le monde approuve.

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

We have had a useful hearing of views here and we have also heard considerable divergence in views in relation to this issue. Having heard what others have said, you are correct in summarizing that there was no consensus, no unanimity. There was also a range of views that indicated that the time was not right to deal with this issue, and it was not a priority to be dealt with.

There was no consensus on convening a Working Group to study this further. I do not believe there was a consensus on a way forward to consider this further, including on informal consultations between here and the next Council, so we cannot endorse the conclusion that you just drew in relation to further informal consultations.

We believe that we would get to the next Council and find ourselves in the same position.

## **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Y a-t-il d'autres interventions? Donc, si je comprends bien, seule l'Australie estime qu'on ne devrait pas avoir de consultations d'ici au prochain Conseil.

### **Gabriel Ganyir LOMBIN (Nigeria)**

I have great sympathy for the views expressed by those who are a bit apprehensive of the proposal, but what is the meaning of an informal consultation - that we have to seek the permission of this Council in order for the Africa Group to discuss this subject? Is that what we are being told?

I do not know the meaning of informal consultation if we have to get formal approval to do that. I do not think that this is the essence the Chairman intends to convey. I thought the idea was that they had Regional Groups so that they could discuss this amongst themselves and at the end of the day see if the matter was worthy, but here the aspect of coming to this Council is a different ball game altogether.

Surely, I do not want to be told in my own Regional Group that we cannot even raise it because the Council has said we should not raise it. I hope that is not the correct understanding.

**Anthony BEATTIE (United Kingdom)**

I wonder if I might suggest the following.

There is no point in the Council discussing this issue unless there is broad agreement beforehand that it is an issue worth discussing and the Council has some machinery in mind for handling it. We are clearly not in that position and I do not think that it would be appropriate to draw the conclusion now, that this Council wishes to see the subject on the Agenda of the next Council.

It seems to me in the light of what has been said this evening, that the right thing to do is for the Asia Group to continue to consult informally with other Regional Groups. If they can then establish a consensus with other Regional Groups that this item should be on the Agenda of the next Council, they can make a proposal to that effect, as they have for this Council and the Council can then have a discussion about how to deal with the issue.

I do not believe that there is sufficient ground at this stage to put the item on the Agenda of the next Council. So informal consultations can continue and it will then be for the Asia Group to decide, in the light of those consultations, whether they have sufficient backing to make it worth discussing this at the next Council.

**Yohannes TENSUE (Observer for Eritrea)**

The proposal will not only limit the Programme and Finance Committees. Every country has the right to request an insertion in the agenda of the Council to review how the compositions of different regional allocations or groups are done. Notwithstanding the remarks of the United Kingdom and others, no-one has the right to block the request. For the sake of compromise, if the Working Group was allowed to discuss this topic they could be prepared to defend it even if the Session of the Council does not agree with it.

We should be prepared to agree on this. In fact, if this is blocked, it could be agreed that the idea was a good one and it should have been said. It might be said that the reason given by Japan was not convincing. However, other elements could be considered, other options put forward and the regions may well be accommodated. This is asking how we can be a Group and if we review the problem we could arrive at a solution. So, there is nothing wrong in bringing this issue to the next Council if they know what element to consider, what issues and options to consider, even I may come with a silly proposal if they could accommodate the Regions who have few countries, some of those who are ? It is not selling the countries, but just how we can group and this reviewing process could help and solve the problem. So there is nothing wrong in consulting and bringing the issue to the next Council.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Y a-t-il d'autres interventions? Je vais essayer de conclure. Je crois que les Groupes régionaux peuvent continuer à se rencontrer, à essayer de se consulter. Bien entendu, toute région, tout pays a le droit de demander l'inscription d'un point particulier à l'Ordre du jour du Conseil. Nous verrons, d'ici au prochain Conseil, s'il y a une évolution de cette question. Ce que je propose, c'est que les Groupes régionaux ou le Groupe Asie, continuent à avoir des consultations avec les autres Groupes régionaux pour essayer de faire avancer cette question.

Je crois que nous pouvons conclure ici ce point de l'Ordre du jour.

Je vous demande la permission de vous quitter parce que j'ai une réunion et je passe donc la présidence à l'Ambassadeur Noori-Naeini. Mais avant de vous quitter, je voudrais vous remercier pour tout le travail que nous avons fait jusqu'à maintenant. Je voudrais également vous dire qu'il serait souhaitable, et je crois que nous pouvons le faire, de terminer nos travaux demain soir. On demandera au Comité de rédaction d'être très efficace.

Merci Monsieur l'Ambassadeur Noori-Naeini, je vous passe la présidence.

*Mohammad Saeid Noori-Naeini, Vice-Chairperson, took the Chair*  
*Mohammad Saeid Noori-Naeini, Vice-présidents assume la présidence*  
*Ocupa la presidencia Mohammad Saeid Noori-Naeini*

**CHAIRMAN**

There are two, maybe three, three items; hopefully we can read them very quickly.

**17. Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and Other Main Sessions 2003-2004**  
 (CL 124/INF/8)

**17. Calendrier 2003-2004 révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des autres réunions principales de la FAO** (CL 124/INF/8)

**17. Calendario revisado para 2003-2004 de los períodos de sesiones de los órganos rectores y de otras reuniones importantes de la FAO** (CL 124/INF/8)

**CHAIRMAN**

The first one is Item 17, Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and Other Main Sessions 2003-2004. There changes to this calendar are shown the document, CL 124/INF/8. Item 2 has been changed, having been identified by an asterisk.

One important change is the Regional Conference for Africa, which will not take place from 9 to 13 February, but from 1 to 5 March 2004. Are there any other comments on any other items?

Thank you for having adopted the calendar.

I would like to inform you that the next Council session will be from 26 to 28 November 2003. This will be right before the Thirty-second Session of the Conference.

**10. Preparations for the 32nd Session of the FAO Conference** (CL 124/12)

**10. Préparatifs de la trente-deuxième session de la Conférence de la FAO** (CL 124/12)

**10. Preparativos para el 32º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO** (CL 124/12)

*10.3 Nomination of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of Commission I and Commission II*

*10.3 Nominations des candidatures aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions I et II*

*10.3 Presentación de candidaturas para los cargos de Presidente de la Conferencia y presidentes de las comisiones I y II*

*10.4 Nomination of Nine Members of the Credentials Committee (Countries)*

*10.4 Nomination des candidatures des neuf membres de la Commission de vérification des pouvoirs (pays)*

*10.4 Presentación de candidaturas para nueve miembros del Comité de Credenciales (países)*

**CHAIRMAN**

We have already been informed that Austria will chair Commission I, and that a Member Nation from the G-77 group will chair Commission II. New Zealand will chair the Conference. In this connection, I now inform the Council that following the consultations among the regional groups I am pleased to state that the Credentials Committee's nominations are ready and as follows:

They are: Argentina, Armenia, Bangladesh, Canada, El Salvador, Greece, New Zealand, Uganda, Slovenia and Sudan.

The Regional Groups are also in accord with the designation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, to chair the Commission II of the Conference.

This was the information regarding documents CL 124/INF/8 and with this, if there are no comments, I can conclude this item.



**18. Any Other Matters****18. Autres question****18. Otros asuntos**

*18.1 Margarita Lizárraga Medal (CL 124/INF/13)*

*18.1 Médaille Margarita Lizárraga (CL 124/INF/13)*

*18.1 Medalla Margarita Lizárraga (CL 124/INF/13)*

Now we move to Item 18, Other Matters. Item 18.1, Margarita Lizárraga Medal, the document is CL 124/INF/13 and I am pleased to ask Mr Nomura, Assistant Director-General of the Fisheries Department, to introduce this agenda Item.

**Ichiro NOMURA (Assistant Director-General, Fisheries Department)**

The FAO Conference at its Twenty-ninth Session in November 1997, by Resolution 18/97, instituted that the Margarita Lizárraga Medal to be awarded biennially by the Conference upon the proposal of the Council to a person or organization that has served with distinction in the application of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

For the 2002-2003 biennium ten nominations were received. This is double the number of nominations received for the past two biennia.

The Selection Committee met in FAO Headquarters in Rome on 26 February 2003 during the Twenty-fifth Session of the Committee on Fisheries. The Meeting was chaired by Mr David Harcharik, Deputy Director-General of FAO. The Meeting reviewed the applications on the basis of the following criteria: Outstanding practical and hands-on contribution to the application of the Code; the output should be tangible; be a sustained effort and not a one off initiative and; have the potential for a snow-ball/catalytic effect.

The Selection Committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the Council proposes the awarding of the Margarita Lizárraga Medal for the 2003-2004 biennium to the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF). The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers has, by its comprehensive, sustainable and catalytic initiatives through workshops, outreach and advocacy activities, mobilized grassroots support and enhanced human capacity-building for the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Its information dissemination through its widely-circulated flagship magazine SAMUDRA has increased awareness about the Code and contributed to national fishery policy formulation and implementation in accordance with the Code's principles and articles.

You may wish, among other things, to invite the Council to endorse the nomination of the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers and recommend that the Medal be presented to the Representative of International Collective in Support of Fishworkers by the Director-General, as part of the proceedings of the Thirty-second Session of the Conference.

I wish to inform you that the Committee on Fisheries at its Twenty-fifth Session welcomed the decision of the Government of Mexico to provide additional financial resources to the Trust Fund that had been set up to help FAO award the Margarita Lizárraga Medal. In this respect, I wish to express the gratitude of FAO to the Government of Mexico, which has already made a contribution to the Trust Fund.

I take this opportunity to reiterate the call by the delegation of Mexico at the last Session of the Committee on Fisheries that all Members' Governments of FAO should join this initiative and thus provide additional funds to the Trust Fund.

**Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)**

México desea expresar su profundo agradecimiento a la FAO por mantener vivo el recuerdo de una mexicana ejemplar. Margarita Lizárraga emprendió siempre un trabajo sistemático y decidido para hacer realidad el Código Internacional de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable que se ha constituido en pocos años en la referencia obligada para las políticas y normas que en materia de

pesca emanan de esta Organización. El presidente del Comité de Pesca, mexicano, para el período de sesiones realizado este año, participó en la reunión del Comité de Selección para otorgar la medalla al Colectivo Internacional de Apoyo al Pescador Artesanal, el mismo que reúne las características para hacerse merecedor de la citada distinción. Por ello mi delegación apoya la recomendación de dicho comité a favor de esa cooperativa pesquera con sede en la India.

Mi Gobierno considera que debe fortalecerse esta distinción que otorga la FAO, única que reconoce hasta ahora la trayectoria de un funcionario de su programa regular de personal. En ese sentido sería conveniente que el Departamento de Pesca difundiera oportunamente también entre las representaciones permanentes con sede en Roma, la convocatoria a dicha distinción. Sería conveniente que la misma convocatoria contenga de manera precisa las fechas de inicio y conclusión para la presentación de candidaturas. También resultaría conveniente que las representaciones permanentes en la FAO conocieran la composición del Comité de Selección.

Finalmente, como ya le informé atinadamente el Sr. Nomura quien merece todo nuestro aprecio, el pasado 4 de marzo mi país cumplió su promesa para contribuir con recursos extra presupuestarios para el otorgamiento de la medalla Margarita Lizárraga y deseamos renovar el llamado a todas las representaciones para que se unan a este esfuerzo y puedan mantener esta noble distinción que otorga nuestra Organización.

### **18. Any Other Matters**

#### **18. Autres question**

#### **18. Otros asuntos**

*18.2 Appointment of a Representative of the FAO Conference to the Staff Pension Committee (CL 124/2-Rev.1)*

*18.2 Nomination d'un représentant de la Conférence de la FAO au Comité de la Caisse des pensions du personnel (CL 124/2-Rev.1)*

*18.2 Nombramiento del Representante de la Conferencia de la FAO en el Comité de Pensiones del Personal (CL 124/2-Rev.1)*

### **CHAIRMAN**

We are now dealing with the nomination of the Representative to the Pension Committee and the document is CL 124/2-Rev.1. Mr. Chris Richard, who is the Deputy Representative of the United States of America, has been transferred and a new appointment is, therefore, necessary to complete the mandate that remains.

The Council is asked to confirm Mr. Bruce Burton, again Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States of America to FAO. The term runs until 31 December 2004. Is there full agreement for this nomination? This has been approved and this Item is concluded.

*Approved*

*Approuvé*

*Aprobado*

### **Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO (Observador de la República Dominicana)**

Trataré de leer este documento lo más rápido posible, los intérpretes tienen copia, para que podamos abandonar la sala lo antes posible.

Es una intervención del GRULAC sobre un tema general. El GRULAC desea traer al Consejo una preocupación con el único objetivo de contribuir en un espíritu positivo a mejorar los procedimientos de la Organización para que las distintas representaciones de todas las regiones puedan tener una participación más abierta y productiva en las deliberaciones. Esta preocupación contribuiría a que se incremente el rendimiento cuantitativo y cualitativo de todos los Estados Miembros de la FAO. Se trata de los métodos actualmente en práctica para la elaboración de las agendas de los Comités Temáticos. Sabemos que las Reglas Generales prevén consultas entre la Secretaría y los presidentes de las mesas antes de elaborar el proyecto de agenda de cada reunión con plazos mínimos para obtener una adecuada retroalimentación. Todos sabemos que la

Secretaría cumple esta obligación con transparencia aunque en algunas ocasiones por razones diversas los plazos efectivos han sufrido recortes. Dentro de este proceso y aunque esto no se encuentra previsto en los reglamentos, lo lógico, razonable y natural sería que cada presidente consultase a su vez con los demás Miembros de su mesa y con ello en la práctica repartir la responsabilidad de hacer aportes a cada proyecto de Agenda entre todos los grupos regionales. La alternativa que el GRULAC propone, es que la Secretaría inicie la saludable práctica de reunirse con el presidente de cada mesa en cumplimiento de las Reglas Generales y solicite convocar a los demás Miembros de la directiva para que éstos convoquen a sus respectivos grupos regionales de modo que el proceso de consulta se amplíe y la Agenda gane en calidad y profundidad con los aportes que serían presentados. La práctica actual ofrece poca oportunidad a las distintas delegaciones para examinar los temas con la profundidad y atención que éstos merecen. Reiteramos que esta posición es de crítica constructiva y deseamos que la FAO continúe acercándose a los Gobiernos, a las delegaciones y que esté cada día más en sintonía con nuestras expectativas e intereses, no sólo de los Estados Miembros del GRULAC sino de toda la Organización.

**Mooneshwar RAMTHOHUL (Mauritius)**

Under any other matters, I would just like to inform delegates and the Council that the delegation of Mauritius would like to place on record and congratulate the Secretariat of FAO for its very comprehensive Paper CL 124/INF/19 on the activities of FAO in support of the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. This document highlights the various challenges facing these countries and the support given to them by FAO to overcome the current marginalization from global markets, to adapt the technological change, all in an environment of declining external investment in agriculture.

With regard to paragraph 19, I would like to inform Council of the preparation of the International Meeting on the Review of the Barbados Programme of Action of the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States convened by the United Nations, which will be held in Mauritius from 30 August to 3 September 2004.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL**

The Drafting Committee will meet immediately in the Mexico Room and all day tomorrow in the Mexico Room in order to complete its work and we will meet again on Saturday morning at 11.00 hours here to adopt the Report of the Council.

**CHAIRMAN**

The only thing that I have to do before that is to congratulate the Members of the Drafting Committee for a long night and day before them. Have a nice evening and see you on Saturday morning at 11.00 hours.

*The meeting rose at 20.25 hours*

*La séance est levée à 20 h 25*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 20.25 horas*



# COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<b>Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session Cent vingt-quatrième session 124º período de sesiones</b>
<b>Rome, 23 – 28 June 2003 Rome, 23 - 28 juin 2003 Roma, 23 - 28 de junio de 2003</b>
<b>NINTH PLENARY MEETING NEUVIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE NOVENA SESIÓN PLENARIA</b>
<b>28 June 2003</b>

The Ninth Plenary Meeting was opened at 11.05 hours  
Mr Aziz Mekouar,  
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La neuvième séance plénière est ouverte à 11 h 05  
sous la présidence de M. Aziz Mekouar,  
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la novena sesión plenaria a las 11.05 horas  
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Aziz Mekouar,  
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

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

**DRAFT REPORT - PARTS 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)**  
**LES PROJETS DE RAPPORT - PARTIES 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)**  
**LOS PROYECTOS DE INFORME, PARTES 1 - 10 (CL 124/REP/1-10)**

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je déclare ouverte la neuvième séance de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil. Il s'agit d'adopter le rapport de la session.

J'invite les Membres du Conseil à s'assurer et qu'il ont bien avec eux les différentes parties du rapport. Les parties sont au nombre de dix et portent les références CL 124/REP/1, CL 124/REP/2, etc., jusqu'à CL 124/REP/10.

J'aimerais demander à Monsieur Samuel Yegon du Kenya, qui a présidé le Comité de rédaction, de présenter le rapport.

**Samuel Cherunge YEGON (Chairman, Drafting Committee)**

We had a very busy Drafting Committee Session, which took us a total of eighteen hours. Some were late at night in order to complete the work you gave to us. We had very serious and constructive discussions in connection with all the items we covered. We all worked in a good spirit, took time to listen to every region's views, of course, conscious of the heavy responsibilities you gave us and with the hope of satisfying every region.

Hopefully, this consensus report presented to you will meet your expectations. We made all efforts to reflect what actually took place in the Plenary. Of course, we had to rely on consensus. We could not put everything in our Report.

Before I conclude, I wish to take this opportunity to thank all the Drafting Committee Members and I wish to specifically thank the Vice-Chairman, the Representative of Germany, who was kind enough to assist and chair some of the Sessions. The Sessions were sometimes too long, and he came in very handy.

My special thanks also goes to the Drafting Committee's Secretary, Secretariat representatives at the Session, interpreters and all those who participated in one way or another in making our work progress smoothly.

My duty is just to present the report to you and to this Plenary for your consideration and adoption.

**LE PRÉSIDENT**

Je souhaite remercier les Membres du Comité de rédaction pour le travail accompli et les longues heures passées dans la salle du Comité de rédaction.

Je voudrais donc savoir si le Conseil souhaite adopter le rapport de la session en bloc. Y a-t-il des observations à ce sujet? Il me semble qu'il n'y a pas d'observation et que nous pouvons adopter le rapport en bloc. Le rapport de la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil est adopté.

*Adopted*

*Adopté*

*Aprobado*

*Applause*

*Applaudissements*

*Aplausos*

Je souhaite maintenant inviter le Directeur général à s'adresser au Conseil. Je voudrais, avant de passer la parole à Monsieur le Directeur général, vous remercier tous pour ce travail magnifique accompli, la rapidité des travaux et la manière constructive dont nous avons tous travaillé pendant une semaine.

### **LE DIRECTEUR GÉNÉRAL**

Je voudrais naturellement, exprimer, ma satisfaction en voyant que le travail s'est déroulé dans d'excellentes conditions et que nous sommes arrivés à un consensus qui reflète l'esprit d'universalisme du Système des Nations Unies et notre souhait de travailler tous ensemble pour régler des grands problèmes, notamment celui de la faim dans le monde.

Je voudrais remercier tout particulièrement le Président pour les efforts qu'il a fait pour arriver à un consensus dans un cadre d'esprit dynamique mais qui tienne aussi compte des vues de l'ensemble des parties de cette institution.

Je voudrais aussi remercier tous les groupes qui ont travaillé parfois très tard, à des heures même impossibles, pour pouvoir arriver à une entente. C'est cet esprit de dialogue et ce souhait d'écouter l'autre et de comprendre que nous venons d'horizons divers, que nous avons des problèmes différents mais que nous avons tous le même but qui est d'arriver à un monde plus juste où il n'y a plus 840 millions de personnes qui se couchent le ventre creux, qui nous ont tous animé.

J'ose espérer aussi que malgré les difficultés que les uns et les autres peuvent rencontrer dans la conduite de l'économie de leur pays, dont les résultats sont sujets à de nombreux facteurs extérieurs, nous aurons à l'esprit de maintenir le cap au sein de cette Institution et de lui donner les moyens de travailler, parce que sans ces moyens, naturellement, nous ne serons pas en mesure de répondre à vos attentes et à vos exigences de sérieux, de compétence, d'efficacité et de professionnalisme, et surtout à votre attente de résultats.

Je voudrais, encore une fois, vous remercier et vous dire la disponibilité du Secrétariat à continuer à travailler avec vous pour aboutir à un budget, qui je l'espère en décembre, sera en mesure de nous permettre de continuer l'excellent travail qui a été commencé.

### **LE PRÉSIDENT**

Puisque nous avons clôturé nos travaux, nous avons bien travaillé, je vais déclarer, si vous le permettez, la cent vingt-quatrième session du Conseil close. Á très bientôt.

*The meeting rose at 11.15 hours*

*La séance est levée à 11 h 15*

*Se levanta la sesión a las 11.15 horas*