

June 2013



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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones Unidas
para la
Alimentación y la
Agricultura

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE CONFERENCIA

Thirty-eighth Session - Trente-huitième session - 38.º período de sesiones

**Rome, 15-22 June 2013
VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II
OF THE CONFERENCE**

**Rome, 15-22 juin 2013
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES DE LA COMMISSION II
DE LA CONFÉRENCE**

**Roma, 15-22 de junio de 2013
ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISIÓN II
DE LA CONFERENCIA**

**CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE
CONFERENCIA**

Thirty-eighth Session - Trente-huitième session - 38.º período de sesiones

**Rome, 15-22 June 2013
VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II
OF THE CONFERENCE**

**Rome, 15-22 juin 2013
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES DE LA COMMISSION II
DE LA CONFÉRENCE**

**Roma, 15-22 de junio de 2013
ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISIÓN II
DE LA CONFERENCIA**

Table of Contents – Table des matières – Índice

FIRST MEETING OF COMMISSION II PREMIÈRE SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II PRIMERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II (17 June 2013)

	Page
20. Programme Implementation Report 2010-2011 (C 2013/8; C 2013/8 Corr.1 and 2; C 2013/LIM/2)	1
20. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2010–2011	
20. Informe sobre la ejecución del Programmea en 2010-11	
21. Programme Evaluation Report 2013 (C 2013/4)	5
21. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2013	
21. Informe sobre la evaluación del Programmea en 2013	
24. Report on Implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) (C 2013/26; C 2013/26 Web Annex 1 and 2 [English only]; C 2013/LIM/20)	10
24. Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action immédiate (PAI)	
24. Informe sobre la ejecución del Plan inmediato de acción (PIA)	

SECOND MEETING OF COMMISSION II DEUXIEME REUNION DE LA COMMISSION II SEGUNDA REUNION DE LA COMISION II (17 June 2013)

	Page
24. Report on Implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) (continued) (C 2013/26; C 2013/26 Web Annex 1 and 2 [English only]; C 2013/LIM/20)	
24. Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action immédiate (PAI) (suite)	
24. Informe sobre la ejecución del Plan inmediato de acción (PIA) (continuación)	17
22. Reviewed Strategic Framework (C 2013/7; C 2013/LIM/19)	
22. Cadre stratégique révisé	
22. Marco estratégico revisado	20
23. Medium Term Plan 2014-2017 and Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 (Draft Resolution on budget level) (C 2013/3; C 2013/3 Information Notes 1 to 10; C 2013/3 Web Annexes XI and XII; C 2013/LIM/8)	
23. Plan à moyen terme 2014–2017 et Programme de travail et budget 2014–2015 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget)	
23. Plan a plazo medio para 2014-17 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2014-15 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto)	25

CONFERENCE CONFERENCE CONFERENCIA

Thirty-eighth Session Trente-huitième session 38.º período de sesiones
Rome, 15-22 June 2013 Rome, 15-22 juin 2013 Roma, 15-22 de junio de 2013
FIRST MEETING OF COMMISSION II PREMIÈRE SÉANCE DE LA COMMISSION II PRIMERA REUNIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN II
17 June 2013

The First Meeting was opened at 11.14 hours
Ms Gerda Verburg,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La première séance est ouverte à 11 h 14
sous la présidence de Mme Gerda Verburg,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la primera reunión a las 11.14
bajo la presidencia de la Sra. Gerda Verburg,
Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRPERSON

Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning to all of you and welcome in Commission II. We have an important task ahead of us and now we have the quorum and we can start. We count on other participants to walk in and to join us in our work.

First of all, thank you for electing me as your Chairperson. It's a great honour to serve as your independent Chair and I, together with the team of the Secretariat, will do our utmost to support the decision making in order to find solutions for all the issues that are at stake. We are all aware that probably the Programme of Work and Budget might take most time to find consensus, but let us start.

We will start with agenda Item 20 but during the day, we will have a wrap-up on the Programme of Work and Budget to have your summarized point of view and to have an answer on the question whether we need more information before we can start the negotiations and the decision-making.

I ask you, therefore, to think about whether we have enough information from the Secretariat, otherwise we need to ask for it to be prepared during this afternoon or tonight, so that tomorrow we can work a whole day on the Programme of Work and Budget.

I ask you to be prepared to work tomorrow night if necessary, if we don't have consensus tomorrow at 18:00 hours, then we have to work tomorrow night. And in view of the still divergent opinions on the level of the budget, based also on the practice in Commission II, I propose to convene a Friends of the Chair Group to continue the discussion.

The procedural format I propose for the Friends of the Chair is as follows: the membership will be composed of up to two delegates from each of the seven Regional Groups. I request, therefore, the Regional Groups to nominate their focal points with full mandate for the discussion and confirm the names of their representatives to the Secretariat. All other Members of Commission II may, of course, attend the meetings of the Friends of the Chair, but only as silent observers.

The Secretariat will be in attendance to provide support and respond to questions as required. We have reserved the King Faisal Room for the meetings of the Friends of the Chair. That's the way we propose to proceed. Is that okay with you?

20. Programme Implementation Report 2010-2011

20. Rapport sur l'exécution du Programme 2010-2011

20. Informe sobre la ejecución del Programmea en 2010-11

(C 2013/8; C 2013/8 Corr.1 and 2; C 2013/LIM/2)

CHAIRPERSON

We will now start with the first Item on the Agenda, which is Item 20, Programme Implementation Report 2010-2011 and is presented in documents C 2013/8, C 2013/8 Corr.1, C 2013/8 Corr.2, and C 2013/8 Web Annex also refer.

At its 145th Session, the Council endorsed the Programme Implementation Report 2010-2011 to be submitted to the Conference for consideration. The extract of the Report of the Council on this document is presented in document C 2013/LIM/19. The Council and the Programme and Finance Committees welcomed the progress of implementation of the Programme of Work of 2010-2011, encouraged efforts to achieve geographical balance of Professional staff at FAO and called for improvements to the next PIR including a more concise format, a focus on lessons learned, and more enhanced reporting generally. The Conference is requested to endorse the Programme Implementation Report 2010-2011 providing such guidance as it deems appropriate.

The introduction of the item will be done by Mr Boyd Haight.

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

I will briefly present the purpose, format and content of the Programme Implementation Report for the 2010-11 biennium. The purpose of the Programme Implementation Report is to inform the Membership of the work carried out by the Organization over the previous biennium. It is retrospective in nature, reporting on what the Organization has achieved in terms of programmatic

results and financial performance compared to the two year targets set out in the Medium Term Plan and the budget of the Programme of Work and Budget.

Under the Results-based Framework that covers all FAO's work under all sources of funds, the monitoring reporting arrangements are built on three elements: work plan monitoring, mid-term review, and an end of biennium assessment.

The periodic work plan monitoring was undertaken by all Unit managers to identify risks and improve programme delivery during the biennium. The Mid-term Review 2010 was a qualitative assessment by managers and Strategy Team Leaders of progress towards achievement of the Organizational Results. It was carried out in early 2011 and presented in the Mid-term Review Synthesis Report 2010 to the Programme and Finance Committees.

The end of biennium assessment presented in the Programme Implementation Report 2010-11 before you, provides a comprehensive analysis of the achievements and identifies opportunities for improved organizational performance. It includes a quality assurance process for reported performance information related to indicators, to verify the progress reported and to document reasons for missed targets, as well as lessons learned.

This is the first Programme Implementation Report produced under the Results-based Framework of the Medium Term Plan 2010-2013. The structure is, therefore, somewhat different from past reports and was developed in consultation with the Programme and Finance Committees.

The first section of the Report highlights four major policy developments in the 2010-11 biennium, related to FAO's work on food price volatility, emergency intervention, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and sustainable increasing food production through "Save and Grow".

The second section, called *Making a Difference*, provides an overview of the Organization's main achievements under the 11 Strategic Objectives in the current PWB, the Functional Objective X collaboration with Member Nations and stakeholders, and the Technical Cooperation Programme.

The third section, called *Managing Resources Wisely*, describes FAO's managerial performance. It combines a review of the work done under Functional Objective Y on administration with various financial analyses and other initiatives to improve internal efficiency and effectiveness.

The Report includes five printed Annexes and one Web Annex providing information on quality assurance, regional dimensions, language policy, gender and geographical distribution of professional staff, programmatic results and sessions of FAO Governing Bodies.

So, what did we achieve during the 2010-11 biennium? As you will recall, the agreed measure of FAO's effectiveness is through indicators and targets of the Organizational Results. In 2010-11, we achieved 76 percent of the 174 performance targets in the Organizational Results. The main reasons for the shortfall were three-fold.

First, changes in donor interests and competing priorities, and ambitious targets accounting for 29 of the 41 targets not met. Second, optimistic assumptions about the cost of data collection, its timeliness and availability accounting for 6 of the targets not met. Third, measures for 6 indicators that were only available later in 2012, one of which under Strategic Objective L, has now been reported as exceeding the target.

Concerning administrative and financial performance, the Organization spent 99 percent of the approved regular programme budget for 2010-11, with total expenditure, including increased voluntary contributions rising by 25 percent during the biennium to USD 2.7 billion.

Other important achievements include: an increase in the representation of women among the professional and higher ranks of staff from 21 percent at the end of 1996 to 40 percent at the end of 2011; a reduction in the number of Member Nations outside the range of equitable representation among professional and above staff; continued improvement in the recovery of administrative and operational support costs from 64 percent in 2006-07 to 84 percent in 2010-11. And also, successful decentralization of the Technical Cooperation Programme with a reduction in the TCP Project approval time from 6 to 4 months and putting in place an internal assessment of TCP results.

The main value from a review of past performance is to identify opportunities to improve corporate performance. I would like to highlight four lessons learned that helped to shape the reviewed Strategic Framework and the new Medium Term Plan

First, the potential of partnerships and alliances to increase FAO's impact and influence. Second, the use of multidisciplinary approaches to better meet the needs of stakeholders, especially when coupled with an evidence base of good science, statistics and assessment. Third, the importance of investing in capacity-development as an engine for sustainable improvements. Fourth, strengthening results-based management techniques and practices in the Organization, in particular the results chain and the formulation and cost effectiveness of our indicators and targets.

Madam Chairperson, with this brief overview, the Secretariat is ready to provide any clarifications required by the Conference in considering the Programme Implementation Report for 2010-11.

Mr Jariath O'CONNOR (Ireland)

I am honored to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, the acceding countries to the EU, Croatia, and the candidate countries to the EU, Iceland, Montenegro, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, align themselves with this statement.

We welcome this Report which provides the first monitoring of FAO's performance against its first Results-based Framework and a good overview of the activities and developments of the Organization including the ongoing reform.

We believe that the use of examples makes the Report more accessible and we would encourage greater use of this format. We also appreciate the comprehensive annexes that provide information.

We support the format used, which shows the work undertaken under each Strategic Objective and also the lessons learned in each area. This is a good first step towards learning from experience and managing for results. In some cases, outcomes are also provided and we would encourage further reporting on such outcomes to demonstrate the impact of FAO's work.

The use of indicators is clearly visible in the comprehensive annexes. We would also like to see more measuring of results against indicators and more use of qualitative indicators in the main Report.

While a great deal was achieved, it is difficult to measure effectiveness unless indicators are more clearly visible in the Report. The 2010-2011 Report covers a very challenging time when food prices reached historic highs and disasters such as the earthquake in Haiti and weather events worldwide. The FAO response via the EU Food Facility Programme, AMIS, the One Health Programme and partnerships with other global actors is to be commended.

The eradication of rinderpest is another milestone of which this Organization can be justly proud. The need for partnerships with other stakeholders is mentioned many times in the Report. We encourage the FAO to continue developing such strategic partnerships as a way to deliver greater efficiency and to avoid duplication.

We also commend the FAO's work on gender equity, which we hope will lead to more availability of sex disaggregated data and better targeting of programmes. The state of food and agriculture Report on women in agriculture clearly shows the importance of ensuring equality for women and access to productive resources.

In addition, we welcome increases in female professional staff and we urge the FAO to continue to make progress particularly in the higher ranks of this Organization.

Finally, we note the statement in the Report that micronutrient malnutrition is hidden hunger that affects more than two billion people. We hope that the FAO's work of food and security in malnutrition, including strengthening national capacities, improved data collection, and the use of technology such as the satellite based crop monitoring system will contribute to lowering this number.

Once again, the Report highlights the need for partnerships when it says that the lack of a common data strategy across international partners hinders coordinated action. We hope that the FAO can take a lead role in approving such actions.

We look forward to FAO building on its results reporting preferably on an annual basis and reporting against the new Results-based Framework with clear milestones and indicators. This will help to improve decision making and accountability, strengthening FAO's performance and delivery of results.

Sr. Luis Alberto MARIN LLANES (Cuba)

Cuba coge con beneplácito un informe presentado por la Secretaría. Coincidimos con la visión de insatisfacción por la cantidad de personas que padecen hambre aún, a pesar de los datos referidos en el documento en contra la disminución de personas hambrientas en 132 millones, entre 1990 y 92, y 2010/2012. Teniendo en cuenta, sobre todo, que esto se concreta en un contexto de crisis a nivel mundial, agravado por varios factores; entre estos, la volatilidad de los precios de los alimentos, y en particular debido a la especulación financiera en el mercado internacional de alimentos.

Es significativo que en el período no se alcanzó el 17 por ciento de las metas planteadas, principalmente como resultado de cambios en los intereses de los donantes, y de prioridades contrapuestas, entre otros aspectos. Sobre los resultados alcanzados, mi delegación desea reconocer especialmente la implementación de las actividades de la FAO en el terreno; en particular, aquellas con enfoques adoptados a las circunstancias determinadas por la incidencia del cambio climático, en la agricultura, la gestión de la reducción de riesgos de desastre y la colaboración con otras organizaciones, como es el caso del Programa Mundial de Alimentos.

Entre las temáticas apoyadas por la FAO en el período, la referida a la inocuidad de los alimentos tuvo una constatación concreta entre los resultados alcanzados por el Programa de cooperación técnica en la región, que en el caso de Cuba le permitió una revisión de la situación actual que debe enfrentar el país en momentos en que hemos decidido descentralizar la producción de alimentos, llegando al nivel local. Sin duda alguna, apoyos de este tipo son los que necesitan los países para sentar las bases de la creación o fortalecimiento de las capacidades nacionales, para garantizar la seguridad alimentaria. En este mismo sentido, Presidenta, mi delegación desea expresar su reconocimiento a los esfuerzos de la organización para lograr una mayor eficiencia en su trabajo, en lo cual está jugando un papel importante en las medidas promovidas por el Director General.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

We consider the PIR as a bottom up approach in measuring results at unit level for each of the 56 Organization Results covered in the Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11. We treat the PIR as an accountability report by management to adjoining bodies. We do not expect the assessment or impact from the PIR. Impact assessment of the Programme of Work and Budget is the domain of the Office of Evaluation and in some areas of work the dominant of the Office of the Inspector General.

We support the five recommendations of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees on 7 November 2012 on the PIR. We appreciate the efforts of the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management and other Units at Headquarters and decentralized offices in their preparation of the PIR. The job is laborious and cost organizational. In this convention, we welcome the explanation provided in annex one of the document, page 86 of the English text, of how the information on performance and Organizational Results was assembled and sifted for consistency and accuracy.

We appreciate, in particular, the contents of annex two of the document. We note that a common outline was used in explaining the biennium performance of each of the Strategic Objectives. Under FAO's response, major accomplishments are highlighted along with a box, which reflects an outstanding achievement in a specific area of greater potential for impact.

We welcome the use of the common outline and take note that the programmatic result of the 49 Organization results of Strategic Objective 11 and several Organizational Results of Functional Objectives X and Y are listed in annex five.

We wish to score the following points presented in the Report. First, as shown in figure two, pages 13 of the English text, the overall 76 percent rate of success for Strategic and Functional Objectives is a sign of healthy performance.

Second, we note the steady rise in the recovery of administrative and operational support cuts derived from budgetary resources, funded through projects, but the aim should be at 100 percent recovery. From figure 17, page 69 of the English text, we note that the professional staff of Headquarters units still remain the major source of technical support to field projects, 55 percent with the share of the sub-regional offices remaining relatively low. We hope this will change dramatically with the strengthening of the technical hubs.

From figure 23, page 107 of the English text, we note that it is at the D2 level where women are far less represented than men, 16 percent only and also at P5 level 27 percent more. We hope that this is changing in favour of women.

Finally, Chairperson, we look forward for a more concise and focused PIR 2012-2013, as recommended by the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees of 7 November 2012.

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

One thing to put on the table at the outset is that this Report covers the 2010-11 biennium. You are looking at it now three-quarters of the way through the 2012-13 biennium when there have been quite a few developments over the past 18 months. One of which, for example, is about partnerships where you have considered and approved a new strategy on partnerships so we're already trying to address some of the lessons learned over the 2010-11 biennium.

The same goes for indicators, although your next PIR will still be reporting against the same set of indicators, we are hoping to make some progress in being able to make the Reports more meaningful, but also hopefully see a better performance level.

And in this regard, we will of course attempt to have a more concise Report for 2012-13, although the format may be very similar to this one, because for 2014-15, which has a completely new set of objectives and set of indicators, we will have to have yet a further significant revision to the reporting.

CHAIRPERSON

The Conference welcomes the PIR 2010-11 and the biennial performance against pre-established targets encourage continuous efforts to achieve balanced geographical representation and improved representation of female staff in FAO while stressing the primary consideration of merit in recruitment, recommends the next version of PIR to be more concise alongside comprehensive access and include the following: a) greater use of examples; b) reporting aligns with Strategic Objectives; c) clear reporting vis-à-vis indicators within the new results framework; d) assessment of crosscutting issues, including gender; and e) more enhanced reporting, generally.

This is the conclusion of agenda Item 20.

21. Programme Evaluation Report 2013 (C 2013/4)

21. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2013

21. Informe sobre la evaluación del Programme en 2013

CHAIRPERSON

We continue with Item 21 on the agenda, which is the Programme Evaluation Report for 2013, presented in document C 2013/4.

The Report provides a summary of the main evaluation activities of the Organization. In particular, the Report summarizes new developments in FAO's Evaluation regime. It outlines FAO's collaboration with the rest of the UN System on evaluation matters; it draws on common lessons learned from the evaluations that were undertaken during this biennium. It presents the Programme of Work completed during the 2012-13 biennium, and the work programme plans for the 2014-15 biennium.

It presents summary briefs on the major evaluations which were completed during the biennium and presented to the Governing Bodies. The Conference is invited to provide such guidance as it deems appropriate.

The introduction of the item will be done by Mr Robert Moore, Director of the Office of Evaluation.

Mr Robert MOORE (Director, Office of Evaluation)

The Programme Evaluation Report (PER) for 2013 provides a summary to the Conference of the main evaluation activities of the Organization which were previously discussed in detail in the Programme Committee and through the Programme Committee's report during the Council.

The document follows a format that was initiated in 2005. The PER begins with a summary of new developments in FAO's evaluation regime over the past biennium related to greater consultation with Member Countries during the evaluation process, independent validation of follow-up reports on management responses to major evaluations, inclusion of evaluation provisions and initiatives funded by resource partners, increased collaboration between evaluation and audit, and evaluation knowledge management.

The section on common lessons was first included in the Programme Evaluation Report 2011 in response to a request from the Programme Committee and was well received. The focus of this section is on areas where need for improvement was noted in evaluation reports. The evidence base for these general findings comes from the evaluations completed in the past biennium.

Summaries of these evaluations, which were presented in the last biennium to the Programme Committee along with the management responses to them, are annexed to the PER's evaluation briefs 26 to 35. The full reports are available on the FAO evaluation website.

The PER also outlines FAO's collaboration with the rest of the UN System in common evaluation endeavours. This included the first peer review of the evaluation function in FAO which took place in 2012 under the auspices of the DAC (Development Assistance Committee of the OECD) UN evaluation group joint task force on professional peer reviews of the evaluation function in multi-lateral organizations.

The review panel, which included membership from other UN Agencies and bilateral organizations, found that paired with many other agencies in the UN System, FAO had a mature evaluation system with considerable experience. It concluded that significant progress had been made over the previous two years in implementing the evaluation related IPA recommendations.

Finally, collaboration has been enhanced particularly with the evaluation functions of the Rome-based Agencies, mainly WFP, IFAD, and the newly established independent evaluation arrangement of the CGIAR. This was fostered through joint participation in events focusing on various aspects of evaluation methodology. Other noteworthy events included the participation of FAO evaluation staff on selection panels for two positions in IFAD and planning for a second joint evaluation with WFP in 2013 on the joint FAO/WFP food security cluster.

The evaluation functions of the Rome-based Agencies also agreed on joint actions to enhance future collaboration. Aspects covered included sharing of work plans and other evaluation related information, holding of learning events, peer review with terms of reference and reports, and preparation of synthesis reports and meta evaluations on topics of interest related to agriculture, food security, and nutrition.

Distinguished Delegates, with the guidance from the Programme Committee Office carried out, an ambitious work Programme that we hope has kept members informed about the key issues facing FAO and through management responses and follow-up reports, how the Organization is responding in these areas. We look forward to your debate on the PER and your advice on how to increase the utility of the evaluation function to the Member Nations that we serve.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

Thank you, Robert Moore for your introduction of this Report. We appreciate the 2013 Programme Evaluation Report which is informative and concise. We would comment briefly on each section of the report.

With respect to consultation with the Permanent Representative, as a Member of the Programme Committee, I was consulted by the team leaders of several cooperative evaluations prior to submitting the report. The last consultation was with the team leader of Afghanistan's country evaluation. I found

this consultation very useful and I am sure all of my colleagues in the Programme Committee think so too.

The evaluation of the follow-up reports on major evaluations is a welcome development. It does call for resources, but we think it is an important line of activity by the evaluation office. We consider it important that funds for evaluation should be a budget line for most, if not all, Technical Cooperation Projects, and these funds be pooled into a trust fund for extra budgetary funded projects.

We would most welcome collaboration between the Office of Evaluation and the Office of the Inspector-General, including joint activities. This joint work could have been put to the test with respect to the evaluation of the Regional and Sub-Regional Offices, but unfortunately it wasn't done.

We appreciate the efforts of management, including the role of the Internal Evaluation Committee, especially in selecting topics for strategic evaluation and making greater use of lessons learned from evaluation and the work of FAO. As a member of the Programme Committee, I also feel there should be a periodic exchange of views in evaluation work between the Members of the Programme Committee and the Internal Evaluation Committee.

Section three, drawing common lessons from evaluation, paragraph 13 to 31, is appreciated but it is far too general for a serious dialog among Member Nations. An in-depth assessment for one or two decades of work would have been a more useful approach. In this connection, we wish to point out that the 2012 Evaluation Report of the WFP focuses on only one thing, partnership, and that evaluation was well done.

We feel that collaboration with other UN Agencies on evaluation should be further strengthened, especially with the two Rome-based Agencies. One joint evaluation with the UN Agencies in each area could be an ideal approach. In this connection, we appreciate the evaluation of the cluster with the WFP which is ongoing.

Madame Chair, we note that in 2012, eight evaluations, or 17 percent, of the 47 evaluations carried by OED were of a strategic nature. Given the importance attached to strategic evaluation by the Governing Bodies, one to five ratio between strategic and project evaluation will be the right proportion.

The briefs on ten major evaluations are well done and worthy of appreciation. We are glad to note that in each brief, also includes the comments by management on the evaluation as well as the views expressed by the Evaluation Committee on the findings and recommendations of major evaluations.

Cooperative evaluations are expensive and time consuming. In future reports to the Conference, it would be advisable to provide information on the costs of each strategic evaluation and the number of consultants recruited to do the job.

Finally, we are pleased to note that in the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 which we will be discussing soon, provided an additional sum of 1.1 million of net appropriations for work for evaluations. This is in line with the IPA 2.78 which stated that the evaluation budget be raised from 0.8 to one percent of total Regular Programme and Budget over two biennia and was subsequently confirmed by the Conference.

Ms Debra PRICE (Canada)

Just a few brief points to underline some of the things that we have said previously. Canada strongly supports a fully functioning and effective evaluation function. We welcome the continuous improvements undertaken over the last biennium in order to improve this oversight function of the Organization.

The FAO must continue to maintain rigorous oversight of its programme activities to ensure results are being achieved and lessons learned are incorporated into future work. Effective follow-up on recommendations including assessment and impact of management responses is one area where we continue to believe more work is required.

Mr Jarlath O'CONNOR (Ireland)

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States. The acceding country to the EU, Croatia, and the candidate countries to the EU, Iceland, Montenegro, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Turkey, align themselves with this statement. We endorse the Programme Evaluation Report which gives a good overview of the activities and work of the Office of Evaluation. We appreciate the high quality of the report and congratulate the Bureau for the work done.

Since 2011, the OED has been consistent in consulting with Member Countries through their Permanent Representatives to FAO. We also know to satisfaction that there are plans to evaluate the Regional and Sub-Regional Offices over the coming 12 months.

We welcome the fact that management has utilized evaluation reports both in terms of learning and accountability. However, it is disappointing to note that the Report states that the Organization, and I am quoting directly from the report, "has done relatively little to deal with a major imbalance of male and female staff." The report identifies what it calls a corporate culture that is overly gender blind. This is a major concern.

It also states, and I quote again, "the recommendations of the Project and Programme Review Committee were ignored in a number of cases." While welcoming recent positive steps taken, we urge the FAO to continue to urgently work towards strengthening the efforts to improve mainstreaming of gender equality and we look forward to the follow-up report due in October 2013.

While FAO has been fairly successful in developing partnerships with other International Organizations, there are still major weaknesses at the country level and partnerships with NGOs is also quite limited. These are weaknesses that must be addressed.

We are disappointed to learn that there is still a lack of corporate vision. The Organization seems about to make the most of its expertise and instead focuses on narrowly defined areas of work. Concerning publications, a significant number have been short on quality, and priority should be given to address this issue so as to improve their usefulness and impact at regional and country levels.

We endorse the need for more comprehensive integrated planning and programming at country level. FAO needs to support governments in developing sectorial and sub-sectorial strategies across the areas of FAO expertise. We also note the absence of systematic monitoring and reporting at all levels of FAO's work, and the Organization needs to urgently address these concerns.

We are also disappointed by the findings on the FAO's role and work in nutrition where gender, once again, was not sufficiently factored into the project design and implementation. The recommendations in the report rightly emphasize the central role of nutrition in FAO's mandate. The Programme Committee expressed concern about the truly dissatisfying findings and saw an urgent need for action; so do we. As the report recommends, Senior Management in FAO have to commit to a strong focus on nutrition.

Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)

Australia welcomes the 2013 Programme Evaluation Report and supports the strengthening of FAO's capabilities. I would just like to comment on a couple of issues that we have picked up from the Report.

One of those relates to FAO's work with the other Rome-based Agencies and we encourage FAO to continue to work efficiently with the other agencies to ensure that FAO is working to its areas of comparative advantage. Identifying these areas will decrease the duplication of work across the agencies.

Australia supports increasing FAO's engagement as a partner institution. FAO should take a lead role where it possesses comparative advantages and take advantage of others expertise where it does not. Australia urges the reform of the Organization continue to be pushed forward to eliminate inefficiencies, improve transparency in governance, and enhance FAO's effectiveness as a partner institution.

Australia encourages FAO to continue to implement evaluation recommendations to strengthen the capacities of country offices, particularly in regard to priority setting. FAO must be responsive to the needs of its member countries. This is a critical component of long-term FAO reform. Doing so will improve Programme effectiveness at country level.

Just as the report identifies that Programmes are currently opportunistic and based on the availability of funding, Australia encourages FAO to ensure country priorities are matched to areas of FAO comparative advantage.

Australia looks forward to the findings on the use of the technical cooperation trust fund which is due late 2013; early 2014 for evaluating voluntarily funded technical cooperation for development initiatives. Australia encourages the Office of Evaluation and the Office of the Inspector-General to continue to collaborate on issues that require the attention of both offices.

And lastly, Australia, similar to the intervention from Ireland, notes the evaluation of regional offices and the recently commences evaluation of the Asia Pacific region. We look forward to that review and believe that its observations will help the Director-General in terms of it strengthening the focus of FAO in the Southwest Pacific.

Mr Robert MOORE (Director, Office of Evaluation)

A few points maybe worth mentioning, several of them raised by Mr Ayazi from Afghanistan. On the regional and sub-regional office evaluations, we have been working closely with audit actually on these. All of the audit reports that are done are shared with us and we – we have exchanges of views with auditors when necessary.

It would be worth pointing out that in a number of the country evaluations that we have done in the past, audit has been actually on the mission with us to look at the work of the FAO representations and we would like to continue that more in the future.

I take note of his comments, that it might be preferable to have a more in-depth assessment of one to two areas in the future in the PER and that is something that could certainly be considered, and also that we should indicate the costs of the strategic evaluations and a number of consultants that took part in them.

In terms of the follow-up to the management responses, and particularly the mention was made of the evaluation on nutrition, I would just point out that the follow-up report on that nutrition evaluation will be presented to the Programme Committee at its next session in November, and that particular follow-up report will have one of these independent verification assessments.

We take note of the comments about continuing to work with the other Rome-based agencies and I am sure we'll continue to do that. Thank you.

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

I would just like to make a few remarks on behalf of the Management about the PER and about some of the comments that have been made, in particular, concerning the lessons learned, which is section 3 of the report. As with the PIR that you have just considered, this report is looking backwards to a certain extent and trying to draw lessons that we can use in the future. I would just like to emphasize that the five lessons that are pointed out in section 3 of the report are being dealt with through the Strategic Thinking Process, the Reviewed Strategic Framework, the new MTP, and Programme of Work and Budget that you are considering at this Conference.

For example on gender, in the new MTP we made a concerted effort to mainstream gender across the Strategic Objectives rather than having it as a separate objective, and at the same time strengthening the work on gender advocacy, capacity development and partnerships.

And in relation to partnerships, as I also mention in my remarks on the PIR, we have worked in the last 12 months to develop a partnership strategy, which the Council has approved and will help to achieve the outcomes in the new Medium-Term Plan.

And on visions and strategies, the whole purpose of the Strategic Thinking Process was to set a new strategic direction based, on the one hand, on a very rigorous identification and analysis of trends and challenges and the attributes of the Organization, and on the other hand consultation with the Membership. So here again we're already dealing with some of the findings of the evaluations.

And also in terms of the country level priorities as was mentioned by some Delegations, the decentralization strategy and policy that was considered by the Council one year ago included the use of country programming frameworks, based, in fact, on the findings of the Evaluation of Country Programming to improve the prioritization at country level.

Paragraph 26 of the report talks about the need to communicate our normative knowledge products which is in fact part of the strengthened Medium-Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium, and again, effectiveness at country level as I mentioned on decentralization.

I have tried to put the PER findings in perspective of what the Organization has done to address them going forward.

CHAIRPERSON

Here are the conclusions of this agenda item: The conference appreciated the Programme Evaluation Report, the section Lessons Learned from the evaluations undertaken in the past biennium and encouraged more in-depth analysis of specific lessons learned.

The Conference welcomed the quantitative data provided on evaluation undertaken, stressed the importance to make budgetary provision within trust funds projects for evaluation to be carried out, recommended strengthening of collaboration with the other Rome-based Agencies on evaluation matter. Requested further information on the cost of strategic evaluations to be included in future reports. Noted the mainstreaming gender related issues in review strategic framework as highlighted in the report and encouraged FAO to implement the recommendations arising from the report.

24. Report on Implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA)

24. Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action immédiate (PAI)

24. Informe sobre la ejecución del Plan inmediato de acción (PIA)

(C 2013/26; C 2013/26 Web Annex 1 and 2 English only; C 2013/LIM/20)

CHAIRPERSON

Item 24 on the agenda refers to the Report on Implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) and is presented in document C 2013/26. This document was reviewed by the Council at its 146th in April 2013, which endorsed the recommendations of the 148th Session of the Finance Committee on the financial aspects in the Report; and the recommendations of the March Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees on the substantive aspects of the Report.

The Council endorsed the document and recommended that it be submitted to the 38th Session of Conference for approval. The extract of the Council Report on this document is presented in C 2013/LIM/20.

As you are aware, this is the final Report of the Reform process which started with the Independent External Evaluation of FAO in 2005, and was later implemented by the Immediate Plan of Action agreed by the Conference. The implementation of the IPA was overseen by members of Conference and was undertaken and reported on by the Secretariat; the Reform process started in November 2005 and has been implemented at a total cost of approximately USD 100 million, echoing the motto of the IEE for "Reform with Growth"; the Council considered that the funds made available for the purpose of IPA implementation had been spent effectively and efficiently; it has been successfully concluded and FAO is now moving from implementing Reform and the IPA to mainstreaming its benefits, and above all continuously improving to become more effective and efficient.

Commission II is requested to endorse the Final Management Report on the Immediate Plan of Action Implementation and the FAO Reform Process, for approval by the Conference.

Mr David BENFIELD (Director, Immediate Plan of Action Programme Management Unit)

This final Management Report on IPA implementation completes the reporting cycle on implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action.

It responds to the request made by the 145th Session of Council in December 2012 for a comprehensive Report on IPA implementation on the FAO reform process containing detailed information of a quantitative, qualitative financial and budgetary nature and reporting also on post IPA arrangements.

It presents a comprehensive account of the history of the FAO reform, the costs of the FAO reform programme, the quantitative progress made, and most importantly the benefits of the IPA.

Member States requested that management report on the big picture of FAO reform in terms of benefits rather than the details. The details of all benefits identified are available in the annex to the Report but the Report indicates that a small number of key IPA actions and associated benefits form the core of the FAO reform.

The impact of these is greater than the sum of their parts. They reinforce each other and they have a multiplier effect in terms of their impact. These are firstly the establishment of a Results Based Framework that includes the development in a participative and collaborative manner of Strategic Objectives based on real world needs, regional priorities and FAO's comparative advantages.

Secondly, the transformation of the Strategic Objectives into tangible results for achievement by the Organization. Third, the targeted use of FAO resources towards achievement of these results through the full commitment and engagement of its staff and taking full advantage of its worldwide coverage and in partnership with other players.

Fourth, the monitoring and assessment of the Organization's performance in delivering these results. And finally, the effective reporting of the extent to which these tangible results have been achieved.

Major change is not easy and management was aware that FAO is in a learning process but would require more than one biennium to fully complete. In particular, the change to the new Results Based Framework that in all organizations takes more than one biennium to achieve, and changes impacting on staff due to their nature, need more time and more consultation to conclude.

However, the IPA has provided the foundation for a transformational change to an organization that is budgeted, managed and assessed on its tangible contribution to Strategic Objectives.

In terms of quantitative progress, implementation of the IPA programme completed at the end of December 2012. At that date, 252 of the 274 IPA actions in the programme had been completed. This represents the completion of 92 percent of all actions leaving eight percent of 22 actions to be completed. Of these 22 actions, three are for Members to complete and the responsibility for coordinating efforts in this regard are with the Independent Chair of the Council.

This leaves 19 for management to complete and these 19 actions have been mainstreamed into the work of the Organization. Of these 19 actions, two are reviews which by their nature are scheduled to complete after the IPA implementation has completed. The first of these is the review of the workings of governance reforms which is scheduled to take place in 2014 with a report to Conference in 2015.

The second is the independent evaluation of the evaluation function which is scheduled to take place every six years, with the first planned to take place in 2016. This leaves 17 actions for management to complete and with the exception of culture change for which management considers an end date to be inappropriate, all of these actions are planned to complete by the end of 2013.

Management had indicated in the final report on IPA implementation, paragraph 237, that seven of these 17 actions would complete prior to this Conference, and the Council at its 146th session in April of this year requested that management report to Conference on progress with these seven actions.

The first of these seven actions is action 3.42 which instructs management to develop and deploy a field version of Oracle adapted to FAO's needs. This is the major project to deploy the new global resource management system, the GRMS system, to all decentralized offices.

I am pleased to report that this deployment has progressed as planned and more than one hundred offices are now live with GRMS. This completes the deployment and the GRMS programme will close on the 30th of June.

The second of these seven actions is action 7.19 to change the translation service model. The measures to change to the new operational model are included in the PWB 2014-15 and this action will be closed following consideration of the related measures in the PWB by this Conference.

The third of these seven actions is action 3.103 to review the reorganization with a view to further improvements. Based on a critical review, structured adjustments were introduced in headquarters and presented to Members in the 2014-15 PWB. Again following consideration by this Conference of the changes presented in the PWB 2014-15, this action is considered closed.

The fourth of these seven actions is action 3.66, to revise the competency profiles of regional representatives, sub-regional coordinators, and FAORs. A working group was established with representatives of OHR, CSP, and OSD, and the group has revised the job descriptions of regional representatives, sub-regional coordinators, and FAORs. The revised profiles are now in final form and have been submitted to the Director of OHR and Director of OSD for review and endorsement prior to the end of June.

The fifth of these seven actions is action 3.61, to establish an incentive-based rotation policy. It was reported to the 148th session of the Finance Committee that a decision had been taken to retain the proposed policy in draft form until the incoming Director of OHR had reviewed it in consultation with the Director-General to determine how to position mobility within the overall direction of human resources management.

The final draft of the new corporate mobility policy was endorsed by the Director-General in May of this year. It is being presented to senior management in June prior to further consultation and OHR will implement the policy by the end of 2013.

The sixth of these seven actions is action 3.36A to appoint an ombudsman. The final IPA report indicated that the action was delayed during 2012 due to an initiative which was subsequently superseded, to explore possibilities of a joint FAO and WFP ombudsman function, and also pending the results of a review of staff related functions.

Following a careful review of the functions of ombudsman and ethics, a decision has been taken to merge these two positions with a view to rationalizing and streamlining overlapping staff related functions. A revised job description has been prepared and the vacancy announcement for an ombudsman/ethics officer was issued on the first of June. Follow-up activities are in progress and therefore this action is considered closed.

The seventh and final action is action 4.1 which relates to the responsibility of the Council, supported by the Programme and Finance Committees to monitor the progress of IPA implementation and report to Conference. The final management report on IPA implementation was considered by the March 2013 sessions of Finance and Programme Committees and by the April 2013 session of Council. And as this was the final report on IPA implementation, this action can be considered complete.

However, although this is the final report on IPA actions as a whole, management is aware that individual progress reports are required for all 19 open IPA actions which management has the responsibility to implement. The mainstreaming section of the final management report on IPA, paragraphs 236 to 238, describes in detail for each of these 19 open actions, the officer who is responsible for completing the action, the target date for completion, and the Committee, Finance or Programme Committee, to which progress will be reported.

Accordingly, management has assured that the upcoming meetings of Finance and Programme Committee in October/November of this year include on their agendas progress reports on these open IPA actions. In this manner, the outstanding actions have been fully mainstreamed into the Organization's work plans and also into its reporting cycles.

With the submission of this report, we consider the FAO renewal process successfully completed and look forward to benefits from its implementation for many years to come.

CHAIRPERSON

My proposal would be to have your reflections and your comments after the lunch break and as we decided at the very beginning of the work of this Commission, we will start at the time listed in the Programme. I would like to wish you a good lunch and I hope to see you at 14:30 sharp.

The meeting closed at 12:29

La séance est levée à 12 h 29

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.29 horas

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE CONFERENCIA

Thirty-eighth Session Trente-huitième session 38.º período de sesiones
Rome, 15-22 June 2013 Rome, 15-22 juin 2013 Roma, 15-22 de junio de 2013
SECOND MEETING OF COMMISSION II DEUXIEME REUNION DE LA COMMISSION II SEGUNDA REUNION DE LA COMISION II
17 June 2013

The Second Meeting was opened at 14.33 hours
Ms Gerda Verburg,
Chairperson of Commission II, presiding

La deuxième séance est ouverte à 14 h 33
sous la présidence de Mme Gerda Verburg,
Président de la Commission II

Se abre la segunda reunión a las 14.33
bajo la presidencia de la Sra. Gerda Verburg,
Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRPERSON

Welcome to the afternoon session.

First, I'd like to make an announcement about the Drafting Committee and I would like to thank those countries who agreed to be members of the Drafting Committee of Commission II. The Chairperson is Ms Hedwig Wögerbauer from Austria and the Members are Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Brazil, China, Congo, Ecuador, Germany, Japan, Ireland, Russian Federation, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America and Yemen.

The Drafting Committee of Commission II will meet in the Lebanon Room on Wednesday at 14:30 hours.

24. Report on Implementation of the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) (continued)

24. Rapport sur la mise en œuvre du Plan d'action immédiate (PAI) (suite)

24. Informe sobre la ejecución del Plan inmediato de acción (PIA) (continuación)

(C 2013/26; C 2013/26 Web Annex 1 and 2 English only; C 2013/LIM/20)

CHAIRPERSON

This morning we had the introduction from the director IPA and we have already requests listed and they were honoured. Who would like to take the floor to make a comment on the IPA?

Sr. Luis Alberto MARIN LLANES (Cuba)

En primer lugar, agradecemos a la Secretaría por la presentación del Informe, que describe bien, en nuestra opinión, lo realizado desde el año 2005 hasta el año 2012, la repercusión de las medidas, las reformas adoptadas y lo realizado en este sentido en el año 2013.

Cuba reconoce el esfuerzo realizado por la Secretaría en la ejecución de las medidas del Plan inmediato de acción, a lo cual, sin duda, ha contribuido el compromiso y empeño del Director General, quien proporcionó una nueva orientación a la renovación de la FAO, centrada en la necesidad de acelerar el proceso de reforma y concentrarse en los beneficios más que en los índices de finalización e incorporar las medidas del PIA al trabajo de la Organización.

Como parte del proceso de reforma, ha sido acertada la realización de un proceso de reflexión estratégica a través del cual se establecen las tendencias mundiales que pueden determinar las condiciones de desarrollo agrícola, los desafíos principales a partir de las mismas, y los atributos esenciales, funciones básicas y ventajas comparativas de la FAO en relación con los principales retos que debemos enfrentar.

Y con esto, la elaboración de los cinco Objetivos Estratégicos para el trabajo futuro de la Organización a partir de lo cual contamos con un procedimiento que refleja las prioridades regionales y toma en cuenta las competencias técnicas y ventajas comparativas de la FAO. De esta manera, las actividades de la Organización pueden ser dirigidas más eficaz y eficientemente.

Mr Patrick HANNESSY (Ireland)

I am honored to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, the acceding country to the European Union, Croatia, and the candidate countries to the European Union, Iceland, Montenegro, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, align themselves with this statement.

We find the document useful especially since it gives a good overview of the comprehensive reform process. It is important to build on the achievements of the IPA reform to date. Key among these are the cooperation and trust built between Member Nations and the Secretariat, and among Member Nations themselves, which should be maintained.

We believe that Member Nations could have implemented more of the actions allocated to them and hope that this will prove possible in the future. We urge the outstanding IPA actions under the responsibility of the Secretariat to be fully implemented in 2013 and request the Secretariat to keep us updated on the remaining IPA actions scheduled for completion.

Looking forward, benefits must be clarified and actions which have no end date such as culture change must continue to retain momentum. We therefore welcome the fact that members will receive progress reports on culture change through the Joint Meetings of the Finance and Programme Committees.

A key lesson from the IPA process that the FAO must not ignore is the need for continuous efforts to improve gender balance. In the context of lessons learned, we welcome the upcoming assessment of governance reforms as called for by IPA action 2.74 and its applicability to the post-IPA reform period.

Finally, we firmly believe that the benefits in terms of efficiency gains and savings achieved in the past biennium due to the IPA should be taken into account when considering the baseline for the budget 2014-2015.

Mr Yo OSUMI (Japan)

Japan thanks Mr Benfield of the Secretariat for his concise and effective explanation and we appreciate it.

IPA is a matter of keen interest for our delegation and we are very pleased that it has been completed. For us, the crux of the operation of any international organization or any of the entity of that kind can be summarized in four words; core strength, strategic priority, efficiency and self-discipline. With that, we have a few comments.

One, we would like to repeat again what we stated in the Council that culture change is a most important benefit and a reform bridge should be embedded in FAO's DNA. As the Director-General said, FAO cannot continue to reform forever and we believe reform activities would not be necessary if the bureaucratic culture were to be progressively overhauled and benefits accrued as a result of the IPA being internalized fully into the Organization's operations.

Secondly, but not less important, we would like to be informed of the expenditure of the IPA budget as from after the April Council to date. We requested at the April Council that the IPA resources be efficiently used and we expect it to be discussed in the Finance Committee after the summer. We would like to know if the expenditure has been spent as planned and if it is on track.

Third, we would like, as Ireland being the representative of 27 plus countries pointed out, that these efficiency gains should be included in the context of the discussion we will talk about at a later moment this afternoon.

Finally, the Government of Japan thanks Mr Benfield for his presentation and we feel sad for the departure of Mr Benfield. Our mission and especially Mr Yamada and our government have greatly appreciated it, in fact we are indebted by his dedicated service, and wish him all the best for his future.

Mr John TUMINARO (United States of America)

I would also like to extend our thanks to Mr Benfield for his very informative presentation. As you know, the United States has been involved in and a leading proponent of FAO's reform process from the very beginning and we are pleased to see it come to an effective conclusion.

The United States is also pleased to hear about the additional actions that have been completed prior to this Conference and encourages FAO management to take necessary steps to ensure all open actions including those requiring substantial activity be completed.

In addition, the United States looks forward to the progress report of the 19 remaining actions at the upcoming Programme and Finance Committee meetings.

As we stated at the 146th Session of the Council, the United States continues to urge that savings accrued from IPA implementation be deducted from the overall assessment to Members when calculating the Programme of Work and Budget.

Mr David BENFIELD (Director, Programme Management Unit)

Thank you very much Madam Chair, and thank you very much for those very kind comments and as always indeed extremely constructive comments.

A number of questions relating to the efficiency savings from the IPA being reflected in the baseline as the Organization moves to discuss the PWB. I think that item has been covered in information note number four but would be better discussed under the upcoming session rather than under this session on the IPA itself.

In terms of culture change, indeed the new direction for culture change is very much to embed the culture change as management moves to managing by our Strategic Objectives, the culture change programme is being refocused to assist in that quite formidable task.

The third item I would just like to respond on is the IPA budget in terms of our progress to date. We will be reporting in full to the Finance Committee meeting in October/November of this year, as was requested by the Finance Committee at its meeting in March. In terms of our progress to date, a number of items occur at the end of the year in terms of costs transferred. We will take those fully into account. At this point in time, we are very slightly below where we should be in terms of profile but we expect that situation to be rectified by the time we report to the Finance Committee.

I think that covers the issues that have been requested.

Mr Daniel GUSTAFSON (Deputy Director-General, Operations)

Just a quick word in closing on this section to recognize the sterling work of Dr Noori who is in typical fashion in the back row, but speaking on behalf of the Director-General, and really all of us from the point of view of the Secretariat, who has worked with Dr Noori throughout the IPA, he has done more than any other individual, for what the delegate from Ireland mentioned as building the cooperation and trust between the Secretariat and the Members and we would like to take advantage of this opportunity, probably the last time we will have the opportunity until hopefully a small social event on Friday, for which I do not have full details, but we salute you Dr Noori.

And also as David Benfield is sadly leaving soon for retirement also recognizes really the outstanding work of David and the entire IPA team, some of whom are up here also, for the successful conclusion of what was this long and very constructive process. We'd also like to thank you David.

CHAIRPERSON

Thank you Mr Gustafson. Dear Members of the Commission, here is the conclusion on this point on the agenda, Item 24. The Conference welcomes the final Management Report which outlines a good overview of the successful conclusion of FAO reform which was begun by the Conference in 2005 through the Independent External Evaluation of FAO.

The Conference appreciated the benefits arising from implementation of the IPA and looked forward to their continued internalization and mainstreaming, in particular those relating to culture change.

The Conference urged completion of remaining IPA actions under the responsibility of the Secretariat. The Conference looked forward to an independent review of the working of the Governance reforms in 2014 for assessments by the Conference in June 2015.

The Conference appreciated the work carried out jointly by Members, management and Professor Mohammad Saied Noori Naeini in undertaking FAO Reform. And finally, the Conference endorsed the final Management Report on the Immediate Plan of Action implementation and the FAO Reform Process.

This is the conclusion of this agenda item and I would like to invite you to applaud Dr Noori and Mr David Benfield and their respective teams.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

22. Reviewed Strategic Framework (C 2013/7; C 2013/LIM/19)**22. Cadre stratégique révisé****22. Marco estratégico revisado****CHAIRPERSON**

We then move on to Item 22 the *Reviewed Strategic Framework*, presented in document C 2013/7. At its 146th Session, the Council endorsed the document and recommended approval by Conference of the *Reviewed Strategic Framework*, in particular FAO's Vision, the revised Global Goals, the new five Strategic Objectives, as well as the Sixth Objective and the cross-cutting themes of Gender and Governance which were integral to the achievement of the Strategic Objectives.

The extract of the Report of the 146th Session of the Council on this document is presented in C 2013/LIM/19 and the Conference is invited to endorse the Reviewed Strategic Framework in particular FAO's vision, Global Goals and Strategic Objectives. Mr Boyd Haight, Director of the Office of Strategy Planning and Resource Management will make a short introduction of the item.

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

FAO's Strategic Framework provides the overarching strategic direction for the work of the Organization. In doing so, it lays the groundwork for FAO's Medium-Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget, which provide the means for implementation.

Over the past 18 months we have together reviewed the Strategic Framework 2010-2019 as part of the established planning system. The review was guided by the analytical and consultative strategic thinking process launched by the Director-General to determine FAO's future strategic direction.

The document before you is the final product of this process. Let me touch on the key elements.

FAO's Vision is clear, compelling and unchanged: "A world free from hunger and malnutrition, where food and agriculture contribute to improving the living standards of all, especially the poorest in an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable manner."

As part of this Vision, the Membership established three Global Goals in 1999 and refined them in 2009. The current review has resulted in the revision of the first Goal and confirmation of the second and third Goals, which are briefly: First, "the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition..." As highlighted by the Director-General this morning, the Council last December recommended this revision from the present wording of "reduction of the absolute number of people suffering from hunger".

The second Goal is "the elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all... The third Goal is "the sustainable management and utilization of natural resources."

FAO's vision and Global Goals are inspirational. They help to guide the formulation of more concrete development objectives, the Strategic Objectives which Members seek to achieve through FAO. In reviewing the Strategic Framework, we have used an interactive analytical and consultative process to derive new Strategic Objectives.

First, we looked at external factors. Through a staff working group and expert outside advice, 11 major global trends were identified relating to major development problems in the immediate future. From these trends and taking into account FAO's broad mandate, seven development challenges were formulated as having special significance and urgency for Member Countries.

Then we looked at internal factors. We undertook a critical review of FAO's core functions in the context of the Organization's basic attributes. The seven revised core functions are our critical means of action to achieve results. That is, FAO facilitates and supports development and implementation of normative and standard setting instruments such as international agreements and codes of conduct. We assemble, analyze, monitor and improve access to data and information.

We facilitate and support policy dialogue at global, regional and country levels linked to the norms, standards and information. In doing so, we support capacity development for evidence based policies, investments and programmes at country and regional levels.

We advise and support on the uptake of knowledge, technology and good practices. We facilitate partnerships between governments, development partners, civil society organizations and the private sector that are critical to achieving outcomes. And we advocate and communicate in areas of FAO's mandate.

Through the analysis of external trends and challenges, the application of FAO's core functions and the consultative process with Members through the Governing Bodies, five cross-cutting Strategic Objectives for FAO were derived. These are: to contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition; to increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner; to reduce rural poverty; to enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national, and international levels; and to increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises. These Objectives are the development outcomes that the Membership seeks to achieve through FAO.

The Reviewed Strategic Framework includes two innovations to enhance the work of the Organization. First, a sixth Objective has been derived to reassert our commitment to the technical quality, knowledge, and work of FAO. This Objective provides the basis for ensuring and measuring the quality and integrity of our technical and normative work, including the global public goods that FAO produces and, in particular, the production and analysis of data on hunger, food, and agriculture.

A second innovation linked Objective six is that gender issues and improvements in governance will be mainstreamed across and within all of the Strategic Objectives as critical to their achievement. The strategies and approaches to work on gender and governance will be measured through Objective 6, while the work itself will be integrated into the Action Plans of each Strategic Objective.

Chairperson, we have come a long way in the past 18 months in formulating a new strategic direction for the Organization in line with FAO's Vision and Global Goals. The five new Strategic Objectives, the sixth Objective, and the crosscutting themes are set out in the Reviewed Strategic Framework and have been endorsed by the Council for your approval. They will be implemented through the new Medium-Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget.

Mr Patrick HANNESSY (Ireland)

I am honored to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, the acceding country to the EU, Croatia, and the candidate countries to the EU, Iceland, Montenegro, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Turkey align themselves with this statement.

We commend the broad, inclusive, and thorough process undertaken in revising the Strategic Framework. We commend the five Strategic Objectives of the new framework which will serve to break down existing silos so that the FAO can perform more effectively at all levels, thereby better integrating the work of different departments to achieve common goals.

The success of the Strategic Framework now lies in its timely implementation. The Strategic Objectives are very broad and for the most part, the responsibility for ensuring their successful completion depends on Member States with FAO in a supporting role. However, it must be possible to evaluate to what extent FAO fulfills its mandate. Such evaluation depends on appropriate indicators, targets, and base lines yet to be defined.

We believe the additional sixth Objective still needs further clarification. It is especially important for FAO, given its role as a provider of global public goods in the areas of food and agriculture, fisheries, and forestry. However, this aspect of FAO's work has received little mention in the Strategic Objectives and we feel it must be explicitly reflected in the Programme of Work and Budget. We welcome the two cross-cutting themes of gender and governance but would strongly reiterate the need to integrate these across all the Strategic Objectives. At the moment, we feel this is still lacking.

With regard to decentralization, we reiterate the need for FAO to implement transparent rules for accountability, oversight, and governance of the Decentralized Offices.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

Madame Chair, because of our heavy agenda, we hope the Commission will deal with this agenda item expeditiously. This is more so because you will be dealing with section E of the document, Strategic Objectives, in our next agenda item. In fact, Mr Boyd Haight has already introduced the MTP when he was talking about the new Strategic Framework.

From this point of view our intervention on the reviewed Strategic Framework, we will be very brief. We subscribe to the 11 global trends and recognize their direct linkage to FAO's mandate. We would have preferred the inclusion of two other trends, namely aging population and the continuation of agricultural subsidies, but we do not want to insist on them.

We are in agreement with the seven challenges which are the same as those proposed to the 144th Session of the Council in June last year. We agree with the set of FAO's basic organizational attributes as mentioned in paragraph 66. We agree with the seven core functions as stated in paragraph 68 and appreciate their further elaboration which should not exist in the version submitted to the 144th Session of the Council.

We go along with the statement in paragraph 70 in relation to FAO's comparative advantages and appreciate information note ten which elaborated FAO's comparative advantages in relation to social production.

Madame Chair, on Strategic Objectives, we would like to discuss this in our next agenda item.

Mr Hideya YAMADA (Japan)

As Mr Haight said, we have come a long way and Japan supports the approval of the Reviewed Strategic Framework.

Japan has pointed out that the Strategic Framework should not be only for eradicating hunger but also for utilizing agriculture, forestry, and fisheries resources in a sustainable manner, as well as for providing statistical data and conducting standard setting activities which benefits both developing and developed countries. We appreciate that the Reviewed Framework reflects these points and we encourage that FAO continues to prioritize its work based on this Strategic Framework.

The target year of this framework is 2019 and we should keep the long-term objectives in our mind when doing our day-to-day work. We should not forget the eventual objectives by being distracted by daily detailed events.

This morning I was listening to the radio corridor and the broadcaster said that Strategic Objectives, SO, stands for "Soon Over." I strongly disagree with that. Our Delegation strongly hopes that the SOs will be implemented effectively and efficiently.

Sr. Luis Alberto MARIN LLANES (Cuba)

Cuba agradece la presentación del Informe con la actualización del proceso de reflexión estratégica, el Marco Estratégico revisado y el esquema del Plan a mediano plazo 2014-2017.

Vemos con satisfacción que el proceso de reflexión y la revisión del Marco Estratégico han avanzado y que las reformas emprendidas en los últimos años se han acelerado con la aplicación de iniciativas y la introducción de medidas transformadoras para lograr la mejora del impacto de la labor de la FAO, que debe centrarse en su principal objetivo, que es la lucha contra el hambre, la malnutrición y la inseguridad alimentaria, a través de la conversión de su labor normativa en resultados concretos en el plano nacional y de sus productos de conocimiento global en cambios reales de política y práctica donde proceda.

La elaboración del Plan de mediano plazo 2014-2017, incluyendo planes de acción para cada uno de los cinco Objetivos Estratégicos, es un objetivo adicional asociado con la calidad y la capacidad de conocimiento y trabajo técnico en el que se contempla toda su actividad normativa; y considerar el género y la gobernanza como áreas transversales en todos los Objetivos muestra un adecuado avance, presentando las versiones preliminares de los Planes de acción de cada Objetivo Estratégico.

Cuba respalda estos objetivos propuestos. Considera también que resulta imprescindible que, en las versiones posteriores a estos planes, se establezca una definición clara y precisa de las metas y los productos asociados a cada una de ellas y que se establezcan los indicadores necesarios para medir cuantitativamente, siempre que sea posible, lo que se ha logrado y la eficiencia con la que se obtuvo. Ello permitirá contar con un marco de resultados que brinde una clara orientación para el trabajo.

Ms Debra PRICE (Canada)

Canada is very pleased with the Reviewed Strategic Framework which now includes a more limited and focused set of Strategic Objectives. We particularly would like to flag, however, the importance of ongoing work on mainstreaming of gender and governance and the particular challenges that this implies for us as Member States as well as the Secretariat.

We believe the inclusion of the sixth Objective relating to the normative work of FAO will in fact provide a needed and more direct linkage to the standard setting activities, including the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the International Plant Protection Convention, an area of importance which was highlighted by Canada and the United States in our Regional Conference in April 2012.

In relation to the sixth Objective, we would like to emphasize that we believe FAO provides vital technical support for the developments of standards for food safety and that FAO should increase its investment and building capacity among Member Countries to enhance the development, use, and compliance with science-based standards.

Finally, I would just like to say that we fully support the points that were made by Ireland on behalf of the European Union as well.

Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)

Australia supports the Director-General in his intent to focus the work of FAO in only those areas where it has a comparative advantage and can make a real difference. Thus, we strongly support the shift of fewer Strategic Objectives and we reiterate the importance of the normative work of FAO which is fundamental to its role.

Once endorsed by the Conference, the Director-General and FAO face a massive challenge in implementing the Strategic Framework and installing a new way of working horizontally across the Organization in the shift to genuine matrix management.

Australia will continue to provide constructive assistance to support this fundamental shift. As Australia has previously stated, FAO will need to clearly demonstrate a real prioritization of work so as to ensure that all of its activities are contributing directly and significantly to the new Strategic Objectives.

FAO also needs to work more closely with the other Rome-based Agencies and International Organizations. Measuring progress will now be of critical importance for FAO to show the world that the new Strategic Objectives are making a real difference and providing a clear line of sight from the basic text to the farmers in the field.

We strongly advocate that FAO continue to further improve the action plans, outcomes, and indicators for each of the Strategic Objectives, and as my esteemed colleague from Afghanistan has already mentioned, we will get onto that in more detail in the next agenda item.

Australia supports the Strategic Framework document being endorsed by Conference.

Mr John TUMINARO (United States of America)

We would also like to thank Mr Haight for his very informative presentation. As we stated in the 146th Session of the Council, the United States fully supports the Strategic Framework as presented. We view the reduction of the previous 11 Strategic Objectives to a more focused, manageable, and concise number of five, and the inclusion of gender and FAO's normative work as crosscutting objectives as also important improvements.

One of the core goals of FAO is to eliminate hunger by promoting food security through a variety of methods. However, we note that many of the priorities supporting this goal do not receive adequate

resources from the assessed budget in the 2014-15 draft Programme of Work and Budget. These priorities include promoting sustainable crop intensification through agricultural technologies, containing livestock diseases and threats to agriculture, governance of fisheries and aquaculture, improving regulatory standards, sustainable forest management, information management, and policy instruments for biodiversity and genetic resources, technical and policy assistance to improve trade for smallholders, improving nutrition for women in vulnerable groups, and increasing public and private investment.

As we stated at the Council, the United States requests that allocations of assessed contributions to the line items addressing food security, sustainable production of food systems, and resiliency be increased and we are confident that we can achieve this without growing the budget. This would mean the need to reduce proposed increases in other line items such as outreach.

We also ask that FAO's work on rural poverty alleviation be well coordinated and complimentary of work on that subject performed by the World Bank, IFAD, and other relevant organizations. The United States endorses the Reviewed Strategic Framework and we look forward to seeing FAO address the above mentioned priorities in the 2014-2015 biennium.

Ms Gothami INDIKADAHENA (Sri Lanka)

I will speak only for Sri Lanka at this particular moment. I will first take this opportunity to thank you on your election as the Chairperson of this important Commission. My delegation, on this agenda item, would like to echo what most of the delegations had stated at this particular Commission, particularly recognizing the Director-General's vision, his shared vision of a renewed FAO which is in sync with our times and also up to challenges we face.

At the last Council, he spoke of an ambition transformation that he started, the impact of which is not always immediately visible, but essential so that FAO can function in the Twenty-first Century and fulfill the role for which it was created. He also spoke of action being initiated to establish a comprehensive accountability framework, a much improved performance evaluation system, and change the Organization's culture to bring real excellence to the working conditions and many more issues.

In light of these reasons, my delegation is pleased and would wish to support the Reviewed Strategic Framework, in particular FAO's vision, the revised global goals, the new five Strategic Objectives as well as the sixth Objective, and cross-cutting themes of gender and governance which were integral to the achievement of the Strategic Objectives, and recommends its approval by this Conference.

This is a point of convergence on which Members agreed and, of course, reiterated at this Commission. Sri Lanka also supports the changes introduced into the organizational structure, a trio of Senior Managers responsible for the coordination of the main areas of organization which are management of its operation, capacity for technical cooperation, the integrated management of productive natural resources, and economic and social development work and communication. Partnerships and advocacy functions will be separated and strengthened.

Since there appears to be no objection, we feel there is an imperative need that the Members endorse this proposed organizational structure and recommend its approval by the Conference.

Mme Christina BLANK (Suisse)

La Suisse soutient le Cadre stratégique révisé, en particulier la vision de la FAO, les objectifs mondiaux révisés et les cinq objectifs stratégiques, ainsi que le sixième objectif et les thèmes transversaux relatifs à la parité homme/femme et à la gouvernance. La Suisse souligne l'importance, pour la réussite du Cadre stratégique, de l'objectif relatif à la gestion et l'usage durable des ressources naturelles, incluant une attention adéquate accordée aux fonds réels, du sixième objectif pour maintenir et mesurer au moyen d'indicateurs précis la qualité technique du travail de la FAO, et des partenariats, tant avec la société civile qu'avec le secteur privé.

Mr ZHAO Lijun (China) (Original language Chinese)

I would also like to thank the Secretariat for their work on the documents. After a year of review, we find that this document is a very good one. The Delegation of China appreciates the analytical work regarding the challenges and the trends identified, the Strategic Objectives and the cross-cutting themes. For an effective functioning of the Organization, the Delegation of China also proposes the Secretariat to ensure the proper implementation of the Strategic Objectives.

We hope that various departments, services, and Member Countries can coordinate their work to ensure proper implementation. Also, we hope that the new Objectives will be integrated with previous work on the previous Strategic Objectives.

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

I appreciate the support expressed by Members in this Commission for the Strategic Framework, the work that we have done together over the last 18 months. Many of the issues raised, I think, are better taken under the next agenda item, particularly relating to the Medium Term Plan.

I did hear, though, very clear support for indicators that will measure both what countries are achieving through FAO and also what FAO is contributing, and that is indeed what we are trying to put in place in the new results framework. The other point was the support for the cross-cutting nature of the work on gender and on governance, as well as ensuring that our normative and standard setting work has prominence but is also integrated in the Strategic Objectives. Objective 6 is indeed intended to measure how well we do that.

CHAIRPERSON

Then the conclusion reads as follows. The Conference appreciated the strategic thinking and transformational change processes from which the Reviewed Strategic Framework was derived. The Conference endorsed the recommendation of the Council for strengthening of FAO's global goal to read; eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition; progressively ensuring a world in which people at all times have sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.

The Conference recalled that the five Strategic Objectives represented the areas of work on which FAO will focus its efforts in support of Member Nations and welcomed their cross-cutting nature which will enable the Organization to break down past silos.

The Conference underlined the importance of the sixth objective for the technical quality, knowledge and services of FAO's work. The Conference stressed the need to integrate the cross-cutting themes of gender and governance across the Strategic Objectives.

The Conference stressed the importance of partnerships with civil society organizations and the private sector in implementation of the Reviewed Strategic Framework. And the Conference approved the Reviewed Strategic Framework in particular FAO's vision, the revised global goals, the new five Strategic Objectives, as well as the sixth objective and the cross-cutting themes of gender and governance which were integral in the achievement of the Strategic Objectives.

23. Medium Term Plan 2014-2017 and Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 (Draft Resolution on budget level)**23. Plan à moyen terme 2014–2017 et Programme de travail et budget 2014–2015 (projet de résolution sur le montant du budget)****23. Plan a plazo medio para 2014-17 y Programa de trabajo y presupuesto para 2014-15 (proyecto de resolución sobre la cuantía del presupuesto)**

(C 2013/3; C 2013/3 Information Notes 1 to 10; C 2013/3 Web Annexes XI and XII; C 2013/LIM/8)

CHAIRPERSON

I propose to start now with Item 23, the Medium-Term Plan 2014-2017 and the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015.

The relevant documents are the main documents C 2013/3 and C 2013/3 Corr. 1, documents C 2013/3 Web Annex 11, and C 2013/3 Web Annex 12, also refer. The extract of the Report of the

146th Session of the Council on this document is presented in C 2013/LIM/8. And the C 2013/3 Information Notes 1-10 which were produced by the Secretariat in response to requests by the Members.

The MTP and PWB document is derived from the Reviewed Strategic Framework which you considered earlier today. The Medium Term Plan 2014-17 outlines a new Results Framework for monitoring and reporting the implementation of the Reviewed Strategic Framework. The PWB 2014-15 contains proposals by the Director-General for programmes to pursue the Organization's new five Strategic Objectives and the sixth objective as well as the resources required to deliver them.

In April this year, the Council came to two main conclusions. Firstly, it recognized the need to support the proposed Programme of Work and secondly it could not agree on the overall budget level proposed by the Director-General.

Informal discussions took place in two meetings of the Friends of the Chair meeting Chaired by the independent Chairperson of the Council but no agreement was reached on the budget. So, our biggest challenge as Commission II is to recommend a budget level to the plenary session of the Conference for FAO in 2014-15.

I think we are obliged to do this because all through the discussions of the Council and in informal meetings thereafter, I have noted convergence on the principle among all Members and also by the Director-General, the firm will or call it the desire to reach consensus on the budget level. So I would urge and call upon this commission to work on the basis of that very principle, to show flexibility as Members but also as a Secretariat or FAO Management in order to find consensus on the budget.

Having said this, I'd like to give the floor to Mr Boyd Haight who will introduce this item but before I give the floor to Mr Boyd Haight, I would announce the way we will operate. I have announced this already this morning by organizing a group of the Chair with two representatives of each region but I would like to use this afternoon to do a kind of wrap-up to where we are exactly.

What is the bridge we need to build or how will we bridge it? And do we have all the needed information because if we want to have more or new information from the Secretariat we have to ask for it this afternoon, so then by tomorrow we have everything we have to know or want to know before the negotiations. We have everything on the table and if the Secretariat knows it during this afternoon session, they can prepare and make documents available tonight or tomorrow morning early.

So now I'd like to give the floor to Mr Boyd Haight to introduce this item. You have the floor.

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

The Medium Term Plan for 2014-17 provides the four year results framework for FAO's Strategic and Functional Objectives and Organizational Outcomes with performance indicators and targets to be achieved through the application of our core functions just described in the Strategic Framework.

The Programme of Work and Budget for 2014-15 quantifies the costs to carry out the two-year Programme of Work. It lays out the Organizational structure and implementation arrangements and it makes provision for long-term liabilities and reserve funds.

The MTP and PWB have been prepared in line with the reform of the programming budgeting and results based monitoring system put in place by the Conference in 2009 under the IPA. They will implement the Reviewed Strategic Framework that you have just considered and approved. The MTP and PWB build on and maintain momentum of the ongoing transformational changes as highlighted by the Director-General in his statement this morning with a focus on efficiently achieving measurable results.

I will provide a brief overview of the MTP and PWB proposals and then turn to the issues raised by the Council in April. Concerning the proposed MTP for 2014-17, I would like to highlight five new features that are part of transformational change.

First, the MTP is driven by what needs to be done to achieve the 17 Organizational Outcomes under the five Strategic Objectives. That is the changes at country, regional and global level arising from the

use of FAO's outputs, products and services as set out in an action plan for each Strategic Objective. This provides the opportunity to focus the Programme of Work on what FAO does best as we prepare our work plans.

Second, a sixth Objective has been defined to ensure and improve the technical quality, knowledge and services provided by the Organization including the global public goods such as food and agriculture statistics.

Third, the cross-cutting areas of work on gender and governance are integrated across and within the Strategic Objectives with areas of focus developed within each Strategic Objective action plan. The resources and performance indicators for these two areas of work are included in the sixth Objective as I mentioned in my previous presentation on the Strategic Framework.

Fourth, the Functional Objectives which provide the enabling environment to support implementation of the Strategic Objectives have been reformulated based on our experience over the last four years. The Functional Objective on administration remains focusing on efficiency and effectiveness.

The Functional Objective on collaboration with Member States and stakeholders has been broken into three new and more focused Functional Objectives; on outreach, on information technology, and on FAO governance oversight and direction. This will allow for more transparent budgeting and measurement of contributions to achieving the Strategic Objectives.

Finally, a concerted effort is being made by the Secretariat to define indicators of achievement of the Strategic Objectives - which is a first at the level of Strategic Objectives - as well as indicators, baselines and targets of the outcomes linked to the Objectives. This will facilitate monitoring and evaluation of performance as well as accountability for results.

Now let me turn to the proposed Programme of Work and Budget for the 2014-15 biennium. The Programme of Work is defined by the five Strategic Objective Action Plans along with the enabling environment provided by the sixth Objective and the Functional Objectives, and the Technical Cooperation Programme. They work together as a package to deliver FAO's outputs and achieve the defined outcomes.

To deliver this Programme of Work, a number of priority areas require incremental resources in 2014-15 totaling USD 31.5 million. These include the Technical Cooperation Programme, communications and partnerships, social protection, and evaluation, as further elaborated in information note two that was provided in April.

Some resources allocated to other areas in the current Programme of Work and Budget have been identified for reallocation towards these priority areas in the next biennium totaling USD 21.5 million. The balance required of USD 10 million is proposed as a 1 percent real increase in the budgetary appropriation to deliver the proposed Programme of Work.

Additional resources are needed to deliver the Programme of Work to take account of inflation, which is known as cost increases in the document. These cost increases were estimated at USD 54.5 million in the PWB published in early February. The Secretariat has kept the assumptions and projections for these cost increases under close review over the past four months and in fact updated estimates on the inflationary costs of staff salaries and benefits became available in March and April as presented in Information Notes 1 and 3.

As a result, the estimated cost increases have been brought down from USD 54.4 million to USD 39.6 million. Therefore the budget proposal to deliver the Programme of Work is USD 1,055.2 million, being the current net appropriation level of USD 1,005.6 million plus USD 10 million in real growth plus the cost increases of USD 39.6 million.

Now if I can turn to the deliberations of the Council in April. First, on a purely financial matter that does not affect the budget. The Council noted that the Finance Committee would undertake a comprehensive review of proposals to improve FAO's financial health, liquidity and reserves at its regular session in October 2013.

In addition for the 2014-15 biennium, it recommended that the Conference continue to follow the previously approved approach of partial funding of USD 14.1 million towards the After-service Medical Coverage past service liability. This is a financial matter that does not impact on the budget.

As requested by the Council, the Secretariat has published seven additional information notes in the past month to facilitate Members' full understanding of the proposed Programme of Work and Budget and to support your constructive dialogue on the level of the net appropriation budget.

Four of the notes provide additional information to enable fuller understanding of the proposal covering: the progression of budgetary requirements 2012-13 to the 2014-15 biennium; the arrangements being put in place for implementing the PWB using a matrix management approach including internal governance, responsibility and accountability, and training of staff and managers; information on FAO's comparative advantage in relation to work on social protection; and the impact of the new scale contributions for 2014-15.

The other three notes provide information requested by the Council that has a direct impact on the PWB proposal. First, as set out in information note number seven, the Director-General has now taken measures that adjust the Organizational arrangements to ensure the visibility and integration of FAO's gender related function in the PWB. Specifically, all technical work related to gender studies and policy analysis will remain in and contribute to the work of the social protection division.

The expertise relating to gender advocacy, partnerships and capacity building will be consolidated and enhanced in the renamed Office for Partnerships, Advocacy, Gender, and Capacity development (OPC) in the apex reporting to the Director-General.

Secondly, possible options to reduce staff costs are presented in information note six. As emphasized by the Director-General this morning, most of the decisions that concern staff salaries and benefits are made by the International Civil Service Commission in New York as mandated by the UN General Assembly.

Finally, information note nine explores measures for further efficiency gains and savings in the next biennium, aimed at reducing the cost to deliver the Programme of Work.

As you heard from the Director-General this morning, he has demonstrated his commitment to find efficiency savings by reducing bureaucracy and staff costs and he will continue in this quest. This is not an easy task. It requires change and support from the Membership but it is necessary to protect the Programme of Work and the technical capacity of the Organization.

Based on developments since the PWB was published in February 2013, we have been able to forecast USD 4 million in further efficiency gains in 2014-15 as set out in number nine. These gains relate to streamlined processing of administrative transactions through the Global Resource Management System and further measures relating to consultants and travel without effecting the Programme of Work.

Taking these USD 4 million in further efficiency gains as savings will bring the resource requirement down from USD 1,055.2 million to USD 1,051.2 million to deliver the Programme of Work in the next biennium.

So what's the road ahead? The MTP and PWB document sets out the Programme of Work for the next biennium and is the starting point for the ongoing detailed planning of our work. This includes the effort to finalize the indicators, baselines and targets for the objectives and outcomes. Following the Conference decision on the budget level, the Director-General will prepare adjustments to the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-15 at the approved budget level, also taking account of any guidance that is provided by the Conference.

The adjustments will include a full set of indicators baselines and targets as well as the implementation arrangements. In line with the programme and budgeting system, the Council in December 2013 will consider and approve the adjustments to the PWB 2014-15 for implementation from the first of January 2014.

Madam Chairperson, the proposed MTP for 2014-17 and PWB for 2014-15 which are submitted for approval by the Conference aim to transform and focus the way FAO works efficiently and with measurable impact. The Council has stressed the importance of supporting the proposed Programme of Work of the Organization. The Secretariat has provided the information requested by the Council to enable Members full consideration of the proposal and to help you come to a consensus on the level of the budget to deliver the Programme of Work. Thank you.

Ms Gothami INDIKADAHENA (Sri Lanka)

We are very happy that we have really come to the real business on this agenda item. Madam Chair, I would like to seek your indulgence at this particular moment. Would you like us to make statements covering our position, so is it dedicated to really seek clarifications from the Secretariat? It would be useful for you to organize this, because some countries may overlap both options, the clarifications and their statements.

So I would just like to seek your clarification on the area that we should focus on in our interventions.

CHAIRPERSON

My proposal would be to do both, so you can make clear where your country or your region stands. But if there is a need for more information, please come forward with the request so that it can be prepared during the evening or even during the afternoon. So both in one round.

Ms Gothami INDIKADAHENA (Sri Lanka)

I actually make this intervention on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. You know that the group actually has a larger Membership, more than 132 countries in the United Nations System.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you, Madam Chair, for having a very positive role and we believe that you will continue to discharge your duties under this neutral role but we know that it is a very difficult task before you in really steering the discussions in Commission II.

We also would like to present our opinion particularly on the reporting of the outcomes of these consultations, the G77 actually expects that you, as the Chair, would have a very key role in ensuring the views of all Delegations, including those of our Group are properly taken into account and presented in your summary.

Let me dwell on the budget from different aspects of it which we believe are essential and need to be preserved. First, on the Programme of Work proposed by the Director-General and we know it has full support from the Member Countries which was evident at the 146th Session of the Council. I think you also read out in your brief introduction of this agenda item. Members have stressed that it is important to support the proposed Programme of Work of this Organization, which we also saw in some aspects reiterated by the Regional Groups at the last two consultations we had during the Friends of Chair meetings with the Independent Chairperson of the Council.

The Group therefore firmly believes that the Programme of Work proposed by the Director-General needs to be preserved in its entirety, and the group is not in a position to renegotiate on the content of the Programme of Work of 2014-15 at this juncture. The Members need to ensure that adequate financial resources are made available to implement the Programme of Work for the 2014-15 biennium.

Regarding the budget level, the Director-General has identified that the total budget needed in 2014-2015 to deliver this proposed Programme of Work is USD 1,055.2 million which is in USD 49.6 million more than the budget approved for 2012-13.

Out of this, USD 39.6 million is to take care of the inflation or cost increases. The real increase, therefore, proposed in the budget, when you take into account the 2012-13, is only USD 10 million.

This budget increase represents one percent more in real terms compared to the approved budget in 2012-13 and five percent more in nominal terms than the budget approved in 2012-13. Talking on the negotiations on the baseline calculations, the one-time investment cost of USD 8.6 million in IPA related activities, we believe, was an integral part of the 2012-13 budget, and it was identified as to be

used as seed money or capital expenditure for FAO. It was not savings or efficiencies generated by the IPA.

The discussion over the budget baseline of the budget linked the 8.6 million of one-time IPA costs is therefore meaningless because Members are going to negotiate the budget level based on the resources required to deliver the Programme of Work in 2014-15, not on whether the previous budget contained one-time costs or not.

The proposed budget at FAO is always compared to the budget approved for the previous biennium. This is to allow an accurate and consistent comparison with the previous budget, a practice used across the world, in every national government. The Group, therefore, does not see any valid reasons for adopting a different baseline and calculating the proposed budget increases in the 2014-15 PWB.

This is a non-issue from the Group's point of view. So the only basis for negotiation on the budget level for 2014-15 is whether the proposed Programme of Work can be delivered with a budget which is less than USD 1,055.2 million. Otherwise, any Member that wishes to curtail the Programme of Work must specify which programmes that they propose to cut in 2014-2015.

Now comes to the negotiations on cost increases. The cost increases of USD 39.6 million are the inflation in the costs of delivering the Programme of Work which comes mainly from the increase in unit staff costs, and the vast majority of these increases are determined by the International Civil Service Commission and the General Assembly, therefore beyond FAO's control. It is not because more staff is proposed to deliver the Programme of Work of 2014-15 compared to 2012-13. In fact, the Director-General is proposing to deliver the Programme of Work in 2014-15 with less staff than 2012-13.

Neither the Director-General nor FAO Members have the authority to decide on the remuneration of staff. Conference document C 2013/3, Information Note 6 published recently outlines the various areas of unit staff costs and of the authority, the role of the ICSC and the General Assembly, the Director-General and FAO Members for each area.

Information Note 6 also points out that a comprehensive revival is under way by the ICSC and the General Assembly. That being so, are we to permit curtailing the proposed budget increase in the PWB in five priority areas amounting to USD 31.5 million in order to absorb the staff cost increases. The group is not in a position to accept such a stance. Hence, let's not consider it an issue for negotiations.

On the issue of efficiency savings, during the budget discussions for the 2012-13 biennium, the Conference requested the Secretariat to find USD 34.5 million in efficiencies to deliver the Programme of Work. The Director-General found USD 34.5 million in efficiencies as requested. In addition, he found further USD 19.3 million in efficiencies for the 2012-13 biennium.

This high level of USD 55 million in efficiencies is unprecedented. In the *Programme of Work and Budget 2014-15*, the Director-General is proposing a further USD 10 million in efficiencies. In keeping with his commitment to find further efficiency savings with the aim of delivering the Programme of Work in 2014-15 more efficiently, he has found further efficiency savings worth four million in 2014-15 as provided in C 2013/3 Information Note 9, especially in three main areas.

First, through implementation of Global Resource Management System, USD two million. Second in travel costs, USD one million; and third, of course, consultants, USD one million. With this new declared savings of 14 million, the proposed budget level will come to USD 1,051.2 million which is 0.5966 percent growth in real terms.

Does this mean, after finding an unprecedented level of savings in 2012-13 which amounted to USD 67.6 million, and proposing a further USD 14 million efficiency savings in 2014-15, should the Members expect the Director-General to find more savings? Any such attempt, we will see the result in serious risk of delivering the Programme of Work in 2014-15.

We recognize the importance of preserving priority areas of work. In a given situation where the proposed budget increase of USD 31.5 million mitigated to the Programme of Work in five priority

areas is not reachable, would the Group be ready to accept reductions in budget increases in priority areas? For example, technical cooperation, social protection, adequacy and capacity development in which gender issues will be mainstreamed and consolidated as per C 2013/3 Information Note 7, and forgo the programmes in these identified areas? We are certainly not.

The Information Note 9 highlights that the only way to have significant savings is to abolish a post beyond these identified through efficiency measures. This would have a direct impact on the scope and delivery of the Programme of Work. In a similar vein, Information note 9 also explains that delaying the recruitment of staff to a weakened budget post will not result in further savings.

The Group certainly does not agree with the proposals being made by some that the additional post numbering 55 created recently by Director-General in Decentralized Offices to strengthen their activities should be frozen. This would not only hamper the activities of Decentralized Offices, but creates further distortions in allocations of posts within the countries.

On the issue of zero nominal group budgets: when the Director-General states that it is difficult to implement the Programme of Work under Zero Nominal Growth budget without harming the programmes, should we agree on a Zero Nominal Growth budget for the sake of reaching a consensus. The Zero Nominal Growth budget means that you literally maintain the same level of budget of 2012-13 which is USD 5.6 million, and absorb the cost increases worth USD 39.6 million, where you will end up with an overall budget of USD 966 million unless you find adequate efficiency savings to offset the cost increases.

This would finally result in a reduction of 2014-15 proposed budget by 0.95 percent compared to the 2012-13 approved budget level. When other sister UN Organizations have said high or low, we know it is a reported budget increase in the range of 0.3 percent and WHO approved the budget recently without any reduction has approved their budgets with more than a zero budget growth.

Can FAO, being the leading UN Agency, get a reduction in poverty and end hunger in our countries, be deprived of this opportunity to do more for the peoples of our countries? The Group is, Madame Chair, open to further negotiations to find a consensus that does not harm or risk the delivery of the Programme of Work.

Madame Chair, I think as you indicated in your first remarks that we all have to give and achieve the consensus – but Madame Chair, we the Group are open as we stated for more negotiations, but the condition is that we do not wish to risk the Programme and Budget. I think with this sense of compromise and participation willingness, we would like to approach this agenda item and we will assure you that we will be very constructive in our negotiations.

Mr Abdul Razak AYAZI (Afghanistan)

I am making this statement on behalf of the Near East countries. We wish to make the following eight observations on the MTP and the Programme of Work and Budget.

One, with respect to the five Strategic Objectives, we note with favor the change in wording from earlier versions, especially by adding the word contributing to Strategic Objective one, and the reformulation of Strategic Objective two.

In our view, the definition of Strategic Objective three could have been to contribute to the reduction of rural poverty. This is because apart from agriculture, the reduction in rural poverty also demands improved public health, sanitation, education, and better governance in rural areas. All of these sectors are not within the mandate of FAO. We most welcome the inclusion of the six regional initiatives under the five Strategic Objectives.

Number two, we agree with the sixth Objective entitled “Technical Quality, Knowledge, and Services” and the four functional Objectives, especially the outreach. We also support the two crosscutting themes of gender and governance.

Madame Chair, we prefer not to label Strategic Objective six as a Strategic Objective because it is specific to FAO and not to Member Nations and other stakeholders as the other five Strategic Objectives are. In fact, the sixth Objective and the functional Objective outreach represent the

technical work of the Organization as well as the other functions. Therefore, the sixth Objective and functional Objective outreach are essential for the Action Plans covered under the Strategic Objectives.

Thirdly, we support the six areas singled out for special attention in the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 and which require net appropriations of 31.5 million as stated in paragraphs 173 to 174 of C 2013/3 and further elaborated in information note two and four. Of this sum, half is for TCP and is responding to the Conference Resolution 8/89 which invited the Director-General to make every effort to restore the resources available to TCP to 14 percent of the regular budget and, if possibly, to raise it to 17 percent.

In addition, TCP is now closely integrated to the country programming frameworks and therefore can play a strategic role. The other two major items of USD 31.5 million are support for communication and partnership amounting to seven million and enforcing Strategic Objective three amounting to five million.

Information note two and ten provide further information about the different components of the six areas chosen for special attention. We appreciate that USD 21.5 out of the 31.5 million will come from efficiency savings.

Fourthly, we note with favor that 91 percent of the estimated core voluntary contribution of USD 164.9 million in the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 is led to the five Strategic Objectives. However, it is regrettable to note a fall of 34 percent in estimated core voluntary contribution in comparison to the previous biennium. We therefore encourage the Secretariat to do what is possible to increase – to negotiate with the donors for an increase in voluntary contributions.

Number five, we welcome the contents of paragraph 238 on support for decentralization. With transformational changes, the decentralized offices gained professional posts and according to information note two, the level of net appropriation grows by an additional sum of 5.9 million. This was indeed a good development. However, with respect to the net appropriation for 2014-2015, this situation is not favorable for the budget of the decentralized offices, and here I am excluding TCP allocation by region which are distilled for countries and not for decentralized offices.

Based on Annex 7 of C 2013/3, net appropriations for the budget of the decentralized offices combined is 277 million compared with 285 million for 2012-2013. I again mention TCP is included from the figures that I quoted.

Madame Chair, my sixth point is net budgetary appropriations for 2014-2015 which was first estimated at one billion 70.1 million. Then taking into account the successive reductions in cost estimates, the proposed net budgetary appropriation now stands at USD 1055.2 million of which 1005.6 million is base budget and 39.6 million is cost increase and only 10 million is incremental increase.

Mr Boyd mentioned the possibility of additional efficiency savings of four million. Now, I don't know if that will be counted in the 1055.2 or not. If it does, then it brings the net appropriation to 1051.2 million.

In short, the budget proposed by the Director-General is fairly well adapted to the economic conditions of the world today. We do not think there are additional possibilities for efficiency savings. There are maybe opportunities for reduction in staff costs as mentioned in Information Note 6, but the possibility of such a reduction is the domain of the United Nations and not the management of FAO.

In view of the global and regional challenges facing FAO, any programme cuts would be detrimental to the interests of developing countries which rely on FAO for policy advice, knowledge exchange, and capacity development.

My seventh point, we appreciate the release in information note five on metrics management covering the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015. We welcome the negotiations of the corporate programme monitoring board: the idea of one coordinator for each of the Strategic Objectives who will be responsible for the organizational outcome under each Strategic Objective. He

or she will be assisted by a core team in terms of planning and monitoring, and by team leaders for each output contributed to the outcome of the Strategic Objective. That is theory. There could be 60 output team leaders who are also budget holders.

The product of the output team is to be monitored jointly by the Strategic Objective coordinator and the ADG of the department concerned. While the mechanism proposed looks complex, the point to make is that metrics management is essential for the proposed strategic framework.

Madame Chair, my last point, the eighth point, is that in the last session of the Council, several Members raised a number of issues on the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015 to be clarified by management which has responded in a series of information notes. We would like to mention some of them.

Information note seven explains the visibility of gender in FAO and explains that the proposed social protection division will be responsible for coordinating the crosscutting themes on gender and the OPC will be renamed as the Office of Partnership, Gender Advocacy, and Capacity Development.

Information note five explains the metrics management under the new Strategic Framework. The question of internal governance is explained in paragraph 4 of the note and paragraph 8 and 9 explain the role of the Strategic Objective coordinator and that of the output team leader.

Information note 8 explains the impact of the new scale of contribution for 2014-2015. Information note three explains the cost increase in assumption. Information note 10 explains FAO's comparative advantages in relation to social protection. Information note 2 explains the delegation of authority for the management of natural resources through the proposed organizational structure.

Madame Chair, the Near East Region makes no more demands for further information on the Secretariat. On the level of the budget, the Near East Region is open to discuss with other Regions to try to reach a reasonable consensus.

Mr Patrick HENNESSY (Ireland)

I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States, the acceding country to the European Union, Croatia, and the candidate countries to the European Union Montenegro, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, align themselves with this statement.

We reiterate our support for the work of FAO and the Director-General's vision. We are committed to the implementation of the five Strategic Objectives and to the quality of FAO's work on knowledge as contained in Objective 6.

This is emphasized by the fact that the EU and its Member States is the biggest provider of funding i.e. core and voluntary contributions to FAO. We have acted in good faith during all of the discussions on the Programme of Work and Budget to date, especially as regards supporting the Programme of Work and seeking to protect it.

We are prepared to support many of the higher priorities outlined by the Director-General requiring additional resources although some questions still remain. We would have expected a list of additional priorities to have been accompanied by a list of areas of lesser priority.

Outcome-orientated strategic management has to be based on a finite list of activities rather than on focused expansion. We welcome FAO's emphasis on results-based management. As a priority, FAO needs to clearly demarcate the responsibilities of FAO and governments respectively.

We continue to be concerned that the complexity of the matrix structure will impose governance challenges. We remain concerned about how FAO will deliver and fund the key thematic areas of gender and improved governance. We urge the FAO to continue to work urgently towards strengthening efforts to improve mainstreaming of gender equality.

Madam Chair, we have to recall that many states are operating in very constrained fiscal circumstances requiring the utmost responsibility and efficiency when it comes to public expenditure.

As a result, many EU Member States are under strict instructions regarding their public expenditure, both domestically and internationally.

The request by FAO for a budget increase of some USD 45 million is in contrast to this reality. FAO is out of step with other international organizations, including the Rome-based UN Agencies whose budgets have been agreed with little or no increases.

In preparation for this Conference, we note that FAO did not re-evaluate the baseline for the PWB 2014-15. We question the premise on which the baseline has been determined, and which will have implications for how cost increases are subsequently calculated. This may affect the way in which one-time payments are viewed in the future.

We believe that FAO must absorb the inflationary cost increases by achieving greater efficiencies and savings. We do not wish to comment on specifics but we believe that FAO should look to administrative costs, especially staff costs. We will back the Director-General on taking difficult decisions in this regard.

We are confident that this can happen without affecting the Programme of Work or FAO's delivery of public goods. Even if staff costs relating to salaries and benefits are protected by the rules of the International Civil Service Commission, overall numbers can be revisited as part of a necessary job audit to ensure that FAO has the best staff-skill set for its important functions.

While FAO will deliver the 2014-15 PWB with fewer budgeted staff than the 2012-13 PWB, we do not consider the reduction of two posts credible given the transformational change being undertaken. FAO must face its challenges in an innovative manner and not rely on the view that increases in staff costs are beyond FAO's control.

We appreciate the significant efforts made during the last biennium to find savings, but in a modern result-oriented Organization, the search for cost efficiency is constant. We believe that further cost savings and efficiencies can be achieved by FAO. However, we have concerns about how FAO has dealt with the recent savings. For example, the USD 19.3 million savings arising from the critical review of posts.

It is not for the Membership to decide how savings should be specifically achieved or what if any programmes should be addressed. This is the micromanagement that we all want to avoid. Instead, we trust that the Director-General and his team can deliver savings and efficiencies as requested in the manner most appropriate for the Organization.

Finally, we look forward to engaging constructively on the issues listed above in order to achieve consensus on the Programme of Work and Budget.

Madam Chair, as I have the floor and noting your wish that requests for further information be formulated at this stage, I would ask therefore for an update of HR data that was presented to the Finance Committee at its March session, in particular table 1, workplace profiles by employment type. And it would also be helpful to have figures on a number of current vacancies, actual and in percentage terms, the total number of consultants, the current general service to professional service staff ratio, and finally an update on preparation of the Programme of Work by the Strategic Objective leaders.

Mr John TUMINARO (United States of America)

The United States will make this intervention on behalf of the North American Regional Group. It is clear that FAO's mission is vital to global food security. What is also clear is that many donors are currently faced with significant financial challenges.

These challenges are included in the Finance Committee recommendation on the Medium Term Plan Programme of Work and Budget which states current economic realities must be taken into account when preparing a Budget and Programme of Work for 2014-15. Nevertheless, we believe that the current budget proposal for 2014-15 put forth by the Secretariat contains significant growth.

A consensus budget is important to FAO and its mission and we are confident that we can all agree to one. We encourage FAO to find creative solutions that express programmatic priorities but respect and work within the constraints of global fiscal realities.

UN Agencies worldwide are all working within the constraints of current fiscal realities and are not growing their budgets. For example, as we have already heard, WHO has approved the 2014–15 budget with no growth in its assessed portion.

We are also sympathetic to the constraints with regard to salaries that FAO and other UN agencies must confront. The United States is actively pursuing the control of salaries within the International Civil Service Commission and we will be happy to work with FAO and other UN agencies in pressing the ICSC to control salaries.

Madam Chairman, we are supportive of the vision and leadership of FAO and all other UN agencies, but we believe we have to work within the fiscal realities we collectively face. We believe the greatest proof of confidence is that the FAO is forecasting a record increase in extra-budgetary contributions and we note the current efforts made to streamline FAO's processes and we encourage them to continue with their efforts.

We look forward to continuing this conversation.

Ms Thi Thu QUYNH NGUYEN (Viet Nam)

Viet Nam is speaking on behalf of the Asia Group. As the Asia Group is making a statement for the first time, we would like to congratulate you for the great success of chairing the meeting of this very important Commission.

The Asia Group would like to thank the Director-General for the Medium Term Plan 2014–2017 and the Programme of Work and Budget 2014–2015 he has brought before us.

The group separates the MTP 2014–17 which introduces a new programmatic approach in undertaking FAO activities. With a revised set of core functions and a concrete Plan of Action for the obtainment of the Strategic Objectives, a coordinator is assigned for each Strategic Objective.

We believe that with this new approach, the FAO will gain higher efficiency in its work in the future. With the proposed frame work 2014–2015 with the TCP, Technical Cooperation Programme, gender and social production activity, and ITP of the decentralized offices to help attain regional priorities have got more attention and concentration from the Organization.

We would like to see the Programme of Work be implemented successfully so that the five Strategic Objectives will soon be realized. We thank the Director-General and his team for their great efforts to find ways to finance the implementation of the Programme of Work.

With regard to savings and efficiencies that have been found, having all agreed on the Programme of Work proposed by the Director-General, we are of the view that consultation and a consensus approach should be followed with an aim to getting consensus on the budget level so that we can enable and ensure fruitful implementation of the Programme of Work.

Lastly, we would like to raise the same question as the Near East Group and request clarification from the Secretariat. With the addition of USD 4 million savings provided in the information note number nine, the proposed budget now stands at USD 1 billion 51.2 million. In other words, the real increase will be reduced from USD 10 million to USD 6 million. Are there any other interpretations? I thank you Madam Chair for your attention.

Mr Khalid MAHBOOB (Pakistan)

I should like to thank Boyd for his very informative presentation and also like to thank him for the ten information notes which were very helpful in facilitating our understanding of the various issues.

Madam Chair, I would like to offer some brief comments at the outset on some of the issues which emanated from the Council's discussion and were mentioned here as well and then to give a brief comment on our position on some of the proposals in the Director-General's budget.

Madam Chair, it is important to recall here that at the last Council meeting, Members gave support to the Programme of Work of the Organization, hence the issue at hand is not the Programme of Work but the arrangement for its financing.

The Director-General's proposal foresees a budget level of 1055.2 million to deliver this programme. This figure includes 39.6 million for cost increases to take account of inflation in order to preserve the purchasing power of the net appropriation. In other words, these are costs which protect the Programme of Work which Members approve.

Madam Chair, we concur with the proposed cost increases. We do not subscribe to the view of some Members that FAO should finance the cost increases through further savings. We do not consider it feasible to ask FAO to do that for the 2014-2015 budget.

Madam Chair, if you look at information note nine put out by the Secretariat, which states that significant and unprecedented biennial efficiency gains and savings of 67.6 million are being achieved in the biennium 2012-2013. The same note also states that these gains and savings are of a recurring nature and are incorporated in the PWB of 2014-2015.

In addition, the 2014-2015 budget also identifies and provides for new gains and savings of 10 million. Moreover information note nine is also providing a forecast of 4 million in further efficiency gains and savings upon the full deployment of the Global Resource Management Systems.

Madam Chair, a point is reached in every organization when further savings become more and more difficult after that organization has provided unprecedented and significant savings in the current biennium and is also providing a savings in the next biennium. This is not the first time FAO is providing savings. Every biennium in the budget is prepared. It has to come forward with efficiency gains and savings.

So Madam Chair, to ask FAO to provide additional savings for the next biennium and the next biennium is not that far off would be impractical. It's not that FAO would not be able to achieve savings. It will but it would have to develop new systems. It may have to go in for re-engineering of its business process and the time factor comes in and I do not believe that FAO would be in a position to come forward with additional savings apart from the ones they've already identified without reducing staff members.

And reducing staff numbers without proper reviews would mean cutting into programmes and the programme which is being supported by Member governments and that would have an extremely negative impact.

Madam Chair, I won't deal with the question of the staff costs because the Chair of the Group of 77 has already in detail referred to that aspect and I support what she said that it is beyond FAO's control. It's all in the hands of the International Civil Service Commission and the General Assembly.

But what I would like to say is that staff costs have always been a major component of the budgets of FAO because FAO is a knowledge Organization and is a center of excellence and that's why the staff costs or staff numbers have been always high. That is not to say that a review should not be done and a review is underway in New York and so I don't believe any discussion of that aspect here would contribute positively.

On the question of the baseline again I support what the Chair of the Group of 77 said. FAO's process has always been to take the net appropriation of the previous biennium and treat that as a base to build the new budget on. So the question is not what should be included and what should be excluded from the baseline.

The question is what was the net appropriation approved by Member governments previously? As to what should be the level, that then Members negotiate to see what funds are needed to deliver the programme which they have approved so I don't see why there is a request to veer from the process which has been in place for many years.

Madam Chair, now I would like to offer some comments on our opposition on some of the issues listed in the Director-General's proposals. We support the priority areas identified in the Programme of Work and Budget for incremental resource allocation.

In particular, we fully support the proposed increase in the allocation for the TCP. This is the programme of FAO which responds directly to the needs of Member Nations. Also its enhanced form will ensure greater alignment of TCP activities with the Strategic Objectives and better delivery and impact in response to country level needs. The proposed increase will allow the level of the TCP appropriation to converge towards the target agreed by the Conference of 14 percent of net appropriation.

We also strongly support the need to build up capacity for rural development, in particular social protection. This is an area which needs to be addressed and is important for improving food security and nutrition and in reducing rural poverty.

As information note 10 points out, FAO in providing support to Member Countries focuses on its unique expertise and comparative advantage and therefore does not engage in implementation of activities which other agencies may be better placed to undertake.

Consequently, consistent with its Reviewed Strategic Framework, FAO's work on social protection will focus on supporting countries as described in pages four and five of information note ten.

We support the strengthening of the Corporate Communication Function as well as the creation of the new Office for Partnerships, Gender, Advocacy and Capacity Development.

Madam Chair, in order to finance the high priority areas, we support the proposal that incremental requirement be met by the reallocation of resources from the PWB and a small real increase in the net appropriation before cost increases. This means that 21.5 million will be met from the reallocation of resources and an additional amount of 10 million from the real increase in the budget. We support this figure of real increase in order for FAO to deliver its Programme of Work.

Madam Chair, we also support the proposed organizational structure set out in Paris 2012-2029 in the budget document. In particular, we support the elevation of the management of natural resources by transforming DDK to DDG as this will enable close interaction with other technical departments. We note that this will entail the evolution of the Natural Resources Department as this will generate savings. We welcome this action.

We also support the separate reporting line of the ES which recognizes that economic and social activities are essentially different from other offices and units linked to natural resources.

Mr Robert SABIITI (Uganda)

This statement is aligned with that of Sri Lanka on behalf of the G77, Afghanistan on behalf of the Near East, Asia Group by Viet Nam and Pakistan. Let me mention that I'm making this statement on behalf of the Africa Regional Group.

Madam Chair, with your indulgence, allow me to delve into a bit of history to explicate some aspects regarding the subject under discussion. About 10 years ago, Membership decided to undertake a comprehensive reform of the Organization, which culminated into the Independent External Evaluation commonly known as IEE that ended in 2007 and produced a Report C 2007/7 A.

I would like to allude to some three interesting messages from the Report. The first one was that the world needs FAO but a more relevant, effective, and efficient FAO with more process priorities. This Strategic Framework of the Director-General has been prepared in that direction.

Another message from the IEE was that the principle pitfall often facing the Organization is often found in mismatches between available resources and over ambitious goals. Have we addressed this question? The answer is everybody's guess.

The other message from the IEE was that FAO required a reform with growth. Everyone is talking of reform but silent on growth. The understanding of Membership during the IEE negotiation was that

the growth would constitute of increased resources into the Organization coupled with a higher volume of programme for Membership. Has this been addressed? Again, the answer is no.

In his address to the plenary this morning, the Director-General reiterated how the Organization's budget had faced a progressive decline of up to 27 percent since 1994 and how that had adversely curtailed the ability of the Organization to serve its Members efficiently. The zero nominal growth budget has been a disaster to FAO's work.

All of these are happening at a time when many countries are facing severe challenges of meeting both the World Food Summit Goals and the Millennium Development Goals. In view of the above, Madame Chair, we support the Director-General's MTP 2014-17 and his budget proposals as presented and pledge our readiness to engage in the constructive engagement that will help us reach a reasonable consensus in this regard, should it arise.

M. Marc HEIRMAN (Belgium)

La Belgique adhère entièrement aux propos de la présidence européenne ainsi que du groupe nord-américain. La Belgique a toujours prôné une saine gestion des organisations internationales, tant pour ce qui est de la politique de personnel que des salaires, que des pensions ou encore des outils informatiques. Nous sommes convaincus qu'une gestion rigoureuse doit permettre de présenter un budget en diminution. Et nous soutenons toute proposition qui vise à faire diminuer ce budget de façon rationnelle. Dans la même optique, mon pays est favorable à ce que la FAO se concentre sur son activité de base et s'abstienne d'étendre son champ d'activité. Nous plaidons donc pour une priorisation claire des activités avec un recentrage sur les activités qui sont la raison d'être de l'Organisation.

Madame la Présidente, il y a seulement deux semaines, mon pays a décidé d'allouer un montant de 9,2 millions d'euros, environ 12 millions de dollars non affectés à la FAO pour la période 2013-2015, afin qu'elle puisse répondre au mieux aux attentes que ses bénéficiaires placent en elle.

Ceci témoigne de la confiance que mon pays met dans l'Organisation et son Directeur général. Mais ceci veut également dire que l'on peut demander un budget réduit, d'une part, et appuyer la FAO, d'autre part, afin que l'Organisation puisse atteindre ses objectifs.

Enfin, vu la place que la politique de personnel et des salaires prennent dans notre discussion, je suggère, quelle que soit l'issue de nos négociations, que le Directeur général plaide auprès de la Commission de la fonction publique internationale pour qu'elle prenne en compte la situation financière de la FAO et de ses États Membres, et qu'il nous tienne au courant à travers les voies de communication existantes.

Mr Matthew WORRELL (Australia)

Australia's position on the budget level has not changed from that expressed clearly at last week's second friends of the chair meeting. Rather than repeating our statements, I will simply make a couple of points.

Australia is a strong supporter of the Director-General's efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of FAO. We believe that he is on the right track and we want to recognize this and support his efforts. Australia endorses a fiscally responsible approach to UN budget determination, believing that United Nations Organizations must continue to look for ways to deliver mandates more efficiently and effectively.

As a Member State, we are taking similar exercises domestically in order to maximize our ability to deliver results with limited resources. We consider the proposed budget level too high and out of touch with global and national financial pressures.

Australia believes that the FAO Programme of Work can be progressed without substantial increases in the Organization's budget. As I said on Thursday, the Programme of Work is still under development. The expectation is that FAO's work will be better prioritized and as a result, some activities ceased as they are not contributing directly and significantly to the achievement of the new Strategic Objectives.

Australia believes that the resources utilized for these redundant activities can be utilized for savings and/or increased investment in high priority activities. Australia also fully supports the statement by Ireland on behalf of the EU regarding personnel costs. When the Finance Committee considered the budget in April, we specifically requested consideration of a comprehensive post-audit review to achieve a reduction in costs relating to administrative staff. We are yet to get any information from the Secretariat on these matters and we believe this is a potential area for further discussion by members in seeking to attain agreement to a reduced budget figure.

I will conclude by saying we come to the table willing to work hard to achieve a win/win budget outcome for the Organization and for Member Nations concerned about financial discipline.

Mr Yo OSUMI (Japan)

Madame Chair, you are with inexhaustible energy and we would like to count on your leadership and guidance throughout this discussion to lead us to a consensus which we ourselves and Members of the Committee.

In terms of 2014-17 related to this MTP, we would like to introduce that we had, two and a half weeks ago, we have the Fifth Tokyo International Conference on African Development in Japan which we have every four years, and the Secretary-General came to Japan and we appreciated his presence. And our Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Ministers for Agriculture expressed support for his and FAO's direction toward the future.

We also informed the Secretary-General that we had paid for the DCSU just two weeks after the budget was approved by the parliament, in time for his arrival in Japan. In terms of 2014-15 Programme of Work, our position has been expressed in Council and other occasions for several times already, but we would like to point out that these baseline discussions, the baseline should not be four digits but three digits because some elements which were in the previous Programme of Work, some elements don't exist anymore and that should be reflected in our discussion.

We believe that we should strongly aim for further reduction of the total costs and in that regard we support the United States when they referred to the examples of other Organizations.

As we go towards the weekend, we hope that we would like to see more and more smiles in this room and we would like to work with you, Madame Chair, and other Members of this Commission.

Mr Olyntho VIEIRA (Brazil)

At the beginning, our Delegation wishes you all the success in this endeavor which is not easy and you can count on our cooperation for the successful outcome of this effort. Brazil, as it was stated on different occasions, supports the figures that were presented by the Secretariat.

We understand that negotiations will happen and that we will come to a different figure, but we insist that two points must be kept untouched, the technical cooperation programme and the decentralization process. Those are important items that we understand that should be kept as they are. Although we understand and we expect that further efficiency savings can be found and that we all can come to a final value that is approved by consensus.

Mr Magdy HASSAN ANWAR (Egypt)

First of all I would like to go back to the comments made by the Delegates from Sri Lanka and Pakistan. I would have liked to stress two points but actually the Delegate of Brazil took the words out of my mouth and raised them before me.

Of course, the negotiations regarding the budget are always very arduous, but in spite of that, we always do manage to reach a compromise and often this is something that happens at the very last minute, but I am confident that under your able leadership, we are going to come to an agreement.

And whatever figure is adopted, I would like to reiterate what was just said by the Delegate of Brazil, meaning that technical cooperation programmes should be retained, although given the current circumstances, they should not be stepped up as we would like them to be. They should remain as well as the decentralized offices.

Sr. Gustavo INFANTE (Argentina)

Le agradezco la mera palabra y además le reitero nuestro firme compromiso de respaldar sus esfuerzos en alcanzar un consenso y un resultado exitoso de las tareas de esta Comisión. También agradecemos a la Secretaría la provisión de la documentación e información que, de manera sustantiva, ha contribuido a que tengamos un panorama claro de la situación en la que se encuentra la FAO y de la propuesta que nos presenta el Director General.

Argentina ha reiterado en distintas oportunidades y, en particular durante los trabajos del grupo de amigos del Presidente Independiente del Consejo, nuestro respaldo a la Propuesta del Director General. Y en ese sentido, también respaldamos en esta oportunidad la presentación que hizo Sri Lanka a nombre del grupo del G77 más China.

También nos asociamos a lo que ha sido expresado por Brasil, Afganistán y Pakistán. En todas esas presentaciones se han brindado abundantes datos técnicos e interpretaciones que compartimos, y en las cuales no vamos a insistir.

Sí queremos hacer una reflexión en relación a distintas observaciones que se realizaron esta tarde. Hemos escuchado de distintas delegaciones que se han aumentado las contribuciones extrapresupuestarias. Y ello es bienvenido y se agradece. Nos sorprende en alguna medida que no ocurra lo mismo, entonces, con la intención de efectuar una mayor contribución al Presupuesto Institucional que presenta la Propuesta del Director General. Por el contrario, se insiste en que debemos encontrar mayores ahorros por eficiencia.

Yo entiendo que ese reclamo se basa en que en la exitosa respuesta que dio la administración a solicitudes previas, que permitieron resultados muy positivos el año pasado. Pero nos ha sido explicado que si bien existe la posibilidad de realizar ahorros, difícilmente estos pudieran alcanzar la magnitud de ahorros pasados, lo cual reduce notablemente el campo para poder, a su vez, reducir el presupuesto. La alternativa parece ser la reducción de los costos de personal. Pero da la impresión, por los comentarios que hemos recibido, de que ese es un camino más a mediano plazo; y que realmente no tendría efectos para la propuesta que estamos considerando. Y es aquí donde sobreviene la preocupación, porque si estas vías no presentan la posibilidad de efectuar ahorros, da la impresión de que queda solamente el Programa de cooperación técnica; lo cual es un tema muy sensible.

Y, si bien ha sido mencionado que no se favorece manejar de manera micro las decisiones, debemos tener en cuenta que si tuviéramos que tratar el Programa de cooperación técnica, posibilidad que nosotros no compartimos ni contemplamos, pero si hubiera que hacerlo, sí correspondería a los Miembros tener una participación activa en esa decisión, habida cuenta de la importancia que tiene para el trabajo de la FAO.

En suma, Señora presidenta, le reitero el compromiso que tenemos para trabajar en pos de un consenso que pueda reflejar adecuadamente las necesidades de la organización y el compromiso que ha sido manifestado por todos los Miembros con la tarea de la Organización.

Ms Anthe Katherine CRAWLEY (New Zealand)

New Zealand would like to express its support for the important work of the FAO and for the Director-General's Programme of Work. We would like to state from that onset that we are looking forward to working constructively to contribute to a consensus agreement on the budget level.

Madame Chair, the FAO has to work within a finite budget. This requires careful management of the resources available and highlights the need for effective and meaningful prioritization. In this regard, there is a clear need to ensure that funding is directed to those areas where it can most directly contribute to the achievement of the Strategic Objectives.

In this respect, New Zealand strongly supports the statement of Ireland on behalf of the EU. In a climate of fiscal constraint across the international community and throughout the UN System, we do not see justification for the FAO to be given a USD 10 million real increase and USD 39 million to cover cost increases. Furthermore, we are not able to support the proposal that the one-off USD 8.6

million IPA cost approved for the previous biennium should be included into the baseline for the 2013 assessed contributions.

This undermines the spirit in which the IPA cost was approved. We believe it would have a deterrent effect on Members' willingness to approve one-off costs in the future and it may also have a negative effect on voluntary contribution levels.

New Zealand has joined other Members in asking in the Friends of the Chair meeting last week for further information in regard to identifying options for a revision of the baseline. We regret that this has not been provided. Although we are not asking for further information at this point, we continue to believe that this discussion will be best progressed by a serious effort to identify areas that can be accorded least priority or where they are scrapped for further savings, and exploration of options to redirect funding accordingly.

Mr Song Chol RI (Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

The Programme of Work and Budget for 2014 and 15 submitted to this meeting is in line with the activities of FAO. Its aim is to ensure food security in the world by strengthening agricultural development capacities of developing countries. It is obviously a credit to the efforts made by the Director-General and the Members of the Secretariat.

Last year, FAO identified the building of a world free of hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition as its strategic direction and objective on the basis of the analysis on global food and agricultural situations and trends. The new PWB allocates more resources to fulfill the Strategic Objectives. We note that the new budget saw a 1 percent real increase as against the previous budget.

In particular, FAO has increased the budget for Technical Cooperation Programme to the tune of USD 471.9 million by adding USD 15.8 million. It is a very positive step aimed at strengthening technical assistance to the developing countries.

The deadline for the treatment of MDGs is drawing nearer. The Delegation of the DPR Korea expects to see FAO playing a greater role befitting its status as the leading Organization and therefore to ensure food security by increasing agricultural production.

The DPRK Delegation fully supports the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-15 formulated in keeping with the Medium-Term Plan 2014-17.

Mr Daniel VAN GILST (Norway)

This is the Programme of Work and Budget, so I want to talk a bit more about the work and a bit less about the budget, I hope you'll bear with me.

Norway appreciates the proposed changes initiated in FAO and can in general support the priorities and the proposed Programme of Work. We actively participated in the difficult discussions on the budget for the next biennium. Although the negotiations are challenging, we are optimistic that we can agree on a workable budget.

We have of course some comments concerning the Medium Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget. FAO's normative role in fisheries, forestry and agriculture, FAO is the only global agency that houses agriculture, forestry and fisheries under the same roof, therefore FAO is in a unique position to formulate a holistic approach towards managing global resources in these fields.

The unique mandate in fisheries, forestry and natural resource management should be more adequately reflected in Strategic Objective 2. The Strategic Objective in corresponding Action Plan and Results Framework does not reflect these important normative priorities of the Organization, the proposed Strategic Objectives.

Reducing the number of Strategic Objectives to five is positive as it can facilitate prioritization and sharpen FAO's profile. The Strategic Objectives must be clear as to what the main priorities of the Organization are and what FAO should do to achieve these.

This makes it even more important that the Strategic Objectives and the specific Action Plans are supported by a robust and well-designed Results Framework that facilitates effective prioritization

monitoring and reporting results. The results-based model as presented in the PWB document is a good basis. In particular, we agree that, at the output level, deliverables should be directly attributable to FAO's intervention. However, many of the suggested outcomes for the different Strategic Objectives are formulated in a manner which makes direct attribution of FAO results very difficult.

We expect therefore that the detailed Results Framework for the individual Strategic Objectives will be implemented where outputs can be attributed to FAO activities. A detailed Results Framework and four individual Strategic Objectives will include targets and indicators at the output level to enable the Organization to report in accordance with the results model.

Gender programmes. There is no specific Strategic Objective for gender equality and empowerment of women. Instead this has been incorporated as a cross-cutting concern in Objective six. Gender mainstreaming is one of two approaches specified in FAO's policy on Gender Equality. To avoid that gender mainstreaming results in streaming gender away, it is essential to incorporate gender across all Strategic Objectives.

The Strategic Objectives Action Plans and the Results Framework need to be made more specific as to how the Strategic Objectives will approach and deal with gender issues. FAO's gender policy contains several specific targets and indicators that can and should be directly included in the PWB Results Framework.

Each Strategic Objective therefore should contribute towards these gender targets and indicators and each Strategic Objective should be required to report on how gender is integrated in their programme.

In the proposal, it is a bit ambiguous where the money will go. For example, gender funds are shared with governance and Strategic Objective Three. It is furthermore suggested that the gender team will be split into two units between OPC and ESP. This will make the gender programme even more ambiguous. What are the arguments for splitting this already small tiny gender unit?

At the last Conference we voted on doubling the resources allocated to gender programmes. In the current biennium, the figure is approximately USD 21.5 million or 2.1 percent of the regular budget. In the proposed budget, the funds are being spread over many areas and a cross-cutting gender profile will be lost. We need to make sure that the resources are not fungible and the minimum target should be aspired to.

Reporting on gender is therefore one way to make sure that resources continue to support gender activities. Gender is an important issue for development. Denying focus and the adequate resources to this issue will only prolong the time it takes to get people out of poverty and thus in effect will not be cost effective.

Finally, given the positive development in FAO's resource mobilization for its field activities, it could be worth to revisit the USD 15.8 million reallocation to the TCP.

FAO's normative role is obvious. A clear and detailed Results Framework makes good working sense and an investment towards gender makes not only social but also financial sense. That said, Norway will continue to play a constructive role in these negotiations, with a view to ensuring a budget level which will enable FAO to deliver its programme of work.

Mme Christina BLANK (Suisse)

La Suisse constate avec satisfaction que l'évaluation des dépenses de personnel, effectuée par le Secrétariat, a permis de réduire l'estimation des augmentations des coûts. La Suisse soutient le Plan à moyen terme 2014-17, mais tient à souligner la nécessité de définir des indicateurs mesurables et attribuables pour chaque objectif stratégique, d'une claire délimitation des tâches et responsabilités, et de l'obligation de rendre compte, notamment en matière de gestion des ressources entre les Sous-Directeurs généraux et les Coordonnateurs d'objectifs stratégiques. La Suisse prend note du changement intervenu dans la structure organisationnelle, mais nous souhaitons que la gestion durable des ressources naturelles continue à recevoir la même importance que jusqu'ici.

S'agissant du Programme de travail et budget 2014-15, la Suisse constate avec satisfaction que la nouvelle évaluation, menée par le Secrétariat, a permis de réduire les estimations d'augmentation des

coûts liés aux dépenses de personnel ; elle encourage le Secrétariat à poursuivre de manière constante la recherche d'économies et de gains d'efficacité. Nous pensons que pour l'exercice 2014-15 des gains d'efficacité supérieurs aux 10 millions de dollars prévus pourraient être identifiés.

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

The preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget is a collective effort by members of the Secretariat. So I would like to call on others if I may. The ten information notes were very much a collective effort on the part of many staff of the Organization.

First I'd just like to clarify about the treatment of the further USD 4 million in efficiency savings that the Director-General has identified as requested by the Council.

These are savings that we forecast to achieve in the next biennium for streamlining of processes under the Global Resource Management System, and savings on travel and consultants. We are not proposing to reallocate these savings to new areas of work, therefore they would allow us to deliver the Programme of Work for USD 4 million less than is currently proposed, that is USD 1,051.2 million. I believe there were questions on that from Afghanistan and a few others. That's also one I've tried to explain in my opening remarks.

I have only heard two requests for additional information. One from Ireland on behalf of the European Union requesting an update on the Human Resource data pack that is normally provided to the Finance Committee. I believe it was provided in March and an updated version will be available on Tuesday morning. It will probably only be available in English at this point, as it was not translated when provided to the Finance Committee, although it's mainly numbers.

Ireland, for the EU, also asked for an update on the preparation of the work plans by the SO leaders and perhaps I could give that information now, along with Mina Dowlatchahi who is leading the process. She is the Chief in my office for the developing the monitoring and reporting framework under the implementation arrangements that have been put in place.

This was covered in part in Information Note 5. There is a three-phase process for preparing the high-level and operational work plans. It involves elaborating on the outputs, in many cases changing the outputs so they are more focused, and also defining the indicators for the Strategic Objectives and the Organizational Outcomes, which are the indicators of change that takes place in member countries, as well as indicators of outputs. There are some 70 outputs and as has been mentioned by many countries, the outputs are what FAO is delivering. Those indicators will measure what FAO does.

Then the operational work planning will take place during July to September, once we have the budget level from the Conference, so that we can prepare the adjustments to the Programme of Work and Budget with the indicators and the targets. This will reflect whatever changes result from the work process in terms of areas of emphasis and de-emphasis, the prioritization that many members have mentioned here, and also the staffing configuration and the staffing profiles changes.

I think there was a comment by the EU about the fact that they expected to see fewer staff in the PWB and I think we need to recall what is in Information Note 2. In table 3, it quite clearly shows that in the course of this biennium, we have had a net reduction of 54 posts and we are taking out two more in this PWB. So between the two biennia, there is a reduction of 56 posts. So I think it is important to recall that there have been post reductions this biennium, and as you know the Council has approved these in the adjustments, the further adjustments, the transformational changes. There have been reductions to posts and we may see some further changes in the skill mixes as a result of the work plan exercises taking place over the next three months.

So Madame Chair, may I suggest that Mina Dowlatchahi say some more about the work planning process, and Marcela Villarreal could respond to the questions about gender?

Ms Mina DOWLATCHAHI (Deputy Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management)

I think Boyd has provided all the updated information. The Strategic Objective coordinators are finalizing what we now call the "high level work plan", which will allow us to elaborate further

outputs at a fairly high level. It will also allow to better clarify the level of the outputs. We had some feedback from you when we presented the PWB at last Council that some were unclear and were expressed as intermediate outcomes, and this is being rectified so that we ensure that we have a clear view of the accountability of the Organization.

And at the same time, we're nearly ready to engage with an implementation plan for the baseline survey for the outcome level indicators. So I would say that very soon the overall framework for engaging in more detailed work planning and therefore focusing also in terms of a lower level of activities of the Organization is quite on track.

Ms Marcela VILLARREAL (Director, Office for Communication, Partnerships and Advocacy)

One of the questions is: does it make sense to divide an already small unit in two when it is so very important? And I would say definitely yes, in the sense that we have been analyzing very well which functions would be best implemented where, and this is why the proposal is to have the technical functions under the technical department and the oversight functions, which will allow us to have an overview of what the whole house is doing and also have more incidence on what the whole house is doing, from an apex unit.

This is the rationale behind this proposal. Now, together with that, we thought that the advocacy functions are best performed where you have the rest of the advocacy and partnership functions and that again is in the apex unit under the new division called OPC.

Now, how do we ensure that we have really good, strong mainstreaming? And this is going to be ensured in two different ways. One, yes; each Strategic Objective does definitely have an action plan and there is reporting on that for each Strategic Objective. Now, how do we ensure that gender is actually mainstreamed in each of these Strategic Objectives? There are going to be indicators which are going to tell us how well each of them is performing on very specific gender issues. That is because it has an indicator, it is going to be measured and this is going to be, of course, the basis of the reporting. This is going to be kind of the 'meat' of the action plans, reporting back to you.

In addition, how are we going to ensure that everybody is really addressing gender issues into his or her work plan as should be the case? In the PEMS, in the Performance Management System, for each of the managers, we have included an objective on gender. Therefore we have set strongly into the new Strategic Framework, the results-based management principles, so that will allow us to follow what is being done and on the PEMS, the accountability aspects that will ensure that people are performing as we would want them to do.

In addition to this, we have a system of gender focal points that are throughout the house. This is not only in Headquarters; we have in every decentralized office, gender focal points who have been up to now more and more trained. That capacity development will be continuing. We have had extremely good results and that is going to be also the basis of ensuring adequate implementation throughout the house and also throughout the different locations in the decentralized offices and in Headquarters.

So just to conclude: does it make sense to separate the functions into two different offices? We believe that by doing so, we are strengthening our capacity to implement gender issues and we are following a directive by the Director-General who wanted to have the oversight function to ensure that this is happening very close to his own office.

CHAIRPERSON

Before I close this session, I would like to ensure that the information that was requested from Human Resources would be available by tomorrow, as well as the number of vacancies, as far as I have on my list. They will be available tomorrow morning and tomorrow morning we will start with the Group of the Friends of the Chair at 9:30 in the King Faisal room.

I would like to repeat my request: please inform the Secretariat who will represent the seven Regions. For each Region, there are two focal points to be in the group of Friends of the Chair, and all others are, of course, invited to be silent observers..

So enjoy your evening, have a good sleep and one special announcement for the ERG. The ERG will have a coordination meeting in the German room now, at 17:30 hours.

The session of today is closed.

The meeting rose at 17.33 hours

La séance est levée à 17 h 33

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.33 horas