



# Evidence on effects of plant pests on IPPC strategic objectives and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by the SPS community

A report based on literature review and interviews with SPS organisations

Cecile Kusters, Hermine ten Hove



---

# Evidence on effects of plant pests on IPPC strategic objectives and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by the SPS community

A report based on literature review and interviews with SPS organisations

Cecile Kusters<sup>1</sup>, Hermine ten Hove<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation

This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Wageningen University & Research and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation  
Wageningen, May 2020

---

Report WCDI-20-108  
ISBN 978-94-6395-405-1

---

Kusters, C.S.L., ten Hove, H., 2020. *Evidence on effects of plant pests on IPPC strategic objectives and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by the SPS community; A report based on literature review and interviews with SPS organisations*. Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University & Research. Report WCDI-20-108. Wageningen.

This report is commissioned by the International Plant Protection Commission (IPPC) and is the result of a literature review on the effects of plant pests on the IP strategic objectives, as well as interviews and document review on the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms of the SPS community.

The review shows that there is evidence that the prevention of pests contributes to IPPC's strategic objectives: enhancing global food security and sustainable agriculture productivity; protecting the environment; and facilitating safe trade, development, and economic growth. However, the context is very important and requires context specific interventions. In particular low-income countries struggle to reduce plant pests and need support in this to help them to also contribute to these overarching objectives. The review also shows that the different SPS organisations have different mechanisms in place for monitoring and evaluation, and these are generally not embedded in a formal monitoring and evaluation system. There is need for more attention to monitoring and evaluation in support of adaptive management of the SPS organisations, that work in often complex environments.

Keywords: Codex, evaluation, IPPC, monitoring, OIE, SPS, STDF.

This report can be downloaded for free at <https://doi.org/10.18174/521593> or at [www.wur.eu/cdi](http://www.wur.eu/cdi) (under publications).



© 2020 Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation, part of the Stichting Wageningen Research. P.O. Box 88, 6700 AB Wageningen, The Netherlands. T + 31 (0)317 48 68 00, E [info.cdi@wur.nl](mailto:info.cdi@wur.nl), [www.wur.eu/cdi](http://www.wur.eu/cdi).



The Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation uses a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (Netherlands) licence for its reports.

The user may copy, distribute and transmit the work and create derivative works. Third-party material that has been used in the work and to which intellectual property rights apply may not be used without prior permission of the third party concerned. The user must specify the name as stated by the author or licence holder of the work, but not in such a way as to give the impression that the work of the user or the way in which the work has been used are being endorsed. The user may not use this work for commercial purposes.

The Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation accepts no liability for any damage arising from the use of the results of this research or the application of the recommendations.

Report WCDI-20-108

Photo cover: Agronomist working in pest diagnostic laboratory. ©FAO/Ezequiel Becerra / FAO

---

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>List of abbreviations and acronyms</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1 Background to this review	11
1.2 Approach	11
<b>2 Literature review – a quick scan</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Strategic Objective A - Enhance global food security and increase sustainable agricultural productivity	13
2.2 Strategic Objective B - Protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests	14
2.3 Strategic Objective C - Facilitate safe trade, development and economic growth	15
2.4 Conclusion	16
<b>3 Monitoring and evaluation by the SPS community</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Codex Alimentarius ('Codex')	17
3.1.1 Background on Codex	17
3.1.2 Strategic plan 2020-2025	18
3.1.3 M&E mechanisms	18
3.1.4 Communication	20
3.1.5 Conclusion	20
3.2 IPPC	20
3.2.1 Background on IPPC	20
3.2.2 Strategic framework 2020-2030	21
3.2.3 M&E mechanisms	22
3.2.4 Conclusion	26
3.3 OIE	27
3.3.1 Introduction	27
3.3.2 Background on OIE	27
3.3.3 Sixth Strategic plan (2016-2020)	27
3.3.4 Observatory on implementation of OIE standards	28
3.3.5 Discussion on the design of the OIE Observatory project	29
3.3.6 Evaluations	30
3.3.7 Conclusion	31
3.4 STDF	32
3.4.1 Background on STDF	32
3.4.2 Strategy 2020-2024	32
3.4.3 M&E mechanisms	32
3.4.4 Communications Plan	35
3.4.5 Conclusion	35
3.5 WTO – SPS	36
3.5.1 Background on WTO and SPS	37
3.5.2 M&E mechanisms	38
3.5.3 Conclusion	39
3.6 Summary and conclusions	40
<b>References</b>	<b>41</b>

---

<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Theory of Change for IPPC</b>	<b>45</b>

---

# Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the contributions that different people have made to this report. We would like to thank the following people in particular:

- IPPC Secretariat: Brent Larson, Vinitha Johnson, and Ketevan Lomsadze and other members of the Task Force Monitoring and Evaluation (TFME)
- Codex: Anne Beutling, Tom Heilandt
- OIE: Karen Bucher, Gyllian Mylrea
- STDF: Melvin Spreij, Marlynne Hopper, Roshan Khan, Angelica Cotticagrisuk
- WTO-SPS Secretariat: Rolando Alcala, Anneke Hamilton.

We hope this report will stimulate learning across the SPS organisations and stimulate further thinking on how monitoring and evaluation can be useful for the SPS organisations.

The development of this report was possible thanks to the financial contribution of the European Commission to the third cycle (2018-2020) of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) project.





---

# List of abbreviations and acronyms

Codex	Codex Alimentarius, standard setting organisation for food safety
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
TFME	Task Force Monitoring and Evaluation
ToC	Theory of Change
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
WCDI	Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University & Research
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WUR	Wageningen University & Research



---

# Summary

This report is commissioned by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and is the result of a literature review on the effects of plant pests on the IPPC strategic objectives, as well as interviews and document review on the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms of the SPS community.

This review shows that there is evidence that the prevention of pests contributes to IPPC's strategic objectives: enhancing global food security and sustainable agriculture productivity; protecting the environment; and facilitating safe trade, development and economic growth. However, the context is very important and requires context specific interventions. In particular low-income countries struggle to reduce plant pests and need support to contribute to these overarching objectives.

The review also shows that the different SPS organisations have different mechanisms in place for monitoring and evaluation, and these are generally not embedded in a formal monitoring and evaluation system. Monitoring and evaluation is being carried out in varying degrees and generally include formal, external evaluations, and formal and informal monitoring of strategic plans and projects. Monitoring is more focused on activity and output level than on outcome or impact level.

Having a MEL framework in place (e.g. STDF), is important as it can support of results-based management, learning and innovation. In addition to this, having a communications plan in place (e.g. STDF) that closely links with M&E in support of the strategic plan is also important as this helps to stimulate learning from M&E, innovation and decision making.

In particular members in low and middle income countries face challenges in monitoring the SPS situation. Important factors that influence the extent to which monitoring and evaluation are carried out, include leadership, human capacity, budget, incentives as well as management information systems and communication processes. The challenge the SPS organisations face is that they work at different levels, from Secretariat level to global level whilst monitoring particularly at global level is difficult, especially in relation to measuring outcomes and impact. Whilst it's not necessary nor feasible to set up a fully-fledged monitoring and evaluation system, SPS organisations can share lessons learned in terms of monitoring and evaluation in complex SPS environments. Monitoring complex environments involves more than developing indicators, setting up surveys, commissioning evaluations or organising meetings. It requires a culture change that involves shared sense making and zooming in and out so as to adaptively manage towards improved sanitary and phytosanitary situations.



---

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background to this review

This review is carried out as part of the project IPPC M&E – phase 2, which aims to “develop M&E Frameworks for the IPPC Community and for the IPPC Secretariat (consisting of a Matrix, and a strategic Plan for M&E, based on Theories of Change) to guide strategic and operational decisions on the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), ISPMs and CPM-Rs”.

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC, see also Section 3.2), has requested the services of Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation (WCDI), part of Wageningen University & Research (WUR) for the development of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan for the implementation of the IPPC. The Services will contribute to FAO’s Strategic Objective (SO) 4: Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems, at local, national and international levels and SO2: Make agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable. This work also contributes to the implementation of the IPPC strategic objectives and builds on the work carried out in phase 1, which focused on developing the M&E framework for IPPC. This proposal for phase 2 is to elaborate on the work carried out in phase 1.

This report presents the results of a literature review as well as the results of interviews with and further research on background documents of relevant organisations (Codex, IPPC, STDF, OIE) on their M&E practices. The results of this work inform the M&E framework for the IPPC, which is developed in close collaboration with the Task Force Monitoring and Evaluation (TFME), which represents different units of the IPPC Secretariat, but can also inform the wider SPS community.

## 1.2 Approach

The work includes a literature study and interviews with SPS organisations and further review of documents and online information.

The literature study focused on finding evidence for the Theory of Change (ToC), so as to be able to make claims about cause-and-effect relationships in the theory of change, particularly at higher level of the ToC. For the ToC please see Appendix A.

To find the existing evidence, the study focused on the impact of plant pests (and their related SPS measures) on the three IPPC strategic objectives, so as to generate evidence for cause-and-effect relationships that are difficult (i.e. costly) to prove.

Google Scholar was used to obtain relevant literature, using combinations of the search terms below (one from each box):

**Table 1**      *Used search terms*

Box 1	Box 2
Plant health	Food security
Phytosanitary	Economic growth
Phytosanitation	Trade
Plant pest	Food safety
Plant disease	Development

---

From search results, relevant articles were selected to be studied and coded using NVivo qualitative analysis software.

Interviews were held with the following organisations that are involved in standard-setting:

- Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC): on Codex Alimentarius, standard-setting organization for food safety
- IPPC: standard-setting organization for plant health
- OIE: World Organisation for Animal Health
- WTO - STDF: The Standards and Trade Development Facility
- WTO - SPS Committee: on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

In addition, relevant documents and online information were reviewed in terms of the M&E mechanisms in place in these organisations.

---

## 2 Literature review – a quick scan

In this chapter, the key findings from the literature review, a quick scan, are described.

### 2.1 Strategic Objective A - Enhance global food security and increase sustainable agricultural productivity

#### *Strategic objective A - Enhance global food security and increase sustainable agricultural productivity*

This aims to reduce the international spread of pests, as the losses caused by the spread of a new invasive pest into new areas or crops can be much more catastrophic than endemic pests in a given area. The impact of plant pests on food security is particularly evident in the developing world, where plant health regulatory frameworks often lack capacity. If the spread of pests is reduced and pest management is improved, crop productivity can increase and production costs can be reduced. (FAO, 2019).

#### **Plant pests can negatively affect food security**

Food security exists “when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO, 1996). Plant disease has an adverse effect on the quantity and safety of food that is produced. Low crop productivity contributes directly to malnutrition (Vurro, Bonciani, & Vannacci, 2010). According to Chakraborty and Newton (2011), pathogens claim 10–16% of the global harvest. (Based on (Oerke, 2006; Strange & Scott, 2005). Plant pests have the potential to be detrimental to food security. According to Oerke (2006), they have the potential to deprive humanity of a large share of its food, including, for example, over 31%, 37% and 40% of the attainable yield for maize, rice and potatoes, respectively. Global yield loss of grains is projected to increase by 10% to 25% per degree of global mean surface warming due to growing insect populations (Deutsch et al., 2018). Plant diseases and pests can still negatively affect food security even if yield is not lost. Various pests produce mycotoxins, which can contaminate food and animal feed, resulting in serious poisoning thus affecting food safety as a pillar of food security (Leslie, Bandyopadhyay, & Visconti, 2008). Flood (2010) states that “plant health issues are often ignored despite their impact on livelihoods and food security” and calls for more systematic monitoring of plant health problems in the field and the collection of reliable field data.

#### **Discussion**

In relation to strategic objective A, there are roughly two pathways that link plant pests to food security. On the one hand, evidence shows that prevention of plant pests leads to a reduction of food loss which positively affects food security. On the other hand, prevention of plant pests increases food safety, which also positively influences food security. So basically, the link to food security is quite strong and does not require additional monitoring per se.

---

## 2.2 Strategic Objective B - Protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests

### *Strategic objective B - Protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests*

Plant pests that are invasive alien species can have a significant and devastating impact on the terrestrial, marine and freshwater environments, agriculture and forests. Strategic Objective B addresses environmental concerns related to plant biodiversity and emerging problems associated with plant pests as invasive alien species and the impacts of climate change. (FAO, 2019).

#### **Invasive alien species negatively impact the environment**

MacLeod, Pautasso, Jeger, and Haines-Young (2010) estimate that over 120,000 non-native species of plants, animals and microbes have invaded the USA, UK, Australia, South Africa, India, and Brazil, and have negatively impacted ecological integrity. Increasing globalization facilitates the arrival of invasive alien species (IAS), and environmental changes such as climate change, facilitate their establishment (Early et al., 2016). Invasive plants can reduce biodiversity, alter ecosystem functions and have considerable economic impacts (Kettenring & Adams, 2011). Also Bax et al. (2003) show a negative impact on biodiversity, in this case of marine species: "Invasive alien marine species threaten biodiversity, marine industries (including fishing and tourism) and human health, and unlike oil spills only get worse with time. While some progress is being made internationally on the 10,000 species estimated to be in transit around the world in the ballast water, effective solutions are a long way off; meanwhile the majority of vectors is being ignored. A systematic approach to invasive alien marine species is required to target the means and location of the most effective management actions. Cooperation among regional trading partners will be essential to effectively manage the threat." (Bax, Williamson, Aguero, Gonzalez, & Geeves, 2003). Vilà et al. (2011) demonstrated that on average, abundance and diversity of the resident species decreased in sites invaded by alien species, whereas primary production and several ecosystem processes were enhanced. Alien N-fixing species had greater impacts on N-cycling variables, but they did not consistently affect other impact types. They conclude that alien species impacts are heterogeneous and not unidirectional, even within particular impact types. They also show that by the time changes in nutrient cycling are detected, major impacts on plant species and communities are likely to have already occurred.

Gilioli et al. (2014) indicate that within plant risk analysis, "the assessment of impacts of plant pests on ecosystem services has been neglected, though it has been shown in many different studies that plant pests can transform ecosystems and landscapes significantly and permanently", and propose a procedure of evaluating impacts of plant pests on ecosystem services.

#### **Some contexts are more vulnerable than others**

Early et al. (2016) found that "one-sixth of the global land surface is highly vulnerable to invasion, including substantial areas in developing economies and biodiversity hotspots. The dominant invasion vectors differ between high-income countries (imports, particularly of plants and pets) and low-income countries (air travel)." They indicate that most countries have limited capacity to act against invasions. In particular, they found a clear need for proactive invasion strategies in areas with high poverty levels, high biodiversity and low historical levels of invasion. Early et al. (2016) recommends uniting data on the causes of introduction and establishment of IAS, as they can improve early warning and eradication schemes.

#### **Discussion**

With respect to Strategic Objective B, some effect of plant pests is found on biodiversity and ecosystems. This implies the need to address the spread of plant pests. Climate change can negatively affect the spread of plant pests and as such climate mitigation and adaptation are needed to help reduce the spread of plant pests. Context specific and require careful monitoring and evaluation, so that early warning and eradication schemes can be improved.



---

## 2.3 Strategic Objective C - Facilitate safe trade, development and economic growth

### *Strategic objective C - Facilitate safe trade, development and economic growth*

Trade in plants and plant products is a critically important part of most national economies. It is evident that earnings from this trade stimulate economic growth and brings well-being and prosperity to rural communities and agricultural sectors. The main potential pathway for the global spread of pests is through international trade, so the IPPC aims to maximize the benefits of trade by enabling countries to reduce the risk of international pest spread through the application of harmonized phytosanitary standards. IPPC standards help countries to develop import and export (regulation) systems that manage the pest risks associated with trade in plants and plant products. When properly implemented, trade can occur safely (i.e. without spreading plant pests). (FAO, 2019).

### **Surveillance systems matter but effectiveness depends on context, with limited or no control systems in lower income countries**

Vurro et al. (2010) point out that early disease diagnosis and pathogen identification are essential elements in the protection of crops and natural plant systems and are crucial to taking appropriate action. Lack of rapid detection of pests and pathogens has a profound negative impact on the management and prevention of diseases leading to deterioration in quality and quantity of agricultural products (and as such on food security). National governments are responsible for developing control systems, primarily for preventing or controlling the introduction of pathogens into their countries, but also to avoid the spread of their endemic pathogens to other countries. Diagnostic systems must also be combined with effective monitoring and alarm systems, to give a timely indication of the priorities to be tested, and to identify the emerging risks and their origin. The effectiveness of emerging infectious disease surveillance depends on the context. In Western countries, surveillance systems are relatively easy to establish, due to existing community networks, more economic possibilities and greater availability and affordability of required technology. Low income countries (LIC) have limited or no control systems, which leads to Africa recording a decrease in the number of new diseases as compared to Europe, even though in reality, there was a dramatic increase. If diseases are not flagged, they can spread more easily. Chakraborty and Newton (2011) estimate that plant disease losses cost USD 220 billion annually. With reduced effectiveness of surveillance, the effects on food security (strategic objective A), may in reality also be dramatic, due to the link between plant pests and food security.

### **Lower income countries lack capacity to comply with SPS measures**

The effects of phytosanitary measures (whether or not justified) on trade has been studied by several research teams. Based on a literature review, Murina and Nicita (2017) indicate that SPS measures provide incentives for developing countries to shift their focus to sectors that do not have the same regulatory burdens, negatively affecting export (trade distortion). Murina and Nicita (2014) used an econometric model to investigate the effect of the European Union's (EU) sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures for agricultural goods. They conclude that SPS measures result in "relatively higher burdens for lower income countries". They estimate the reduction of lower income countries' agricultural exports to be roughly USD 3 billion, which equates to approximately 14% of the agricultural trade from lower income countries to the EU. This study finds that SPS measures result in relatively higher burden for low income countries but that membership in deep trade agreements seems to reduce the difficulties related to compliance with SPS measures. The findings back Murina and Nicita's hypothesis that "while many middle- and high-income countries have the internal capacity to comply with SPS measures, most low income countries do not".

### **Discussion**

With respect to Strategic Objective C, the positive linkages between the protection of introduction and spread of plant pests to safe trade, development and economic growth are supported by evidence. Plant pests can have huge economic impact, and prevention of introduction and spread of pests should reduce this economic loss and should be beneficial to economic growth. However, literature also points out that SPS measures are not equally burdensome to all countries. In low-income countries, plant pests are more prevalent, harder to track and there is less capacity to comply with SPS measures.

---

More efforts are needed to support the capacity of lower income countries to implement the SPS measures. Murina and Nicita (2017) recommend, “Well-targeted technical assistance projects, both at the bilateral and multilateral levels, could generate considerable gains for lower income countries”. Their study focused on the EU and found that the regulations to facilitate SPS compliance in developing countries did not suffice. While many middle- and high-income countries have the internal capacity to comply with SPS measures, most low income countries do not.

## 2.4 Conclusion

Overall, one can say that there is evidence that the prevention of pests contributes to enhancing global food security and sustainable agriculture productivity; to protecting the environment; and to facilitating safe trade, development and economic growth. However, the context is very important and requires context specific interventions. In particular low-income countries struggle to reduce plant pests and need support in this to help them to also contribute to these overarching objectives.

---

## 3 Monitoring and evaluation by the SPS community

The main organisations in the SPS community have been interviewed on their M&E practices, supported with a review on existing documents. Below you can find a description of these organisations including a background, reference to the late strategic plan (which is relevant as this is the basis for M&E) and existing M&E practices or mechanisms at different levels (secretariat, country and global). The aim of M&E is not just for accountability purposes, but, even more importantly, M&E can support to an adaptive management. In that respect various mechanisms are described. Where relevant, additional processes and mechanisms have been mentioned, such as for example communication and which can be linked to the strategic plan and M&E. At the end of each section a conclusion is given in particular on the M&E mechanisms in place.

### 3.1 Codex Alimentarius ('Codex')

#### 3.1.1 Background on Codex

The Codex Alimentarius, or 'Food Code' is a collection of standards, guidelines and codes of practice adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Commission, also known as CAC, is the central part of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme and was established by FAO and WHO to protect consumer health and promote fair practices in food trade. The application of Codex standards ensure that food is safe and can be traded. The 189 Codex members have negotiated science-based recommendations in all areas related to food safety and quality. Codex food safety texts are a reference in WTO trade disputes. (<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/en/>).

The Commission's main work is the development of international food standards, guidelines, and codes of practice to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade. CAC also promotes the coordination of all food standards work undertaken by international governmental and non-governmental organizations. (Source: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5645en/CA5645EN.pdf>).

The Codex Alimentarius is a science-based organization. Independent experts and specialists in a wide range of disciplines have contributed to its work to ensure that its standards withstand the most rigorous scientific scrutiny<sup>1</sup>. The work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, together with that of FAO and WHO in their supportive roles, has provided a focal point for food-related scientific research and investigation, and CAC itself has become an important international medium for the exchange of scientific information about the safety of food. The standards of Codex have also proved an important reference point for the dispute settlement mechanism of the WTO.

Over the years, Codex has developed over 200 standards covering processed, semi-processed or unprocessed foods intended for sale for the consumer or for intermediate processing; over 50 hygienic and technological codes of practice; evaluated over 4000 food additives and over 60 veterinary drugs; set more than 5000 maximum residue limits for pesticides; and specified over 100 maximum levels for contaminants. (Source: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5180en/CA5180EN.pdf>).

---

<sup>1</sup> The scientific advice on which Codex standards are based is developed by the Joint FAO/WHO Scientific Advice Programme. FAO and WHO have a number of expert committees that develop this scientific advice - JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA, JEMNU - these committees bring together groups of experts, scientists to work independently to provide the scientific advice. CAC and its committees are considered the risk management bodies – they use the scientific advice available to them from FAO and WHO to develop the standards.

---

### 3.1.2 Strategic plan 2020-2025

Codex has just ended on its recent strategic plan 2014-2019 (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3826e.pdf>). This plan included the following goals:

1. Establish international food standards that address current and emerging food issues
2. Ensure the application of risk analysis principles in the development of Codex standards
3. Facilitate the effective participation of all Codex Members
4. Implement effective and efficient work management systems and practices.

Codex has developed a new Strategic Plan 2020-2025. This Strategic Plan (SP) presents the mission, vision, goals, objectives and measurable indicators for the Codex Alimentarius Commission. It underpins the high priority that continues to be placed on food safety and quality by FAO and WHO and guides the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities and unique mandate to protect consumer health and ensure fair practices in the food trade. The Strategic Plan informs Members, inter-governmental and international non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders of how the Commission intends to fulfil its mandate and to meet the needs, including emerging issues, and expectations of its Members during the period 2020-2025. This new strategic plan includes the following goals:

1. Address current, emerging and critical issues in a timely manner
2. Develop standards based on science and Codex risk-analysis principles
3. Increase impact through the recognition and use of Codex standards
4. Facilitate the participation of all Codex Members throughout the standard setting process
5. Enhance work management systems and practices that support the efficient and effective achievement of all strategic plan goals.

Each goal has a set of objectives with related outcomes and indicators. For example, for the first goal, there are 2 objectives: 1.1 Identify needs and emerging issues. 1.2 Prioritize needs and emerging issues. For 1.1. the outcome is 'Improved ability of Codex to develop standards relevant to the needs of its members' and the indicator 'The number of emerging issues identified by subsidiary bodies. (Meeting reports)'. This is useful as a basis for monitoring the goals and related strategic objectives.

In particular the third goal, with a focus on impact, is new, compared to the previous Strategic Plan. The first two goals are a mix of the previous first two goals.

### 3.1.3 M&E mechanisms

Codex has various mechanisms are in place for M&E at different levels.

#### **Annual implementation review reports**

The Executive Committee has the responsibility to annually monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan. The [last](#) SP implementation report<sup>2</sup> (2018) contains the main indicators that are monitored on a regular basis by the Codex Secretariat. Sources of information include:

- Existing data from monitoring tools (e.g. reports, working documents, commenting and registration systems);
- Replies submitted by Codex Subsidiary Bodies to a standardised questionnaire<sup>3</sup>;
- Information provided from FAO and WHO.

Progress against objectives and related activities is provided. For each of the four goals, objectives and activities have been formulated and progress has been reported assessed against these.

Regular work management reviews on subjects of particular importance under the current SP are held, and include: 2016 Electronic Working Groups<sup>4</sup>; 2017 collaboration with other international standard-

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/wzaghr>

<sup>3</sup> Replies were received in 2016 from all Codex Subsidiary Bodies, except for CCAFRICA, CCNASWP, CCLAC, CCNEA, CCEURO

<sup>4</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/twza786>

setting organizations<sup>5</sup>; 2018 critical review function of the Executive Committee<sup>6</sup> (+ part II CX/EXEC 20/77/4 under development<sup>7</sup>).

### **Survey based system and biannual reports on use of standards and relevance of Codex work**

There are also biennial reports on the use of (selected) Codex standards. One example is provided for the AFRICA region ('Use of Codex in the (Africa) region'<sup>8</sup>). In the context of the revitalization of FAO/WHO Regional Coordinating Committees (RCCs) in 2016, the Codex Secretariat introduced a new survey based system to continuously collect data on use of Codex standards<sup>9</sup> for all six Regional Coordinating Committees with the aim of gaining a better understanding of the relevance of Codex work. While the first survey round started in July 2016 and focused on the use of Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for pesticides in food and feed, three general subject standards and the General Principles of Food Hygiene, the second followed a similar structure, but focused on a different set of Codex standards. The 2019 survey covered: (i) Maximum Residue Limits veterinary drugs in foods; (ii) Two Codex texts on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) i.e. Guidelines for Risk Analysis of Foodborne Antimicrobial Resistance and the Code of Practice to Minimize and Contain Antimicrobial Resistance; and (iii) The Regional Guidelines for the Design of Control Measures for Street-Vended Foods.

The survey was conducted online using the software SurveyMonkey which allowed for easier data analysis and representation. Members were asked about difficulties related to the general use of Codex standards and were informed that other specific standards would be covered in future rounds to build up, over time, a representative data set on the use of Codex texts worldwide.

### **Evaluations**

The last comprehensive evaluation of Codex<sup>10</sup> was done in 2002. This evaluation was commissioned by the Directors-General of WHO and FAO and at the request of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. A wide-ranging review of the food standards work of the two agencies was undertaken by an evaluation team. The evaluation team was asked to examine issues including, but not restricted to:

- the evolving context and challenges surrounding international food standards and their relevance in ensuring food safety, consumer protection, trade and economic development;
- the expectations of governments as to the validity, acceptability and institutional mechanisms for food standard setting within Codex;
- the particular interests and expectations of developing countries and of producers, industry and civil society concerning FAO and WHO food standards work;
- the effectiveness of existing institutional arrangements, management, methods of work and resources for international food standard setting within FAO and WHO; and
- on the basis of the above, make recommendations for improvement to the food standards work of WHO, FAO and Codex.

In addition to this joint FAO/WHO evaluation, an independent evaluation of the capacity of the Codex Secretariat to perform its function effectively was conducted in 2009. Furthermore, in 2017 FAO evaluated their Strategic Objective 4<sup>11</sup> (food systems), which comprises also Codex and WHO ran an evaluation of their normative function including Codex<sup>12</sup>.

### **Diagnostic tool for assessing the status of national Codex programs**

This Diagnostic Tool<sup>13</sup> has been developed for countries to take stock from time to time of their national Codex programme and to assess what is working well, and identify areas in need of improvement. Once complete, the results of the assessment can be used to inform ongoing national workplans and/or form the basis of a request for technical assistance if external support is required to

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/vnw4yf4>

<sup>6</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/wolanhf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/u74abgx>

<sup>8</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/s8mjkwd>

<sup>9</sup> Throughout the document Codex standards refers to all Codex products including standards, guidelines, codes of practice, Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) etc.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/y7871e/y7871e00.htm>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bd718e.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> [https://www.who.int/about/evaluation/who\\_normative\\_function\\_report\\_july2017.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/about/evaluation/who_normative_function_report_july2017.pdf?ua=1)

<sup>13</sup> [https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas\\_work/food-standard/DiagnosticTool-En.pdf](https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-standard/DiagnosticTool-En.pdf)

---

improve national capacities. One potential source of external support is the FAO/WHO Codex Trust Fund (CTF2).

### **WEB platform to collect information on member countries' food safety control systems**

There is a web platform<sup>14</sup> to collect information on members' food safety control systems. This web platform has been developed by FAO, WHO and the Codex Secretariat in response to the request of the 38th Session of CAC. This platform should provide a global source of information for Codex members on national food safety control systems as well as national food safety and consumer protection laws taking into account Codex standards.

The Codex Contact Points (CCPs) of Codex members are encouraged to provide or update data after due consultation of ministries and agencies responsible for food safety/food control. The information is discussed at FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees, which usually meet every other year.

## **3.1.4 Communication**

Whilst Codex has a communications plan, communication is not specifically mentioned in the strategic plan. The last implementation report<sup>15</sup> of Codex Communications work plan 2017-2019 shows what the Codex Secretariat monitors in terms of communication activities. For each objective, activities and indicators have been specified. Communication objectives are formulated around: communication channels; communication with Codex members; guidance for Codex Committee Chairpersons and Codex host Governments; support to FAO and WTO in advocacy and effective communication; engaging observers to support collaboration and cooperation; supporting regional communication initiatives. Indicators are mainly activity based.

## **3.1.5 Conclusion**

There are a range of mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate the work of Codex Alimentarius. This includes annual implementation reviews of the Strategic Plan, which is done by the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and led by Secretariat. This review focuses on progress against objectives and activities under the goals. Currently a new Strategic Plan 2020-2025 is in place. In addition to do this, regular more detailed work management reviews are organised on subjects of particular importance. Also reports are developed on the use of (selected) Codex standards. The last comprehensive evaluation of Codex was done in 2002, as a requirement by its parent organisations FAO and WHO. Furthermore, the Codex Secretariat was evaluated in 2009 and the Codex Alimentarius Commission was reviewed in 2017 under broader FAO and WHO evaluations. A diagnostic tool helps countries to assess what is going well and where additional support is needed. A web platform<sup>16</sup> is set up to collect information on member countries' food safety control systems. Progress is also measured against the communications work plan, mainly in terms of activities.

Monitoring is done against set objectives and activities, but impact is hardly measured. This of course is difficult to do due to the complexity and scale of the work of Codex. There are no policies or guidelines in place for monitoring and evaluation, and there is no separate function in place for M&E. The work is mainly monitored by Secretariat staff.

# **3.2 IPPC**

## **3.2.1 Background on IPPC**

The IPPC is the global international treaty for protecting plant resources (including forests, aquatic plants, non-cultivated plants and biodiversity) from both direct and indirect damage by plant pests, for facilitating safe trade through common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/survey/en/>

<sup>15</sup> <https://tinyurl.com/sjbl3za>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/survey/en/>

---

plant pests, and to promote appropriate measures for their control. It is the only standard setting body for phytosanitary standards recognized by the World Trade Organization's (WTO) the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) and has more than 184 contracting parties. The IPPC is governed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), which mainly identifies strategies and policies to prevent and control the spread of pests, develops and adopts international standards for phytosanitary measures and recommendations to harmonize international trade and assists countries in the implementation of those standards, strategies and policies. (adapted from: IPPC, 2019).

The Convention introduced International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) as its main tool to achieve its goals, making it the sole global standard setting organization for plant health.

The IPPC is one of the 'Three Sisters' recognized by the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement, along with the Codex Alimentarius Commission for food safety standards and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) for animal health standards. (Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/overview/>).

IPPC Vision: Protecting the world's plant resources from pests. IPPC Mission: To secure cooperation among nations in protecting global plant resources from the introduction and spread of plant pests, in order to preserve food security, biodiversity and facilitate trade.

The IPPC has several mechanisms for fostering cooperation among its contracting parties. These include:

- Developing International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs);
- Fostering the exchange of plant health information – for example through National reporting obligations;
- Developing capacity of contracting parties; and
- Providing legal and policy guidelines.

(Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/convention-text/>)

The IPPC is governed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), composed of all IPPC Contracting Parties, and a number of key CPM subsidiary and oversight bodies:

- CPM Bureau – an elective seven-member executive body that provides guidance to the IPPC Secretariat and CPM on strategic direction, cooperation, financial and operational management;
- Financial Committee (FC) – a four-member subsidiary body of the CPM Bureau, providing advice on financial matters and resource mobilization issues to the CPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat;
- Standards Committee (SC) – oversight body for the standard setting process;
- Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) – oversight body for the implementation of capacity development programme;
- Strategic Planning Group (SPG) – an open working group, tasked with providing strategic perspective to the work of the IPPC and to support improvement through the provision of recommendations and advice to the CPM on any issues which have been referred.

The IPPC Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the IPPC work programme and support the governing structure through the coordinated implementation of a multi-level strategy. (Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/>).

### 3.2.2 Strategic framework 2020-2030 (draft)

The draft version of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020 – 2030 is developed to support NPPOs and the global Phytosanitary community to overcome the emerging challenges linked to the growth in global trade, climate change, new patterns in production and food consumption, as well in increased volume and speed of passenger and freight movements. The new Strategic Framework is informed by a new operating environment NPPOs face and addresses the expected structural and operational changes that NPPOs will encounter during 2020-2030. Developments in data processing and transmission as well as efficiency considerations in how far, for example, border clearance processes can be simplified to facilitate fast trade of perishable products, provided that safe trade is maintained,

---

are taken into account. Advances in science and capacity developments, such as remote sensing, will significantly affect plant health activities as will the mitigation of climate change related impacts on agriculture and plant health. All these and other changes and their impacts on the operating environment of NPPOs and the IPPC have been considered in the development of this strategic framework (adapted from: IPPC, 2019).

The multi-level strategy includes the following documents:

- IPPC Strategic Framework (2012-2019). See also: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/1015/>
- IPPC National Capacity Development Strategy
- IPPC Resource Mobilization Strategy
- IPPC Communications Strategy
- IPPC Standards and Implementation Framework

(Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/>)

The new IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 was to be presented to the 15th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-15) in April 2020 for final approval (Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/ippc-strategic-framework/>) but due to the COVID-19 is still in the draft version,

In this strategic framework, the following is described:

- Mission: Protect global plant resources and facilitate trade
- Vision: The spread of plant pests is minimised and their effects within countries are effectively managed
- Goal: All countries have the capacity to implement harmonised measures to reduce pest spread and minimise the impact of pests on food security, trade, economic growth, and the environment
- Strategic objectives:
  - Strategic objective A – Enhance global food security and increase sustainable agricultural productivity.
  - Strategic objective B – Protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests.
  - Strategic objective C – Facilitate safe trade, development and economic growth.
- Core activities include: Standard-Setting; Implementation & Capacity Development; Communication and International Cooperation.
- Then there is a development agenda at that indicates the areas of attention for the period 2020-2030. ([https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/10/IPPC\\_StrategicFramework\\_2020-2030\\_2019-10-21.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/10/IPPC_StrategicFramework_2020-2030_2019-10-21.pdf)).

### 3.2.3 M&E mechanisms

#### **M&E development**

The IPPC is currently working on developing the monitoring and evaluation for IPPC as a whole and for the IPPC Secretariat. Whilst the work started in 2016, with support from the European Commission, the work that was done had to be changed so as to align this with the new Strategic Framework 2020-2030. This was started in January 2019. Before that, there was a gap of nearly 1,5 years before the second phase could be started, due to various reasons. Various workshops have been held, both at Secretariat level (e.g. a *workshop* in February 2019) as well as one *stakeholder workshop* with the international community, with representatives from different countries, held in New Zealand.

Since February 2019 a Task Force Monitoring and Evaluation (TFME) is in place to further develop M&E, supported by Wageningen University and Research. Various meetings and workshops have been held so far to develop staff capacity and work on M&E system development.

There are currently various mechanisms in place with a monitoring or evaluation function for IPPC. These are further described below.



---

## Project monitoring and evaluation

The Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU), in the IPPC Secretariat both implements and backstops projects. Regular project reporting to donors is already undertaken, and some project budgets might have evaluation funds siphoned off.

Reporting to FAO's Results Based Management system. The IPPC Secretariat reports progress under various areas of work under Strategic Objective 4 "Enable inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems", and Strategic Objective 2 "Make agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable." The contribution of the IPPC Secretariat was evaluated in the 'Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Strategic Objective 4: Enabling Inclusive and Efficient Agricultural and Food Systems'<sup>17</sup>.

## IPPC Secretariat Evaluations

Following requests by the IPPC contracting parties, the IPPC Secretariat has been subject to two independent evaluations, carried out by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED). In 2007 OED conducted the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Institutional Arrangements. This was an extended exercise that included, in addition to the analysis of the relevance and effectiveness of IPPC's work at global and national level, also the assessment of the structure and role of the Secretariat.

Another Evaluation was carried out in the period September-December 2014, which was aimed at aimed at identifying how to strengthen its performance in view of the emerging challenges, including the enhanced focus on the implementation of the Convention itself. More information: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/ippc-secretariat-evaluations/>.

The main objectives of the IPPC Secretariat Enhancement Evaluation (hereinafter called Evaluation) were identified by the CPM as follows:

- Identify existing strengths in the Secretariat's structure and operations as well as current constraints to performance and delivery of services, and
- Formulate recommendations for enhancing the Secretariat's capacity to facilitate, coordinate, support, and advance the CPM's strategic goals and annual work program, taking particular account of the focus on implementation, communication and partnerships.

The Evaluation was also asked to assess the relationship between the IPPC Secretariat and the Convention's Governing Bodies, as well as the synergies and areas for improvement in the collaboration between the IPPC Secretariat and FAO and the framework regulating Article XIV Bodies in FAO. The Evaluation would thus contribute to accountability and lessons learning for both FAO and IPPC Members.

Various recommendations have been formulated:

- The Secretariat should fully revise its working procedures and methods, aiming at improving internal communication and collaboration, transparent monitoring of work progress and reporting, and efficient and timely servicing of the CPM and its subsidiary and ad-hoc bodies, and the Bureau.
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities within the Secretariat, and ensure that the profile of the Secretary matches the challenges.
- The Secretariat should be re-structured and staffed to ensure a high degree of integration between the two main areas of work, Standard Setting and Implementation Facilitation.
- The IPPC Secretary should take an active role in reaching out and advocating the mission of IPPC within FAO, and improve collaboration with the various units and divisions in the Organization, including the regional Plant Protection Officers, and taking advantage of the opportunities to present IPPC work and achievements to FAO Governing Bodies including the Committee on Agriculture, Council and Conference.
- The IPPC should develop a good institutional knowledge of FAO rules and procedures on the variety of issues that are of concern to its mandate and work; maintain close contacts with other Article XIV B; facilitate approval of duty-travel; invest in resource mobilization and long-term planning of the budget-flow of trust funds; fully comply with FAO project management procedures.

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bd718e.pdf>.

- FAO Management should consider the IPPC Secretariat's constraints caused by the current rules of the Organization regarding staffing, and identify in particular mechanisms that allow greater staff stability in the case of project posts and Non-Staff Human Resources.
  - FAO Management to take measures in relation to applications and appointment of new IPPC Secretary.
  - The IPPC Secretariat to take the lead to reinforce the Technical Consultations.
- (adapted from the evaluation report).

All in all the functioning of the Secretariat was to be improved in relation to leadership, working procedures and methods, roles and responsibilities, integration of work, and staffing issues are to be addressed by both FAO and IPPC Secretariat.

### **The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) meetings**

Another mechanism to monitor progress and discuss ways forward are the CPM meetings. The IPPC is governed by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), which serves as the Convention's governing body. The CPM meets during March or April each year at FAO headquarters in Rome, Italy, to promote cooperation to help implement the objectives of the IPPC. In particular, the Commission:

- Reviews the state of plant protection around the world
- Identifies action to control the spread of pests into new areas
- Develops and adopts international standards
- Establishes rules and procedures for resolving disputes
- Adopts guidelines for the recognition of regional plant protection organizations; and
- Cooperates with international organizations on matters covered by the Convention

The members of the Commission are the contracting parties to the Convention and are responsible for implementing the work programme of standards development, information exchange and capacity building. Commission meetings are attended by contracting parties and by observers from organizations such as the Regional Plant Protection Organizations, the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee, the Standards and Trade Development Facility, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Meetings also host a scientific session for discussion of important issues. Past sessions have covered topics such as pest movements through food aid shipments and the potential impact of climate change on the spread of invasive alien species.

### **Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)**

The IRSS is an evaluation tool of IPPC that focuses on identifying contracting parties' challenges and opportunities for implementation of the Convention and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). Identifying challenging areas as well as best practices provides vital input in the strategic development of resources and tools to enhance implementation at the national, regional and global levels. Thus, the objective of the IRSS is facilitating and promoting the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs, while contributing to the objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework.

(Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/implementation-review-and-support-system/>).

IRSS seeks to assist contracting parties by understanding their implementation challenges and opportunities through the following activities:

- Performs surveys and convenes meetings to gather information on implementation of the Convention and ISPMs.
- Seeks to identify emerging issues related to plant health, food security, climate change, environmental protection and biodiversity and safe trade facilitation.
- Conducts analytical studies on key issues and recommends ways to improve implementation.
- Collaborates with IPPC Secretariat units, Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and other organizations to enhance implementation.
- Produces a summary on implementation status every three years (results of the general survey).

The IRSS is implemented on a three-year cycle and involves two components:

- Implementation Review System: seeks to identify the challenges that limit implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs and successes of implementation, through surveys, desk studies and other tools.
- Implementation Support System: helps contracting parties address gaps in implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs by facilitating specific actions or activities to improve implementation

(Source: [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2017/05/12/IRSS\\_ResourceFactsheet6\\_W.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2017/05/12/IRSS_ResourceFactsheet6_W.pdf))

---

### Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool

National Plant Protection Organization (NPPOs) often lack a clear and up to date legal framework, a well-defined vision and mission and a well-functioning structure. The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) is a management tool, developed by the IPPC, that can help countries to improve their NPPOs and entire phytosanitary system. It is meant to assist with identification of gaps and challenges and development of the national capacity development strategy and related action plans expended over 5 -6 years. The PCE is:

- a type of *evaluation* that helps contracting parties identify and plan for the development of the best legislative, technical and administrative measures to help them meet their IPPC obligations;
- a *modular online software* system<sup>18</sup> consisting of 13 modules that use a questionnaire style to document the evaluation process. NPPOs can decide to apply all the modules or just a few, according to their preferences; and
- a *process* involving all concerned stakeholders, both public and private. This consensus-driven and confidential process allows contracting parties to identify strengths and weaknesses in their phytosanitary system and plan follow up actions accordingly.

The entire PCE process is under the control of the contracting party. It is not something that is done to a contracting party; it is a framework that the contracting party adopts for its own purposes and benefits. (Adapted from: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/>).

A PCE strategy is developed for 2020-2030. More info: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87701/>

Whilst the PCE tool is a very useful tool at country level, the results are confidential. However, trends can be identified and reported to the CPM anonymously.

### National Reporting Obligations (NRO)

The International Plant Protection Convention establishes several reporting obligations which are the responsibility of the contracting parties to the Convention. Contracting parties should at least report on the following:

- A single Official Contact Point (Art. VIII 2 of the IPPC);
- A description of its official national plant protection organization (Art. IV 4 of the IPPC);
- Phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions which are currently in force (Art. VII 2b of the IPPC);
- Specific points of entry (for consignments of particular plants or plant products required to be imported only through those specific points) (Art. VII 2d of the IPPC);
- Lists of regulated pests, using scientific names, which are currently in force (Art. VII 2i of the IPPC);
- Pest reporting, i.e. reporting regarding occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests (Art. VIII 1a of the IPPC);
- Emergency actions (Art. VII 6 of the IPPC).

The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) agreed that providing the reports via the International Phytosanitary Portal – the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/>) - is the preferred method of meeting official national reporting obligations while making them publicly available. The CPM also agreed that the International Phytosanitary Portal is the preferred mechanism through which Contracting Parties meet their NROs. Bilateral NROs should be communicated directly between Contracting Parties, however they could also be displayed on the IPP if a country wishes to do so (Source: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca6377en/CA6377EN.pdf>).

Official Contact Points (OCPs) designated by the contracting parties are responsible for the reporting and are in practice responsible for providing reports via the IPP or bilaterally on request by other contracting parties when the Convention requires so. (Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/information-exchange/nro/>).

---

<sup>18</sup> The interactive, online PCE tool can be found here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/pce/>

---

The reason for having NROs is to ensure that a minimum amount of official phytosanitary information is available that can be used as the basis for ensuring safe trade, safeguarding food security and protecting the environment from plant pests. In order to be most useful the phytosanitary information should be accurate, up-to-date, clearly presented, consistent with the IPPC guidance and in a format that is easily accessible and understandable. (Source: <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/ca6377en>).

### **IPPC Online Comment System (OCS)**

In order to get feedback from different stakeholders, there is the Online Comment System (OCS), which is an online tool designed for defined stakeholders to apply, share, and publish comments on documents; and for the IPPC Secretariat to compile comments in an easy and efficient manner ('with the click of a button'). Its mission is to provide a simple, efficient, user-friendly online system to apply, share, publish and compile comments on documents.

The OCS helps to standardize the way comments are inputted and presented for discussion.

Through the OCS, IPPC Contact Points can submit comments on draft documents, with the support of the up to four optional Reviewers, designated by the same Contact Point. (Source: <https://www.ippc.int/en/online-comment-system/>).

### **3.2.4 Conclusion**

There are various mechanisms in place for monitoring and evaluation of the IPPC, but there is no overall and comprehensive M&E system yet that can support decision-making for improving processes and initiatives. Project monitoring and evaluation is done for STDF projects, various projects implemented by the Implementation and Facilitation Unit of IPPC, and various areas of work are reported regularly to FAO. Evaluations of the work of the Secretariat has been carried out in 2007 and 2014. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) holds annual meetings to promote cooperation to help implement the objectives of the IPPC. Meetings also host a scientific session for discussion of important issues.

The Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) is an evaluation tool of IPPC that focuses on identifying contracting parties' challenges and opportunities for implementation of the Convention and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). This is done through performing surveys and convening meetings; identifying emerging issues; conducting analytical studies; providing implementation support through a helpdesk; providing technical assistance; collaboration by the Secretariat and RPPOs and other organisations; and producing an implementation status report every three years.

The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool is a management tool, that can help countries rapidly improve their NPPOs and entire phytosanitary system. The results of the tool are confidential PCE and thus cannot be used for aggregation at global level.

The International Plant Protection Convention establishes several reporting obligations which are the responsibility of the contracting parties to the Convention.

National Reporting Obligations (NROs) are necessary to ensure that a minimum amount of official phytosanitary information is available that can be used as the basis for ensuring safe trade, safeguarding food security and protecting the environment from plant pests.

The IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) provides a simple, efficient, user-friendly online system to apply, share, publish and compile comments on documents.

At the moment there is not a comprehensive M&E to support the work of the IPPC. However, a Task Force Monitoring and Evaluation (TFME) is in place to support the development of the monitoring and evaluation for the IPPC at Secretariat and global level, supported by Wageningen University &

---

Research. This work is still in progress but needs to further take shape. This requires strong leadership and support.

## 3.3 OIE

### 3.3.1 Introduction

IPPC and OIE collaborate on topics of common interest. On the topic of monitoring and evaluation of international standards implementation, IPPC and OIE share their respective experiences in order to benefit from each other's experiences and learnings. The next paragraphs provide information from the OIE website, whilst the last paragraph presents a discussion on the OIE monitoring initiative to learn from this experience. OIE is in the process of designing an Observatory for the purpose of monitoring the OIE standards. OIE is also in the process of developing a new, seventh Strategic Plan for OIE. The Observatory will be part of this new strategic plan. Information on the Observatory (including the design and roadmap) will be updated on the OIE website at a later stage.

### 3.3.2 Background on OIE

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) is the intergovernmental organisation responsible for improving animal health worldwide. The need to fight animal diseases at global level led to the creation of the Office International des Epizooties through the international Agreement signed on January 25th 1924. In May 2003 the Office became the World Organisation for Animal Health but kept its historical acronym OIE.

It is recognised as a reference organisation by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and has a total of about 182 Member Countries. The OIE maintains permanent relations with nearly 75 other international and regional organisations and has Regional and sub-regional Offices on every continent.

The organisation is placed under the authority and control of a World Assembly of Delegates consisting of Delegates designated by the Governments of all Member Countries. The day-to-day operation of the OIE is managed at the Headquarters situated in Paris and placed under the responsibility of a Director General elected by the World Assembly of Delegates. The Headquarters implements the resolutions passed by the International Committee and developed with the support of Commissions elected by the Delegates: Council, Regional Commissions (5), Special Technical Commissions (4). The OIE's financial resources are derived principally from compulsory annual contributions backed up by voluntary contributions from Member Countries.

(Source: <https://www.oie.int/about-us/>)

### 3.3.3 Sixth Strategic plan (2016-2020)

Since 1990, the OIE has adopted a strategic planning cycle for its five-year work program. The Sixth Strategic Plan, adopted by the Member Countries who met during the 83rd General Session of the World Assembly of Delegates, which was held from 25 to 29 May 2015, covers the period from 2016 to 2020. It exploits the positive results of previous strategic plans, which it consolidates allowing the OIE to continue to contribute effectively to the responses to major societal challenges by adapting to their changes:

- Risk management for the health and welfare of animals, and contribution to the reduction of the dangers to human health.
- Improve food safety, including reducing the impact of animal diseases on production and establishing standards to ensure transparent and harmonized conditions for national and international trade in live animals and their products.
- Transparency of health information provided by Member Countries, by adapting their tools to new communication technologies.
- Reduction of biological risks, whether they are of natural, accidental, or intentional origins.
- Analysis and optimization of socio-economic links between man and animal.
- Contribution to economic and human development, while ensuring the environment and biodiversity.

---

(OIE, 2015).

(Source: <https://www.oie.int/en/about-us/director-general-office/strategic-plan/>)

OIE is in the process of developing a seventh strategic plan. The above-mentioned website will be updated with information on this over time.

### 3.3.4 Observatory on implementation of OIE standards

While the development of sanitary standards is a central mission of the OIE, the Organisation must also look at how they are implemented. In May 2018, the World Assembly of OIE Delegates adopted the Resolution No. 36 recommending the establishment of an Observatory on the implementation of OIE Standards by Member Countries. Monitoring, identifying and analysing difficulties faced by Member Countries will enable the OIE to ensure a more effective implementation of its standards. This Observatory will assist the OIE to ensure that its standards are continuously relevant and fit for purpose and to develop a more strategic focus to its capacity building activities.

(Source: <https://www.oie.int/standard-setting/overview/oie-observatory/>)

The OIE Observatory is to strengthen the implementation of OIE standards by Member Countries. This was explained in an infographic developed to stimulate Member Countries to respond to an online questionnaire (see 3.3.4) and be part of the OIE Observatory project.

The infographic shows that the OIE Standards aim to improve animal health and welfare as well as veterinary public health worldwide. The OIE Delegates play a key role in ensuring implementation through promoting: Veterinary Services (good governance); Veterinary Legislation (good regulatory practices; harmonisation); Official disease status (Transparency); Public-Private Partnerships; and Participation in OIE standard-setting procedure (engagement, inclusiveness). These are also referred to as success factors. Furthermore, indicates that, to address the challenges faced by OIE members, the OIE Observatory will:

- provide a better understanding of the level of implementation by the countries, through monitoring progress and evaluating challenges;
- contribute to the ongoing improvement of: the standard-setting process; OIE capacity building activities (PVS pathway; Seminars and Workshops); informal mediation among OIE members on trade issues.

(OIE, 2018). (Source: [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International\\_Standard\\_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A\\_Observatory.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A_Observatory.pdf))

The Observatory is intended to serve as a tool to monitor progress and constraints faced by Members in the implementation of the OIE standards.

Through the Observatory, the OIE will be better able to determine the effectiveness and practicability of its standards in order to propose solutions to Member Countries. The expected outcomes would be more effective implementation of OIE standards and to assist the OIE to develop a more strategic focus to its capacity building activities.

The project for the establishment of the Observatory follows a phased-approach:

- The first phase aimed to understand the problem and advocate to Member Countries the need for a new mechanism of monitoring and evaluation (2017-2018). This first phase was achieved through the adoption by the World Assembly of OIE Delegates of the Resolution No. 36 at the 86th General Session, May 2018.
- The second phase aimed to define the design of the Observatory (2018-2019). To achieve this purpose, the OIE collaborates with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). As part of its expertise in international regulatory cooperation and in the context of the Partnership of International Organisations for effective international rule-making, the OECD will carry out an analysis of the concept of 'implementation' of OIE standards and a review of the existing mechanisms supporting the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of OIE standards. Based on this, the OECD will provide the OIE with recommendations and scenarios for the design of the Observatory.

- The third phase of the project will be the assessment of each scenario, the selection of the target scenario and the preparation of a roadmap to build the Observatory (2019-2020). This will complete the design phase, which will be followed by the implementation phase with the deployment of the roadmap (2020 and beyond).

A specific governance for the Observatory project has been established. The Council of the OIE makes strategic decisions while a Reference Group provides technical advice to support the project. The Reference Group was formally launched in January 2019 and is composed of experts from Member Countries (Canada, China, Chile, New Zealand, South Africa, Tunisia), Regional Economic Communities (European Commission, Eurasian Economic Commission, Gulf Cooperation Council) and relevant international organisations (Codex Alimentarius, IPPC, FAO, OECD, STDF and WTO). (OIE, 2019). (Source: <https://www.oie.int/standard-setting/overview/oie-observatory/>)

Please note that the website on the Observatory will continue to be updated with the latest information on the Observatory.

### 3.3.5 Discussion on the design of the OIE Observatory project

OECD has done a study to assist the OIE in the design of the Observatory: assessment of existing mechanisms developed by OIE and other IOs (WTO SPS database with SPS notifications and Specific trade concerns, FAOLEX). The publication of the OECD study is expected in February 2020.

The OECD study assesses which mechanisms can be used to gather information on the implementation of OIE standards, and which information is relevant to collect. OIE intends to aggregate data to provide at global level to generate an anonymous picture of implementation of OIE standards.

At OIE, there are different mechanisms that have other purposes (capacity building, transparency) but which can be relevant sources of information for the Observatory:

- PVS Pathway<sup>19</sup>: capacity building tools to strengthen veterinary services. Doesn't look at implementation of standards, but at capacity to implement standards. The tool<sup>20</sup> is to collect information on critical competencies.
- They also collect information from Member Countries, through official recognition of the disease status<sup>21</sup>.
- The World Animal Health Information System (WAHIS<sup>22</sup>): on transparency of animal health situation. WAHIS is an internet-based computer system that processes data on animal diseases in real-time and then informs the international community. Access to this secure site is only available to authorised users, namely the Delegates of OIE Member Countries and their authorised representatives, who use WAHIS to notify the OIE of relevant animal disease information. The system consists in two components: 1. an early warning system to inform the international community, by means of 'alert messages', of relevant epidemiological events that occurred in OIE Member Countries, and 2. a monitoring system in order to monitor OIE Listed diseases (presence or absence) over time.
- Technical item of General Session: Opportunity each year to send a questionnaire on specific issues to countries. At the last General Session in May 2018, the technical item was on implementation (see Box 1).

In parallel to the work by OECD, there is a reference group from 6 Member Countries, from 3 regional economic communities (e.g. EU). They have also invited relevant international organisations like IPPC, Codex, FAO, WTO, STDF and OECD.

The OIE faces the same challenges as IPPC in terms of data collection and data quality.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.oie.int/en/solidarity/pvs-pathway/>

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.oie.int/en/solidarity/pvs-evaluations/oie-pvs-tool/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.oie.int/en/animal-health-in-the-world/official-disease-status/official-recognition-policy-and-procedures/>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.oie.int/en/animal-health-in-the-world/the-world-animal-health-information-system/the-world-animal-health-information-system/>

#### Box 1 - Questionnaire on implementation of OIE standards

A study was done, based on a questionnaire on the implementation of OIE standards, which informed a resolution for an observatory. This was a Technical item on '*Implementation of OIE standards by OIE Member countries: state of play and specific capacity building needs*'<sup>23</sup>.

The questionnaire was designed with four sections:

- \* Section 1: General information about national systems for sanitary measures;
- \* Section 2: Use of OIE standards when setting sanitary measures for the importation of commodities;
- \* Section 3: Use of OIE standards when negotiating access to export markets;
- \* Section 4: Challenges to the use of OIE standards and capacity building needs.

The response rate was quite high: 80% (145 of the 181 Member Countries).

This Technical Item addressed the implementation by Member Countries of the OIE standards for international trade in live animals and animal products (including food of animal origin). The purpose of the study was to identify and analyse factors that limit implementation of the standards and make recommendations on how the OIE could help Member Countries to overcome these difficulties.

(Kahn, 2018).

(Source: <https://www.oie.int/en/publications-and-documentation/compendium-of-technical-items/>)

### 3.3.6 Evaluations

#### Joint evaluations

In 2018 a joint FAO-OIE Evaluation of the Global Framework for Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs)<sup>24</sup> was carried out. This was the third evaluation of the GF-TADs and covered the period from 2009 to 2017. The evaluation aimed to provide the GF-TADs Global Steering Committee and Management Committee with lessons learned and evidence which can be used to inform its future strategic development by providing recommendations to guide GF-TADs' enhanced collaboration at regional and global levels and encourage improvement of the GF-TADs' tools. The evaluation examined the added value of the GF-TADs as a mechanism to facilitate collaborative work between FAO, OIE and TADs partners in addressing global risks from TADs.

The main conclusions were:

1. There is a continuing need for the GF-TADs platform due to continuing emergence and spread of TADs and due to the unique features of the platform. There are no comparable global platforms for animal health.
2. A regional approach and organizational solutions are justified in recognition of regional differences of the needs for TADs control. Activities at country level are supported indirectly through GF-TADs regional initiatives, yet implementation at country level is beyond the capacity of the GF-TADs.
3. Governance provided by the GSC is generally passive, weak and disconnected from the operational reality. Effectiveness at global level suffers from the lack of agreed managerial processes in the Management Committee (MC), limited resources, lack of staff, a lack of implementation of strategic planning and limited review of progress and activities being undertaken. The MC and the GSC are critical for the functioning of GF-TADs at global and regional level.
4. The strategic commitment of FAO and OIE towards the GF-TADs is uncertain. This is reflected in the commitment of its resources (human, financial and organizational) that is ill-defined and too limited to assure achievement of the agreed objectives. There are needs for coordination, communication and joint learning expressed by the regions that currently cannot be met.

The main recommendation was "To assure relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of GF-TADs, FAO and OIE as leading partners must reconfirm and strengthen their commitment to this collaborative instrument of strategic importance".

#### PVS evaluations

PVS Evaluation and PVS Evaluation Follow-Up missions have been the proven core component of the PVS Pathway since its inception. They provide a careful evaluation of the current performance of the

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.oie.int/en/publications-and-documentation/compendium-of-technical-items/>

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.fao.org/evaluation/evaluation-digest/evaluations-detail/en/c/1158056/>



---

national Veterinary Services, and the capacity to undertake ongoing monitoring of performance over time using consistent methods.

There are other variants of these Evaluations, available as further options for tailored engagement:

- PVS Self-Evaluation: The OIE PVS Tool is publicly available for OIE Member Countries to use for PVS Self-Evaluation purposes.
- PVS Evaluation of Aquatic Animal Health Services (AAHS): The OIE has developed a PVS Tool for AAHS based on the OIE PVS Tool, which includes some amendments making it more appropriate for the evaluation of the performance of aquatic animal health services.
- PVS Evaluation Specific Content: Member Countries can choose to include a specific content supplement (report annex) related to global priority diseases and issues, such as PPR and Rabies into the PVS Evaluation and Evaluation Follow Up missions, which are still completed and reported in full<sup>25</sup>.

A number of countries have waived the confidentiality of (PVS) evaluation reports and the majority have authorised the OIE to send those reports to OIE partner organisations and to international donors working jointly with the OIE in the global programme to strengthen Veterinary Services. In addition, some countries have authorised the OIE to make the reports of PVS evaluation missions fully public<sup>26</sup>.

### 3.3.7 Conclusion

The OIE is in the process of developing an Observatory on the implementation of OIE standards by Member Countries. OECD assists the OIE in the design of the Observatory by undertaking an assessment of existing mechanisms developed by OIE (PVS Pathway, WAHIS, Official Status, etc.) and other IOs (WTO SPS database with SPS notifications and Specific trade concerns, FAOLEX).

OIE intends to aggregate data to provide an anonymous picture at global level.

OIE has developed the pathway to develop the Observatory, and also has a governance structure in place. A key conclusion of the discussion with OIE was that "All international organisations are facing same challenges".

Andersen, A. B., Bang, T., Bardeleben, K. H., Blanner, M., Bonde, C., Elmegaard, N., . . . Horsfeldt, O. (2019). Enabling the Business of Agriculture 2019.

Kahn, S. (2018). Implementation of the OIE Standards by the OIE Member Countries: State of Play and Specific Capacity Building Needs. Retrieved from [https://web.oie.int/download/SG/2018/A\\_86SG%20A\\_Technical%20item\\_Discussion.pdf](https://web.oie.int/download/SG/2018/A_86SG%20A_Technical%20item_Discussion.pdf)

OIE. (2015). World Organisation for Animal Health. The Sixth Strategic Plan 2016-2020 Retrieved from [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/About\\_us/docs/pdf/6thSP\\_ANG.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/About_us/docs/pdf/6thSP_ANG.pdf)

OIE. (2018). World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) Observatory. Strengthening the Implementation of OIE Standards by Member Countries. Infographic for questionnaire. Retrieved from [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International\\_Standard\\_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A\\_Observatory.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A_Observatory.pdf)

OIE. (2019). World Organisation for Animal Health. Observatory on Implementation of OIE Standards (website). Retrieved from <https://www.oie.int/en/standard-setting/overview/oie-observatory/>

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.oie.int/solidarity/pvs-pathway/evaluation/>

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.oie.int/solidarity/pvs-evaluations/pvs-evaluation-reports/>

---

## 3.4 STDF

### 3.4.1 Background on STDF

The Standards and Trade Development Facility is a global partnership that helps developing countries to gain and maintain access to markets by tackling sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) gaps, and promoting food safety, animal and plant health. It works to support sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction, food security and environmental protection. (STDF, 2019b).

Trade in food and agricultural products offers a way for farmers, processors and traders in developing countries to increase their incomes and boost economic development. But despite the potential, they face many challenges. Limited capacity to meet food safety, animal and plant health requirements is often one of the major obstacles. International and regional organizations and donors are supporting developing country governments and the private sector to tackle sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) capacity gaps. The STDF provides a platform for organizations to come together to discuss SPS capacity building needs, share experiences and good practice, leverage additional funding, and work on coordinated and coherent solutions. (STDF, 2019a).

### 3.4.2 Strategy 2020-2024

STDF developed a new strategy for 2020-2024, with the following vision: *“to promote sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction and food security.”* The programme goal is “Increased and sustainable SPS capacity in developing countries” and is expected to contribute to the vision through “Safe trade facilitated”. In order to contribute to the programme goal, two related, and closely interconnected outcomes are defined:

1. OUTCOME 1. More synergies and collaboration driving catalytic SPS improvements in developing countries. Working at global, regional and national level, the STDF will convene and connect diverse stakeholders with the role and SPS capacity development.
2. OUTCOME 2. Greater access to, and use of, good practices and knowledge products at global, regional and national level. STDF will deliver demand-driven activities to pilot and learn from collaborative and innovative approaches in developing SPS capacity.

It is expected that the STDF’s partnership drives catalytic SPS improvements in developing countries. Through the global platform, knowledge work and funding to develop, implement and learn from innovative pilot projects, STDF stimulates and influences sustainable improvements in SPS capacity.

STDF has captured its strategy in a visual Theory of Change. The strategy takes into account existing, new and emerging risks affecting the STDF, and has also made explicit key assumptions for the outcomes and results in STDF’s theory of change. They relate to active engagement of STDF’s members; stakeholders awareness and ability to implement good practices and knowledge products; tailored communication; monitoring and measuring change; and available resources and skills. The document includes a table with mitigation measures for related risks.

(Source: [https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Strategy\\_2020-2024.pdf](https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Strategy_2020-2024.pdf)).

### 3.4.3 M&E mechanisms

Monitoring and evaluation of the STDF partnership has evolved and improved over time, with requirements for monitoring and evaluation of the STDF programme, as well as its project portfolio, outlined in the STDF Operational Rules.

Four external evaluations of the STDF have been commissioned by WTO to date, in addition to independent evaluations initiated and led by individual donors. The most recent external evaluation, published in 2019, recognized how STDF’s monitoring and evaluation improved since the 2015 Mid-Term Review’s recommendation to strengthen results-based management systems, tools and processes.<sup>27</sup> It acknowledged efforts to capture results and lessons across STDF’s global platform,

---

<sup>27</sup> [www.standardsfacility.org/evaluations](http://www.standardsfacility.org/evaluations)

---

knowledge and project work, including the 2018 meta-evaluation of projects. It also concluded that learning has not always been as systematic or far-reaching as possible, given the Secretariat's limited resources and the scope of the existing M&E framework. In June 2019, the STDF Policy Committee endorsed 16 (out of 20) of the evaluation's recommendations, which are currently at various stages of implementation.

### **MEL framework**

A new Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework is being developed by the STDF Secretariat in cooperation with interested STDF partners and other members of the partnership to complement the STDF Strategy for 2020-2024. This framework – to be finalized by October 2020 – will provide a practical framework to track progress in terms of achieving results, provide feedback on the management of the Facility and to distil, learn from and communicate key experiences and lessons across STDF's work programme. It will consolidate the focus on results-based management, building on the STDF external evaluation published in 2019 and the previous M&E framework, which accompanied the 2014-2019 STDF Strategy<sup>28</sup>. STDF expects that this will ensure more emphasis on learning, reinforcing the value-proposition of STDF in piloting, innovating, influencing and catalysing SPS good practices.

The MEL framework is being designed to track progress and results under the STDF's programme goal and two outcomes, based on STDF's Theory of Change, ensuring a focus on measuring outcomes and pathways to change, and not only activities. To ensure that any changes are undertaken with a view to keeping the system simple, practical and cost-effective, it will be developed and rolled out with a focus on practically assessing those areas that are within STDF's influence and reach. (Source: [https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Strategy\\_2020-2024.pdf](https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Strategy_2020-2024.pdf)).

For STDF it is vital to have both the MEL framework and the communications plan developed and linked.

Whilst the external evaluation (2019) indicates that more needs to be done in terms of monitoring and evaluation and communication, this is a general requirement for many organisations. To do this properly, the 2019 external evaluation recognized that the STDF would need to have a dedicated M&E person and adequate budget. STDF has recognized the need for an M&E person and is interested to learn from relevant experiences of STDF partners and other initiatives including instruments from IPPC (IRSS, PCE tool) and OIE (Observatory).

### **M&E system**

The new MEL framework for the 2020-2024 period will include a more robust logical framework, with smart indicators, assumptions and sources of data at different levels. It will enable the achievement of STDF's outcomes and programme goal to be tracked through a set of quantitative indicators, accompanied by case stories to provide qualitative evidence of STDF's role in promoting catalytic change in SPS capacity in developing countries. These efforts will be complemented by thorough baseline studies, evaluations of selected STDF projects and the overall STDF programme, and assessments and meta-evaluations of SPS capacity development more broadly.

Building on STDF's existing processes and systems on M&E, describing below, the MEL framework will incorporate new processes and tools to deliver innovation and improvements in terms of how data and information on progress, results and lessons is captured, reported and communicated. Project implementing partners and other relevant stakeholders will be engaged to support MEL across the STDF's work streams, and facilitate co-creation of knowledge and learning.

Monitoring is used to ensure an ongoing system of information gathering to track performance in delivery across STDF's global platform, knowledge work, and projects and PPGs. Progress and performance indicators and milestones are reported in STDF's Annual Reports, as well as in project and PPG reports, and other documents. End-of-project assessments are carried out by project

---

<sup>28</sup> [www.standardsfacility.org/key-documents](https://www.standardsfacility.org/key-documents)

implementing organizations at the conclusion of all STDF projects, in accordance with the STDF Operational Rules.

Evaluation assesses the overall relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability or impact of the STDF's work streams to ensure accountability to donors and support learning and decisions about what to do next. Evaluation includes: (i) independent ex-post evaluations of selected projects carried out in accordance with the STDF Project Evaluation Guidelines<sup>29</sup>, which are based on the OECD/DAC criteria; (ii) in-depth meta-evaluations or assessments on specific topics and/or cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender or environment) across STDF's projects/PPGs, and knowledge work; (iii) external evaluations of the STDF partnership every five years, in accordance with the STDF Operational Rules; (iv) other independent reviews and evaluations of the STDF commissioned independently by donors, including as part of Aid-for-Trade reviews.

The findings, recommendations and lessons of all monitoring and evaluation activities across the STDF's global partnership, knowledge and project work are shared widely, including through STDF Working Group meetings, other events organized by the STDF Secretariat, STDF partners and other organizations, as well as in evaluation reports, Briefings, STDF publications and other information products.

As indicated above, greater attention will be focused on learning under the new MEL Framework. Expanded focus on learning will complement and strengthen the STDF's ongoing efforts on monitoring and evaluation. This will help to distil, explain and disseminate key experiences and lessons via different media to reach and influence STDF members, the public and private sector, and other stakeholders involved in SPS capacity building on the ground in order to drive catalytic and sustainable SPS improvements.

### External evaluations

External evaluations of the STDF have been carried out in 2005, 2008, 2014, and 2019<sup>30</sup>. The most recent external evaluation of the STDF, carried out by Nathan Associates, was published in 2019 on the STDF website. The evaluation report highlighted the continued added value of the STDF and sets out fresh recommendations to shape its future direction.

#### Box 2 - Beyond results: learning the lessons from STDF projects

In 2018, STDF published a meta evaluation report<sup>31</sup> providing an independent assessment of the performance of STDF projects, aimed at improving the quality and performance of future STDF projects. The report constituted a meta-evaluation of 22 externally evaluated projects, based on an in-depth review and analysis of the independent evaluation reports. The analysis used a structured methodology to assess the quality of the reports, their findings and the lessons learned proposed by the authors of external project evaluation reports.

The meta evaluation classified projects into three categories: sector development, institution building and technical assistance. The study found that: (i) STDF projects score very highly on relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency; (ii) results are easier to track in projects tackling SPS challenges across value chains; and (iii) SPS capacity building projects have value, even if direct impact is harder to measure. It concluded that the STDF project Evaluation Guidelines, which use the OECD/DAC criteria, ensure the quality of STDF project evaluations.

In addition to external evaluations, also project related evaluations are undertaken. For example, the 'Evaluation of IPPC project: Capacity Building Tools for IPPC Standard' and the 'Upcoming evaluation of 'Developing a Network of PCE Facilitators' project'. (STDF).

<sup>29</sup> [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Evaluation\\_Guidelines\\_ENG\\_2018.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Evaluation_Guidelines_ENG_2018.pdf)

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.standardsfacility.org/evaluations>

<sup>31</sup> [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Meta-evaluation\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Meta-evaluation_EN.pdf)

---

### **P-IMA – a framework for SPS planning and decision making**

Monitoring and evaluation can help to inform planning and decision-making. In that respect in the P-IMA(Prioritizing SPS Investments for Market Access) and framework that STDF developed is important: a framework to help inform and improve SPS planning and decision-making processes, so as to support hard choices that need to be made between competing SPS investments. The P-IMA framework offers an evidence-based approach to inform and improve SPS planning and decision-making processes. It helps to link SPS investments to public policy goals including export growth, agricultural productivity, and poverty reduction. In the process, P-IMA encourages public-private dialogue, boosts transparency and accountability, and improves the economic efficiency of investment decisions. The *P-IMA user Guide* uses a multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) approach, as well as computer software (*D-Sight*) to help derive priorities. (Henson, 2016).

P-IMA can make the decision making process more data driven and transparent. Countries are interested to apply the tool, but it's up to them to also release the data. P-IMA is also used for monitoring uptake and spill-over effects. It is a powerful tool to bring stakeholders together. STDF is trying to monitor and take note of examples. The P-IMA tool is resource intensive, but this does lead to prioritised investments or additional funding.

#### **3.4.4 Communications Plan**

According to the external evaluation (NATHAN, 2019), communications and monitoring & evaluation are “intrinsically linked, as it is important that effective lesson learning and results are monitored and measured, and that these lessons and results are effectively communicated to relevant stakeholders. While there have been significant improvements over recent years in terms of reporting of activities and communications, much of the very important lessons coming out of STDF activities are not yet reaching (or only inconsistently) the ultimate beneficiaries”. According to this evaluation “The STDF should build on acknowledged improvements achieved in reporting and communications, placing increased emphasis on measuring results and impact across all STDF activities and on improving beneficiaries’ access to knowledge. This should be underpinned by updating the theory of change and the logical framework to reflect an explicit focus on innovation and lesson learning”. (NATHAN, 2019).

The STDF already developed and used a communications plan (2016) in support of the Medium-Term Strategy (2015-2019).<sup>32</sup> STDF’s work on communications contributed to M&E by sharing results and stories, so as to influence various audiences.

The STDF recognizes that the link between M&E and communication is important in view of results-based management and implementation of the new STDF strategy. The STDF communications plan is currently being updated (for finalization by October 2020) to complement the STDF Strategy for 2020-2024.

The updated STDF’s communications plan aims to extend the reach and impact of STDF’s work by building greater awareness of the importance of investing in SPS capacity among developing country governments, as well as the broader trade and development community. The plan will put a strong emphasis on reaching target audiences in developing countries in line with the external evaluation (2019), supporting an increased take-up and use of STDF knowledge, tools and project support.

The communications plan, developed in 2016, will be updated and strengthened to support STDF partners, donors and other members to collectively champion outreach efforts by bringing on board their communications counterparts. An updated online platform and social media presence will be adopted to promote the plan. To further raise its visibility, the STDF brand will be refreshed through use of graphics, images and design, and prominently feature STDF partners, donors and other members.

STDF communications will continue to focus on developing compelling and high-quality products, including across publications, multi-media and digital content to support the achievement of results

---

<sup>32</sup> [http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Communications\\_Plan\\_2016.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Communications_Plan_2016.pdf)

---

under the strategy. This will include regularly identifying and communicating effectively on results, linked to the MEL framework. In developing STDF communications, beneficiaries in developing countries will be empowered to tell their stories and share their knowledge and lessons across a national, regional and global audience.

(Source: [https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Strategy\\_2020-2024.pdf](https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Strategy_2020-2024.pdf)).

For STDF it is important to link the communication to monitoring and evaluation. A range of communications activities and outputs have supported STDF's work on monitoring, evaluation and learning to date including *Annual reports*, *Results stories*, Briefings, Films, website, YouTube, e-news, events. (STDF, 2016). Here one can clearly see the link between M&E and communication, especially in terms of the annual reports and results stories.<sup>33</sup>

The STDF tracks and monitors communication activities to support results-based management of the STDF strategy. For instance, "To support STDF's results based management, progress on delivering communications activities outlined in STDF's 2017-2018 work plan was monitored and evaluated on a regular basis. To measure the reach and dissemination of STDF knowledge, tools and project support, information was collected on material shared with target audiences at events, presentations and workshops, based on reports from the STDF Secretariat and STDF partners, donors, developing country experts and other organizations. In addition, statistics on user profiles, views and downloads were captured from the website, Virtual Library and YouTube.

To measure the reach and recognition of the STDF, statistics are gathered on: engagement with STDF's E-newsletters and news items; positive feedback generated on STDF across media and social media platforms, and feedback captured from the audience at events. This included reports on dissemination activities from the STDF partnership and from project partners, as well as enquiries received by the STDF Secretariat and levels of interest in joining the partnership.

### 3.4.5 Conclusion

STDF is making progress in terms of M&E and communications, which are closely linked and support results based management of the new STDF strategy 2020-2024.

A new Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework is being developed to complement the STDF Strategy for 2020-2024. This framework will provide a practical framework to track progress in terms of achieving results, provide feedback on the management of the Facility and to distil, learn from and communicate key experiences and lessons across STDF's work programme. It will consolidate the focus on results-based management, building on the STDF external evaluation published in 2019 and the previous M&E framework, which accompanied the 2014-2019 STDF Strategy<sup>34</sup>. STDF expects that this will ensure more emphasis on learning, reinforcing the value-proposition of STDF in piloting, innovating, influencing and catalysing SPS good practices.

STDF has various M&E mechanisms in place, including monitoring progress towards STDF Logframe objectives and indicators, evaluations of STDF projects, and external evaluations. The most recent external evaluation of STDF was done in 2019, whilst a meta-evaluation was done of STDF project evaluations in 2018. The MEL framework supports the strategic plan and decision making related to this plan at global level. For (developing) countries, STDF developed a framework to help inform and improve SPS planning and decision-making processes: Prioritizing SPS Investments for Market Access (P-IMA).

The STDF recognizes that the link between M&E and communication is important in view of results-based management and implementation of the new STDF strategy. The STDF communications plan is currently being updated to complement the STDF Strategy for 2020-2024. STDF's work on communications contributes to M&E by sharing results and stories, so as to influence various audiences.

---

<sup>33</sup> [http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Results\\_Booklet\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Results_Booklet_EN.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> [www.standardsfacility.org/key-documents](http://www.standardsfacility.org/key-documents)

---

The recommendation of the external evaluation to further improve M&E and communications are well understood but require additional resources, including funding and a dedicated M&E person.

## 3.5 WTO – SPS

### 3.5.1 Background on WTO and SPS

#### **World Trade Organisation (WTO)**

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world's trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to ensure that trade flows as smoothly, predictably and freely as possible. The WTO has many roles: it operates a global system of trade rules, it acts as a forum for negotiating trade agreements, it settles trade disputes between its members and it supports the needs of developing countries. WTO stands for a number of simple, fundamental principles form the foundation of the multilateral trading system. The primary purpose of the WTO is to open trade for the benefit of all.

(Source: [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\\_e/thewto\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/thewto_e.htm))

#### **Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures and agreement**

SPS measures are adopted by governments to ensure that food is safe for consumers, and to prevent the spread of pests or diseases among animals and plants. These measures apply to both domestically produced and imported goods. The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) aims to ensure these measures protect human, animal, plant life or health while avoiding unnecessary barriers to trade.

(Source: <http://spsims.wto.org/>).

The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures sets out the basic rules for food safety and animal and plant health standards. It allows countries to set their own standards. But it also says regulations must be based on science. They should be applied only to the extent necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health. And they should not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate between countries where identical or similar conditions prevail. Member countries are encouraged to use international standards, guidelines and recommendations where they exist. However, members may use measures which result in higher standards if there is scientific justification. They can also set higher standards based on appropriate assessment of risks so long as the approach is consistent, not arbitrary. The agreement still allows countries to use different standards and different methods of inspecting products.

All countries maintain measures to ensure that food is safe for consumers, and to prevent the spread of pests or diseases among animals and plants. These sanitary and phytosanitary measures can take many forms, such as requiring products to come from a disease-free area, inspection of products, specific treatment or processing of products, setting of allowable maximum levels of pesticide residues or permitted use of only certain additives in food. Sanitary (human and animal health) and phytosanitary (plant health) measures apply to domestically produced food or local animal and plant diseases, as well as to products coming from other countries.

(Source: [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/sps\\_e/spsund\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/spsund_e.htm))

#### **Standard-Setting Organisations for the SPS Agreement**

Relevant standard-setting organizations for the SPS Agreement are (the 'Three Sisters'):

- The WTO and the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius (Codex) for food
- World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) for animal health
- the FAO's Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) for plant health

(Source: [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/sps\\_e/sps\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/sps_e.htm))

---

### **SPS Committee and Secretariat**

At WTO, work on SPS is handled by the SPS Committee, which reports to the Goods Council. The work is officially recorded in the committee's annual reports to the General Council and in summary reports (equivalent to minutes) of the committee's meetings.

(Source: [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/sps\\_e/sps\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/sps_e.htm)).

The SPS Secretariat, that falls under the Agriculture and Commodities Division of WTO, supports the work of the SPS committee that meets 3 times a year. They also undertake training activities, facilitate trade disputes for SPS cases (calling legal support), develop publications and follow up on the work of the three sisters. Currently the team is also involved in the fifth review of the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement.

### **3.5.2 M&E mechanisms**

Although there are 'no' data on the implementation of the SPS agreement, most information can be found in committee meetings, notifications and the information management system. At the level of WTO, the monitoring and evaluation unit under the technical assistance division, monitors the activities of the SPS Secretariat, as they need to provide reports on the technical assistance they have provided.

Within SPS committee meetings, anecdotal information is shared on how the agreement is implemented. Next to these meetings, the following instruments are in place:

- SPS Notification Submission System: National Notification Authorities can now use the SPS Notification Submission System (SPS NSS) to fill out and submit SPS notifications online.
- SPS Information Management System (SPS IMS): a database of WTO information on SPS (Notifications, concerns raised, other documents, enquiry points, etc).
- ePing SPS & TBT Notification Alert System: By registering on ePing, users can receive daily or weekly email alerts containing SPS/TBT notifications covering products/markets of interest to them.

(Source: [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/sps\\_e/sps\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/sps_e.htm))

### **SPS Committee meetings**

In a year some 3 SPS Committee meetings are held to share information on the implementation of the SPS agreement. The current review process feeds into these meetings as there is no external budget for the review process. The chair sometimes has consultations and conference calls are held with members of the review committee so they can help them in the preparation for these meetings.

### **SPS Information Management System (SPS IMS)**

The SPS IMS is a comprehensive database allowing users to search all notified SPS measures and Specific Trade Concerns (STCs) raised in the SPS Committee. Users can also browse information on SPS National Notification Authorities and Enquiry Points, as well as other SPS-related documents circulated at the WTO.

(Source: <http://spsims.wto.org/>)

### **e-Ping and TBT Notification Alert System**

Products entering a market need to be in line with that market's product requirements. As a producer, trader or government official, it is important to be informed when a government is planning to revise regulations on product requirements (also referred to as Sanitary or Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) or Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) within the WTO). On the ePing website, you can subscribe to receive email alerts on planned regulatory revisions covering products and/or markets of interest to you. ePing also includes a communication platform where you can discuss these upcoming changes with fellow stakeholders and government officials, such as SPS/TBT enquiry points. SPS/TBT enquiry points often serve as a liaison between national stakeholders and other WTO members and can help tracking and addressing issues related to upcoming regulations. A dedicated admin page for government officials working on SPS/TBT transparency matters helps to manage ePing at the national level.

ePing shares information on product requirements using data compiled by the World Trade Organization (WTO). WTO Members are normally required to inform each other when planning to



---

change product requirements and provide an opportunity for other Members to comment on these requirements. They do so by submitting a two-page info sheet on the regulation with information on products covered, a brief summary of the regulation and the deadline for providing comments. These info sheets, called SPS or TBT notifications, are sent to ePing users based on their interests. (Source: <https://www.epingalert.org/en>).

### **Fifth review**

The process for the Review of the Implementation and Operation of the SPS Agreement, provides good input into assessing where changes are needed in terms of the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement. Every 4 years there is a review. The fifth review started in 2018 and will finish in March 2020 with recommendations. The process is primarily led by members, whilst the SPS team supports the process. Some current topics being discussed include the role of the three sisters and regionalisation, and how the different bodies can be more efficient. The purpose of the review is not to discuss or change the text of the SPS agreement but rather to review the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement. This requires that all members agree and thus it is a slow process. The last review process took four years to adopt the report. The current process is faster (2 years). The review also looks at emerging issues.

Some of the benefits of this review process include:

- Relevant topics: the topics are chosen by members.
- Shared learning: since the review process is led and owned by members, and many discussions take place, this leads to sharing their learning, so as to come up with concrete recommendations for improvement.
- Informs strategic decision-making: the review process feeds results into the strategic meetings by the SPS committee. The chair of the SPS committee also supports the review process by organising consultation.
- Improvement of the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement. Since there is ownership for the review process, members can bring their proposals for improvement, and these proposals are subsequently discussed. This helps to support the SPS agreement with more concrete guidelines for implementation.

Challenges of the review process:

- Adoption of recommendations takes time: whilst the process is participatory and creates ownership, the challenge is also that for some of the recommendations to be accepted, it may take time. The last (fourth) review more time than envisaged, since not all members supported all the recommendations.

The role of the SPS Secretariat in the review process is to facilitate the review process by:

- Providing summaries
- Providing access to relevant documentation
- Following up with members on agreed actions

### **3.5.3 Conclusion**

There is no formal system in place to monitor the implementation of the SPS agreement. This is done more at the level of the three sister organisations OIE, Codex and IPPC. Key issues, brought to the table by members, are mainly discussed during the SPS Committee meetings that held three times a year. In addition to this, the SPS Notification System and the SPS Information Management System provide information that is discussed during these meetings. Monitoring of activities carried out by the SPS Secretariat are done by WTO.

However, the process for the Review of the Implementation and Operation of the SPS Agreement, provides good input into assessing where changes are needed in terms of the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement. This review process, which takes place every four years, is member driven, which is important since the committee is a member organisation. The benefits of the fifth review (being concluded in March 2020) are that relevant topics are chosen; shared learning takes place; it

---

inform strategic decision-making; and it helps to improve the implementation and operation of the SPS agreement. The downside of this process is that its adoption of recommendations takes time.

## 3.6 Summary and conclusions

None of the SPS organisations have a formal M&E system in place, but all of them have some form of M&E, which to some extent is based on the (draft) Strategic Framework / Plan. However, the IPPC is currently developing the M&E based on the Strategic Framework. The focus is mainly on following the implementation of the SPS agreements by the different organisations. This is done in different ways, some more systematic than others. None of the organisations monitor necessarily the effects of the implementation. All the organisations seem to struggle with having adequate data at impact level. This also seems to be a bridge too far as the organisations work globally and impact is influenced by many different factors. All organisations carry out monitoring of ongoing activities up to some extent, but what the effects of these key activities are is not systematically assessed by all SPS organisations. Part of this is due to lack of finance, technical (M&E) capacity, leadership support and having a consistent M&E framework in place that is based on the overall strategy.

Both OIE and IPPC are in the process of reviewing current mechanisms and developing a more systematic system for monitoring and evaluation. OIE is in the process of developing a standards observatory, whilst IPPC is in the process of aligning its monitoring and evaluation to the new strategic framework.

All SPS bodies have committees in place to monitor the implementation of the SPS agreements or standards. Other mechanisms in place include online information (e.g. online databases, information management systems, e-notifications etc), surveys, (bi-)annual reports, and diagnostic tools (although country level data are not always made public and thus not useful at global level).

All of the SPS bodies engage in evaluations review of their work or specifically related to projects.

---

# References

- Andersen, A. B., Bang, T., Bardeleben, K. H., Blanner, M., Bonde, C., Elmegaard, N., . . . Horsfeldt, O. (2019). Enabling the Business of Agriculture 2019.
- Andersson, J. (2018). Beyond Results: Learning the lessons from STDF Projects. Retrieved from [http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Meta-evaluation\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Meta-evaluation_EN.pdf)
- Bax, N., Williamson, A., Aguero, M., Gonzalez, E., & Geeves, W. (2003). Marine invasive alien species: a threat to global biodiversity. *Marine policy*, 27(4), 313-323.
- Chakraborty, S., & Newton, A. C. (2011). Climate change, plant diseases and food security: an overview. *Plant Pathology*, 60(1), 2-14.
- Deutsch, C. A., Tewksbury, J. J., Tigchelaar, M., Battisti, D. S., Merrill, S. C., Huey, R. B., & Naylor, R. L. (2018). Increase in crop losses to insect pests in a warming climate. *Science*, 361(6405), 916-919.
- Early, R., Bradley, B. A., Dukes, J. S., Lawler, J. J., Olden, J. D., Blumenthal, D. M., . . . Miller, L. P. (2016). Global threats from invasive alien species in the twenty-first century and national response capacities. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12485.
- FAO. (1996). *Declaration on world food security*. Paper presented at the World Food Summit, FAO, Rome.
- FAO. (2019). Strategic framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat. 23 pp. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- Flood, J. (2010). The importance of plant health to food security. *Food Security*, 2(3), 215-231.
- Gilioli, G., Schrader, G., Baker, R., Ceglarska, E., Kertész, V., Lövei, G., . . . Van Lenteren, J. (2014). Environmental risk assessment for plant pests: a procedure to evaluate their impacts on ecosystem services. *Science of the Total Environment*, 468, 475-486.
- Henson, S. (2016). Prioritising SPS Investments for Market Access (P-IMA). A framework to inform and improve SPS decision-making processes. Retrieved from <https://www.standardsfacility.org/prioritizing-sps-investments-market-access-p-ima>
- IPPC. (2019). Executive summary the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. International Plant Protection Convention
- Kahn, S. (2018). Implementation of the OIE Standards by the OIE Member Countries: State of Play and Specific Capacity Building Needs. Retrieved from [https://web.oie.int/download/SG/2018/A\\_86SG%20A\\_Technical%20item\\_Discussion.pdf](https://web.oie.int/download/SG/2018/A_86SG%20A_Technical%20item_Discussion.pdf)
- Kettenring, K. M., & Adams, C. R. (2011). Lessons learned from invasive plant control experiments: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied ecology*, 48(4), 970-979.
- Leslie, J. F., Bandyopadhyay, R., & Visconti, A. (2008). *Mycotoxins: detection methods, management, public health and agricultural trade*: CABI.
- MacLeod, A., Pautasso, M., Jeger, M. J., & Haines-Young, R. (2010). Evolution of the international regulation of plant pests and challenges for future plant health. *Food Security*, 2(1), 49-70.
- Murina, M., & Nicita, A. (2014). *Trading with conditions: the effect of sanitary and phytosanitary measures on lower income countries' agricultural exports*: UN.
- Murina, M., & Nicita, A. (2017). Trading with Conditions: The Effect of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures on the Agricultural Exports from Low-income Countries. *The World Economy*, 40(1), 168-181.
- NATHAN. (2019). External Evaluation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF). Final Evaluation Report. Retrieved from <http://www.standardsfacility.org/evaluations>
- Oerke, E.-C. (2006). Crop losses to pests. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 144(1), 31-43.
- OIE. (2015). World Organisation for Animal Health. The Sixth Strategic Plan 2016-2020 Retrieved from [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/About\\_us/docs/pdf/6thSP\\_ANG.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/About_us/docs/pdf/6thSP_ANG.pdf)
- OIE. (2018). World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) Observatory. Strengthening the Implementation of OIE Standards by Member Countries. Infographic for questionnaire. Retrieved from

- 
- [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International\\_Standard\\_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A\\_Observatory.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/Observatory/A_Observatory.pdf)
- OIE. (2019). World Organisation for Animal Health. Observatory on Implementation of OIE Standards (website). Retrieved from <https://www.oie.int/en/standard-setting/overview/oie-observatory/>
- STDF. (2015a). Capacity building tools for IPPC standards. Retrieved from <http://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350>
- STDF. (2015b). STDF Medium-Term Strategy. Retrieved from [http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Mid\\_term\\_Strategy\\_2015\\_2019\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Mid_term_Strategy_2015_2019_EN.pdf)
- STDF. (2016). STDF Communications Plan. Retrieved from [standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_Communications\\_Plan\\_2016.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_Communications_Plan_2016.pdf)
- STDF. (2017a). Developing a network of PCE facilitators. Retrieved from <http://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-401>
- STDF. (2017b). Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. STDF 509 – Final. Retrieved from [http://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/ME\\_Framework\\_EN.pdf](http://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/ME_Framework_EN.pdf)
- STDF. (2019a). STDF Vision and Goal. Retrieved from <http://www.standardsfacility.org/vision-and-goal>
- STDF. (2019b). STDF website. Retrieved from <http://www.standardsfacility.org/>
- Strange, R. N., & Scott, P. R. (2005). Plant disease: a threat to global food security. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.*, 43, 83-116.
- Vilà, M., Espinar, J. L., Hejda, M., Hulme, P. E., Jarošík, V., Maron, J. L., . . . Pyšek, P. (2011). Ecological impacts of invasive alien plants: a meta-analysis of their effects on species, communities and ecosystems. *Ecology letters*, 14(7), 702-708.
- Vurro, M., Bonciani, B., & Vannacci, G. (2010). Emerging infectious diseases of crop plants in developing countries: impact on agriculture and socio-economic consequences. *Food Security*, 2(2), 113-132.
- Weitzenegger, K. (2019). Ex-post Evaluation of the STDF Project STDF/PG/350. Global Phytosanitary Manuals, Standard Operating Procedures and Training Kits Project (STDF/PG/350). Evaluation Report January 2019

# Appendix 1 IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030

## INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK 2020-2030



### OUR MISSION

Protect global plant resources  
and facilitate safe trade



### OUR VISION

The spread of plant pests is minimized and their impacts within  
countries are effectively managed

### OUR GOAL

All countries have the capacity to implement harmonised measures to  
prevent pest introductions and spread, and minimise the impacts of  
pests on food security, trade, economic growth, and the environment

### CORE ACTIVITIES



Standard setting



Implementation &  
capacity development



Communication &  
international cooperation

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

A

Enhance global food security  
& increase sustainable  
agricultural productivity

B

Protect the environment  
from the impacts of  
plant pests

C

Facilitate safe trade,  
development &  
economic growth

### IPPC DEVELOPMENT AGENDA 2020-2030

1. Harmonisation of Electronic Data Exchange.
2. Commodity, and Pathway Specific ISPMs.
3. Management of E-commerce and Courier Mail Pathways.
4. Developing Guidance on the Use of Third Party Entities.
5. Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems.
6. Assessment and Management of Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health.
7. Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination.
8. Diagnostic Laboratory Networking.

### CONTRIBUTING TO UN 2030 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS





# Appendix 2 Theory of Change for IPPC

Figure 1. Theory of Change for IPPC Community



---

Wageningen Centre for Development  
Innovation  
Wageningen University & Research  
P.O. Box 88  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
T +31 (0)317 48 68 00  
[www.wur.eu/cdi](http://www.wur.eu/cdi)

Report WCDI-20-108

---

Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation supports value creation by strengthening capacities for sustainable development. As the international expertise and capacity building institute of Wageningen University & Research we bring knowledge into action, with the aim to explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life. With approximately 30 locations, 5,000 members of staff and 12,000 students, Wageningen University & Research is a world leader in its domain. An integral way of working, and cooperation between the exact sciences and the technological and social disciplines are key to its approach.







To explore  
the potential  
of nature to  
improve the  
quality of life



Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation  
Wageningen University & Research  
P.O. Box 88  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
T +31 (0)317 48 68 00  
[www.wur.eu/cdi](http://www.wur.eu/cdi)

Report WCDI-20-108  
ISBN 978-94-6395-405-1

Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation supports value creation by strengthening capacities for sustainable development. As the international expertise and capacity building institute of Wageningen University & Research we bring knowledge into action, with the aim to explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life. With approximately 30 locations, 5,000 members of staff and 12,000 students, Wageningen University & Research is a world leader in its domain. An integral way of working, and cooperation between the exact sciences and the technological and social disciplines are key to its approach.

