

March 2009

E

منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

DESERT LOCUST CONTROL COMMITTEE

Thirty-ninth Session

Rome, 10-13 March 2009

**Towards a more effective response to Desert Locusts and their impacts
on food security, livelihoods and poverty - multilateral evaluation
of the 2003-2005 Desert Locust Campaign
(Agenda Item 9)**

Background

The 38th session of the DLCC was briefed on the Multilateral Evaluation of the 2003-2005 Desert Locust Campaign, which focuses on achieving “a more effective response to Desert Locusts and their impacts on food security, livelihoods and poverty”. The committee asked a Working Group (MERWOG) to consider the 31 recommendations contained in the evaluation and to report back to a plenary session.

The Committee discussed and accepted the Working Group’s preliminary findings that the recommendations fall into three categories **A**, **A+** and **B** according to their institutional complexity, financial and legal implications (see Appendix 1):

- the ten category **A** recommendations (namely, 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 18, 20, 30a-e, 31a-e) were simple, did not require substantial external resources or additional scrutiny and were adopted at the 38th session
- the seven recommendations in category **A+** (8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21a-f, 23a-b) warranted some further deliberations as did two unclassified recommendations (25a, 25b) and were remitted to the Working Group for further study together with
- the fourteen category **B** recommendations (4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 17, 19, 22a-c, 23c, 24a-c, 26a-b, 27a-c, 28a-c, 29a-c) were more complex, needed substantial resources and further consideration to clarify their policy and legal implications

The DLCC endorsed the category **A** recommendations and agreed that recommendations 9, 25c, 26a & b were covered by numbers 24c and 1-8. The committee re-nominated the Working Group to analyse recommendations in categories **A+** and **B** and report their findings to the Secretariat and requested the Evaluation Mission Steering Committee to monitor their implementation.

The Working Group presented its findings, in mid- November 2006. FAO Management accepted with minor clarification/amendment all of the 20 recommendations addressed directly to FAO, and agreed with all of the remaining 11 directed to affected countries and their regional commissions. FAO's responses were discussed with the technical representative of the Steering Committee's Chair Government in February 2007 and were presented to representatives of most of the Steering Committee member countries in April 2007 at a seminar "Transboundary Pest and Diseases and other Disasters: From Early Warning to Building Back Better". The presentation explained the changes initiated or planned in response to the evaluation in order to realize the following goals:

- Protecting livelihoods during locust campaigns and ensuring subsequent rehabilitation in the recession area
- Using the UN Common Appeal Mechanism as part of the locust campaign appeals process.
- Improving operational efficiency both through modifying FAO procedures and outsourcing some activities
- Building and maintaining Desert Locust early warning and control capacity at national, regional and international levels

This paper looks at the operational application of changes arising from the Evaluation Team's key recommendations during the Central Region upsurge from autumn 2006 to May 2008. Details of new collaborating institutions and how amended instruments function, are covered by agenda items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19.

Operational benefits gained from the recommendations

Identifying vulnerable communities

The most significant finding by the Evaluation was that livelihood protection and rehabilitation must be integrated into locust campaigns. Focusing more on these issues, particularly for the most vulnerable affected communities, will provide better justifications for campaigns. This can be considered a breakthrough, which is reflected in the title and text of the Report and particularly in recommendations 10 and 29. However, a pre-requisite for this is obtaining accurate data on, and maps of, locust-affected countries that show the localities of highest food insecurity and vulnerability. By combining these data with real-time locust population and migration data, FAO could play a key role in humanitarian, livelihood "safety-net" initiatives at national and local levels in order to address the potential effects of locusts on the most vulnerable and food-insecure communities.

In line with the priorities expressed by the Evaluation Team, and of the DLCC Working Group, FAO Management has begun (beginning January 2007) to assemble sources of locality-specific data, including especially maps, showing district-level distributions of food insecure, vulnerable communities. There are a number of sources of these maps or locality data: Integrated Livelihood Assessments (TCER and ILO), GIEWS surveys, FIVIMS (ESAF), Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase classification, IPC (ESA), USAID FEWSNET, and WFP-VAM (Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping). Although all of these agencies have been contacted either in the field or centrally, better harmonization among the agencies, a common approach, tools and technologies are still required.

Data from these sources have been used to assess the possible impact on vulnerable communities of Desert Locust outbreaks, which occurred from late 2006 to mid 2007 in Eritrea, Sudan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen, and which later affected Ethiopia and Kenya. As a result swift assistance of total USD 5.5 million was obtained from the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), the Government of Japan, USAID and FAO, which contributed towards preventing an upsurge and possibly avoiding major crop damage.

During control operations, relevant national agencies were encouraged to communicate to the WFP Resident Coordinators whether crops in a given locality were attacked by locusts or not. In case of crop damage, this certification would have permitted local communities higher priority in access to cash, food rations, tools, seeds, and fertilizers as part of international or national safety-net programmes that form part of FAO's core strategy for reducing food insecurity.

Rapid access to external finance

Several recommendations, including 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 25b, called for broader, deeper, and earlier engagement and use of the humanitarian relief mechanisms under the Emergency Relief Coordinator and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). These operate through the InterAgency Steering Committee (IASC), the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP), and most recently the multilateral Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). The CERF, which has attracted a remarkably wide range of donor governments, was upgraded to allow access to all UN Agencies in March 2006 in order to ensure more timely and predictable humanitarian funding and thus enable a prompt response to new or rapidly deteriorating crises.

CERF provides the initial injection of funds for the most urgent life-saving projects in the Flash Appeal to cover the time lag between issuance of the Appeal and receipt of commitments and funds from donors. CERF funding permits an emergency response within 72 hours, but projects are usually limited to three months and one country.

The first CERF grant to FAO for locust control was approved, through rapid action by AGP and TCE emergency staff, for a Migratory Locust outbreak in Timor Leste in April 2007, just over a year from the launching of the new CERF. Two months later, Yemen faced its worst Desert Locust situation in 15 years with potentially dramatic consequences for rural communities. The Government of Yemen requested emergency assistance to control the outbreak on 8 June 2007. Three days later, a project proposal of US\$ 2,432,110 was submitted to CERF in New York. The proposal was approved on 21 June by the CERF Secretariat. This was the fastest reaction to an onset of a Desert Locust emergency ever recorded!

But fast-moving and dynamic transboundary threats such as the Desert Locust require flexible and regional funding within a broader emergency response system. The CERF Secretariat acknowledged this recommendation made by FAO and is facilitating a regional approach.

Between March and July 2007, the grant component of CERF has been reviewed to explore how the CERF instrument, as a humanitarian financing tool, is contributing towards effectively promoting more timely, predictable, equitable, effective and accountable humanitarian response. The CERF has been particularly valued by FAO.

All FAO staff involved in humanitarian activities received training in new emergency operational procedures and planning, including CERF in April 2007.

FAO Operational Efficiency

Although Recommendations 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, and 28 are the most explicit, the Evaluation questioned FAO's operational efficiency a number of times. The FAO Management welcomes these recommendations to pinpoint critical changes.

The Crisis Management Centre along the Food Chain (CMC-FC), endorsed by Programme Committee and approved by FAO Council in 2006, is one of the most obvious innovations to contribute and improve the overall efficiency to respond to animal and plant diseases and pests, and to prevent unsafe food reaching consumers in distant markets. The CMC-FC addresses the risks to the human food chain in their assessment, management and communication in a comprehensive, systematic, inter-disciplinary, institution-wide collaborative approach. Locust management falls within the functional network of the CMC-FC Plant Pests.

In June 2007 the Council initiated a process evaluation to analyse FAO's managerial, administrative and operational constraints in its emergency operations. This evaluation was begun between January and July 2008 with the objective to identify ways to improve FAO's emergency operations to support efficient, timely delivery of emergency and rehabilitation programming. The ability to coordinate core resources among departments and divisions, both within Headquarters and in the field has been identified as a key constraint to FAO's operational efficiency in emergencies. The preliminary findings largely reflect those of previous evaluations, most notably the Independent External Evaluation (IEE), and recommended in its report many areas in which FAO could streamline its operations specifically with regards to flexible funding mechanism for large multi-country programmes and the establishment of Framework Agreements for procuring repetitive inputs.

Contingency plans for Desert Locust emergencies are being developed according to principles of preparedness. An electronic Contingency Planning Assistant has been developed to help the national agencies to cope more effectively in the event of a Desert Locust emergency. This tool will be field-tested in 2009 and should help the national decision makers to apply measures that enhance preparedness prior to an emergency. This process will continue and all front-line countries should have tested and adopted contingency plans by the end of 2010. Desert Locust Emergency Guidelines have been prepared and are currently being reviewed by TCE. The document was designed to advise FAO staff and consultants involved in the coordination and management of Desert Locust emergencies and those of other locust species. It is a reference guide for all emergencies from small scale outbreaks through to the upsurge stage and contains many links to valuable resources and should help facilitating rapid access to CERF funds.

Relevant rosters have been put in place in collaboration with TCE and are regularly updated as a quick reference of: important stakeholders in locust affected countries, various national and international experts who could be called upon, technical specifications of materials needed in emergencies, lists of suppliers and aerial operators with pre-prepared Terms of Reference and standard contracts and other documentation. In addition, advance tenders were requested by AFS from suppliers of standard pesticides, equipment, and aerial spray companies and are being updated at 3 – 6 months' intervals, so that orders can be launched more quickly.

Enhanced Inter-Agency Cooperation

Recommendation 26 posed two stark options: FAO either develops more effective DL procedures, or opportunities for outsourcing should be pursued. FAO intends to do both. Remote sensing imagery, nearly all aerial application, and development and maintenance of mission-critical software and databases are already outsourced, and new partnerships with WFP in vulnerability mapping and on logistics are in progress.

Following the Desert Locust campaigns of 2003-05, many of the affected countries in North West Africa were left with large stocks of unused pesticides. FAO has been working with the countries to improve pesticide storage and stock management systems with the aim of preventing the creation of new obsolete pesticide stocks that would require expensive disposal.

With the outbreaks of Desert Locusts in the Central Region 2006-07, new demands for rapid supply of pesticides came from Yemen. FAO was able to liaise rapidly between governments to negotiate the rapid transfer of pesticides donated by Mauritania to Yemen. Because of prior work, FAO knew precisely which pesticides Mauritania held, was able to provide recent international certificates verifying the quality of the pesticides, mobilized local staff to prepare the required quantities of pesticides for international transport and obtained agreements from Mauritania to donate and from Yemen to accept the pesticides.

Prior discussions between FAO and the logistics department of WFP established that the WFP was able and willing to offer logistical assistance. Even before formal agreements had been concluded, WFP responded to FAO's request for assistance in the transfer of pesticides from Mauritania to Yemen. In a matter of days WFP provided transport at lower cost, with significantly less bureaucracy and faster than any other option could have been arranged.

As a result Mauritania reduced its standing stock of pesticides and made a generous contribution to another country. This saved the cost of pesticide procurement and Yemen received the required products faster than would have otherwise been possible. FAO fulfilled a unique role as intergovernmental agency by using information and systems, only FAO has access to, and by liaising between governments.

In a similar operation to respond to Red Locust outbreaks in Tanzania, Malawi and Mozambique in October 2008, 21,000 litres of pesticides were shipped by WFP to the affected countries from remaining stocks in Mali. This rapid transfer avoided delaying operations for more than six months whilst the pesticide was manufactured.

The 2008 Evaluation of FAO's operational capacity in emergencies and rehabilitation is expected to report serious delays in timely deliveries of equipment to save livelihoods, specifically in fast moving and transboundary emergencies, and to advocate closer partnerships with other organisations, particularly WFP. Since FAO is authorized to use United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD) networks in Brindisi, Accra, Dubai, Subang and Panama City, this access to the WFP network opens up new opportunities to respond more rapidly to fast developing bio-threats such as the Desert Locust. WFP hubs could be used for pre-positioning standard equipment with a long shelf-life (not including pesticides), which routinely is needed to quickly reinforce the national control capacities. This could include not only camping equipment, sprayers, personal protection and communication equipment, etc. but also vehicles. Strategic reserve stocks at WFP warehouses in Dubai, Brindisi or Accra could allow more timely and targeted delivery when and where the actual needs arise and could also provide intermediate storage and targeted distribution of pesticides to avoid later stock piles of obsolete pesticides in the countries. The distributed equipment could be replenished once international assistance materializes in an emergency. However, in order to establish strategic Desert Locust equipment reserve stocks, FAO is requesting support from donors.

Building and maintaining capacity

Training is one of the most important activities to ensure value for money from investment in locust control. The recommendations 13, 14 and 21e&f asked for strengthening of national capacities in various technical aspects of locust control, environmental monitoring and data management and analysis.

FAO is convinced that long-term investment in human capacity building is the only means to achieve better and more sustainable Desert Locust control strategies and practices and increased effectiveness to minimize hazardous effects on the environment with better economic impact. In addition, the only way to reach the hundreds of staff directly and indirectly involved in locust control is through strengthening national training capacities using the Train-the-Trainers approach. This is being addressed within the EMPRES Desert Locust programme by supporting short and mid-term training programmes, and applying a holistic and integrated training approach to cover

the training needs of all different target groups also at the lowest level. This approach is understood as a continuous process giving the chance for further improvement to cope with new technical developments and concepts.

Environmental and health safety

Environmental concerns and pesticide management issues addressed by the Evaluation in recommendations 13, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are entirely shared by FAO.

Already in 2004, FAO initiated the development of specialist teams to monitor and evaluate health and environmental aspects during Desert Locust operations in order to avoid mistakes that had been made in previous locust campaigns when enormous quantities of chemical pesticides were used with little or no consideration for ‘Good Practices’ for pesticide applications. The concept of the specialist teams, called QUEST (Quality, Environmental Protection, and Safety of Treatments), has been widely accepted by the affected countries in the Western and the Central Regions. Most countries became more conscious of environmental issues and interested in a more systematic monitoring of the environment and in monitoring the health of their operators, in particular by using AChE-Testmate kits. The Manual for monitoring of Cholinesterase levels in pesticide workers, first published in French, has been translated into English and has been introduced as standard reference by the QUEST teams.

Although the question of sustainability of the QUEST teams during periods of less frequent or no operations was raised, most countries expressed their wish to locate the teams in their National Locust Control Units either as full staff or under secondment during each QUEST field mission from the Ministry of Health and from the Ministry of Environment.

In collaboration with African Stock Piles Programme in most of the countries with more frequent control operations an improved pesticide management system has been introduced to allow more systematic monitoring of the pesticides, the collection of the empty pesticide barrels and their safe and centralized disposal by using special drum crushing machines.

FAO entirely shares the concern of affected countries specifically as far as their fears with regard to the environmental impact of chemical pesticides are concerned. In Yemen for example, local bee keepers in 2007 ambushed the national control teams, put pressure on the local governments and achieved a temporary moratorium on control operations. In anticipation of a possible resistance FAO provided Yemen with a sizable amount of bio-pesticides for use in ecologically sensitive areas. Some of the remaining bio-pesticide stocks were donated in 2008 by the Yemeni Government to Malawi and Tanzania for use against Red Locust infestations in environmentally sensitive wetlands and game parks.

FAO made for the first time operational use of bio-pesticides with good success in Timor Leste against the Migratory Locust in 2007 where the use of chemical pesticides was not an option due to the dense population of the affected rural area.

FAO’s policy is to reduce the use of chemical pesticides to its lowest possible limits and discourage its application on wetlands, close to water bodies, natural reserve parks, agricultural or populated areas. All these areas should be restricted under all circumstances from locust control operations with chemicals and only bio-pesticides allowed. Also in remote desert areas, FAO only supports the use highly specific chemical pesticides, which are not persistent, carry less acute risks to non-target species and do not accumulate in the food chain. In order to support the affected countries in developing their bio-control capacities with regards to training, monitoring, logistics and facilities, FAO is addressing to the donor community to provide assistance in this endeavour and to contribute to a regional bio-control programme.

March 2009



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

DESERT LOCUST CONTROL COMMITTEE

Thirty-ninth Session

Rome, 10-13 March 2009

Appendix 1 (Agenda Item 9)

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>1. FAO define, in clear terms, the different categories of emergencies and establish the criteria to decide which ones would make use of the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP), for which guidelines have been published by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). When an emergency is not considered complex, the Organization should also spell out the specific rules that will apply and make them known to all concerned.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted Beginning March 2006 the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF - under IASC/OCHA) was upgraded and became more flexible. This joins the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) under IASC and shares a common set of principles and rules; FAO will work with CERF for a clear and transparent application of CERF procedures and definitions to DL including proposing blanket CERF agreement for DL within a region to fast-track individual country requests.</p>
<p>2. In future campaigns in the affected countries, through the appropriate committees, effective exchange of information be ensured among the various stakeholders involved to avoid duplication of efforts and unnecessary high costs</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted During outbreaks carrying risk of upsurge, FAO to ensure that DLIS information on DL in country and neighbouring countries be actively made available to: i) National Locust Units and National Locust Steering Committees; ii) regional commissions and control organizations; and iii) donors with ongoing DL programmes covering affected country/ies.</p>
<p>3. FAO initiates discussions with donors to arrive at a common format for both the funding agreements and the subsequent project document. Such formats should be as simple and user-friendly as possible, but detailed enough to ensure a clear understanding by all the interested parties of what is at stake.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted in large part As CERF becomes initial source of funds in many cases, common format and content applies to Flash and Common Appeals; these can be carried over to multi-bilateral donor projects; FAO's recently (13 March 2007) announced standard project document format can be adapted as standard emergency project guidance that should apply to locust projects.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>4. FAO initiate discussions with donors on the opportunity of having, in future campaigns, only one or two multidonor projects, and those projects be deemed regional in geographical coverage to facilitate dealing with a pest that knows no national frontiers. Due attention should be given during the negotiations to how donor visibility and preferences, as well as applicable policy and regulatory requirements, would be factored into any multidonor arrangement that is reached.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 3: “will take a lot of dialogue & diplomacy on part of FAO...such policy level decisions ... have implications on ... donor... foreign policies” “There...should also be ... room for host-countries and donors... vis-à-vis ...bilateral cooperation...we strongly believe that the recommendation...be rephrased to... reflect... bilateral arrangements.” “If host countries...develop a strategy for regional rather than bilateral assistance...then the dialogue should pursue a tripartite mode with FAO initiating a progression of dialogues with both donors and affected-countries.”</i></p>	<p>Accepted CERF is a multi-donor pool administered by OCHA under IASC; CERF support to locust control constitutes a first step towards greater use of multi-donor projects. Recent initiatives by donors for multi-donor partnership programmes with FAO could also provide examples of how to use this kind of mechanism.</p>
<p>5. The rather <i>ad hoc</i> procurement requirements be transformed by FAO into systems and methods that are specific to Desert Locust control and to similar emergency operations in which FAO is involved, as was also recommended by the Technical Group of the Desert Locust Control Committee (DLCC) in early May 2005 in its workshop on contingency planning for Desert Locust control.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 3-4: “FAO is being asked to ... find out if DL emergencies require specific procedures divergent from other emergencies and if so, how this can be addressed... this will certainly require a great deal of analysis of the FAO’s existing procurement policies and procedures and if and how the suggested modifications ... can be captured by the ongoing internal FAO reform and ultimately incorporated sufficiently. Comparisons of emergency procedures among the various UN, FAO as well as other external entities could yield a positive contribution to the existing procedures.”</i></p>	<p>Accepted Management agrees with the need for more systematic approaches to DL campaign operations. The Programme Committee - endorsed, and Council - approved Crisis Management Centre will play a key role in facilitating the design of transparent interdepartmental procedures on approvals, procurement, and recruitment and monitor development of DL systems, learning from emergency operations of similar scale (HPAI/Bird Flu, tsunami, etc.). Contingency Plans for FAO can be revised and adapted to each region; with support from AG-CMC, they form the basis for detailed operational plans. All subject to decisions following IEE.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>6. The FAO Plant Production and Protection Division plan ahead and set up a well researched roster of dependable, experienced and qualified candidates to fill expert positions pertaining to Desert Locust control, especially in the field, and tries to ensure that their conditions are known and are acceptable to FAO.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted: additional attention should be given to strengthening the potential roster by seeking funds to train recent graduates from affected countries as specialists in locust biology, surveillance, data management, logistics, control operations, impact assessments, health and environmental protection, liaison with humanitarian agencies</p>
<p>7. Delegation of authority for operational activities, lasting for the duration of the Desert Locust campaign, be given by FAO to the lowest possible level.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 4: "... delegating ... to the lowest entity will likely improve activities by removing layers of bureaucratic and management hurdles and speed up the implementation process ... in most cases decentralization of responsibilities and management can improve implementation of activities ... also ... to ensure the ... presence of the necessary capacities and capabilities ... at the decentralized level ... essential that FAO looks into this recommendation ... with those that complement it, including ... 8 and 9 ...".</i></p>	<p>Accepted in large part</p> <p>Delegation to the FAO Representative, and their staff, is key to streamlining from FAO's perspective. As CERF requests must be approved by the UN Resident Coordinator in an affected country, the FAO Representative plays a key role in obtaining this support and ensuring smooth and rapid delivery of project resources within the general 3 months limit.</p> <p>TCE has since 2005 trained staff in FAOR offices in all front line and most affected countries in livelihoods assessments and in common effective management tools for emergency projects. Anticipating sudden-onset disasters like tsunami, windstorms, and earthquakes, many of these tools also apply to the emergency operational aspects of locust control.</p> <p>Local procurement limits still require waivers, but with semi-annual inventories of pesticides, sprayers/ specific locust control equipment and aerial application services, standard TORs and advance tenders, it is likely that waivers permitting local delegation for the duration of the campaign can be obtained as well as for direct procurement from selected suppliers on technical grounds for specific locust control equipment such as sprayers, GPS, radio/ communication material.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>8. A single unified command and wide delegation of authority be bestowed in a future FAO Emergency Centre for Locust Operations (ECLO) and that it be recognized as an operational entity, with its own accounting code rather than that of the Office for Special Relief Operations (OSRO), to facilitate the identification of regular programme and extrabudgetary appropriations put at its disposal by the Organization.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006</p> <p><i>Page 4: "... finds it imperative to leave this to FAO and its internal UN-wide partners to work, review and act on it. The message behind the recommendation should be that in times of emergencies, the chain of command should be streamlined to guarantee efficiency and effectiveness."</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Management accepts and welcomes a model of single unified command, under the technical Service Chief, as ECTAD now applies it to Avian Influenza; the Crisis Management Centre approved by Council will apply the principle to Desert Locusts and Food Safety crises. Currently, an Emergency Response Mechanism (ERM) is built around the Incident Command System with a single unified command is being considered by FAO Management. DL experience is reflected in the ERM design and DL will apply ERM, once approved. The OSRO accounting code is being converted by FAO during 2007 to consolidate trust fund codes.</p>
<p>9. To be considered with recommendation 24c</p> <p>FAO strive to present a clear strategy to the donors at the time of launching the appeals that is part of the relief–rehabilitation–development continuum, by focusing not only on the immediate problem of eliminating Desert Locusts but also on related humanitarian and livelihood protection issues.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006</p> <p><i>Page 5: "... this recommendation complements recommendation 24c in which FAO is called up on to develop a multi-faceted assistance packages to address the issue of the DL in a holistic manner. ... the implementation of this approach fitting given the level of risks the DL invasion poses on affected-communities. ... countries prone to frequent DL invasions are encouraged to look into developing and implementing a similar approach."</i></p>	<p>Accepted strongly by management</p> <p>The major innovation called for by the Evaluation; FAO to incorporate humanitarian aspects in initial requests through CERF mechanism, followed by Flash or Common Appeals as needed; these supported by maps or other data on livelihoods vulnerability derived by seasonal surveys from a network of IASC-associated partners, to target highly vulnerable communities for priority access to safety nets in event of locust attack, and provide baselines against which to measure impact. Standard for all CERF and other OCHA/IASC requests, these would then be used as basic strategies in requests to other donors.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>10. Strategies be adopted by the affected countries to ensure that locust control operations are carried out both in zones with high production potential and in zones with low production potential, where agriculture is usually practiced by farmers with very limited resources.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 5: “... firmly assigns the responsibility ... to ... national units ... also ... to maintain effective communications with other partners during the course of planning and implementation of response interventions ... the most vulnerable communities are often ... hinged on a meagre subsistence farming/livestock/pastoral activity. The economic and social safety net of such communities is believed to be the most fragile where the slightest external shock will significantly offset their livelihoods. Concerned countries should also ... minimize the shock to the most vulnerable as much as political factors may influence decisions that may have a lasting effect on the target communities.”</i></p>	<p>FAO agrees with this recommendation addressed to affected countries, and welcomes the opportunities to improve planning and to assess the livelihoods impacts of locust control, especially in relation to zones with low production potential. FAO could contribute to the development of strategies by affected countries by providing the more detailed vulnerability mapping data (Recommendation 9) to assist with planning. DL surveillance data can be provided, including by FAO in addition to national locust units, to confirm when swarms damage crops in specific locations.</p>
<p>11. Mechanisms be put in place by the countries concerned to estimate the total benefits of the control campaign (value of production saved and additional benefits).</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 6: “... 11 and 12 recognize ...the importance of collaborations among host-countries, regional entities, research institutions, FAO and other partners in assisting with ... the necessary tools to effectively collect and analyze field-based data and help interpret the impact of DL damage and the benefit of control interventions... this ... will require a great deal of efforts from all sides ... it ... continue to undermine the efforts to effectively describe the contributions that control interventions are making to the overall food security and economic well-being of countries affected by the DL threats... affected-countries and their partners should take ... this... opportunity to enhance their capacities ...”</i></p>	<p>FAO agrees with the recommendation and is willing to cooperate with national authorities and other partners as needed.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>12. Relevant national structures be involved in the collection of the necessary data and in the preparation of these benefit estimates (agricultural statistics services, etc.).</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006. <i>See comment at 11</i></p>	<p>FAO agrees with the recommendation and is willing to cooperate.</p>
<p>13. The capacity of environment and health professionals be strengthened through training aimed at understanding and respecting norms and quality standards, environmental procedures and regulations, and precautionary, reduction and mitigation measures, and that these professionals be provided with logistics and financial means to carry out quality tests and field inspections.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>FAO agrees that additional efforts are certainly required, but notes that a significant and increasing proportion of donor funds were applied to building these capacities and in reducing health and environmental risks in the latter months of the campaign. These efforts were expanded, including by budget revisions and new projects, beginning in 2006 and continue.</p>
<p>14. Those who apply pesticides be trained and sensitized to ensure that they fully understand and follow the rules and regulations pertaining to the use of pesticides.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>15. Medical surveillance of specialized staff involved in chemical control be ensured, including provision of adequate protection kits.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>16. The involvement of village and phytosanitary brigades in the chemical locust control campaign operations be stopped on safety grounds, but their locust monitoring capacities be strengthened.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>FAO welcomes this recommendation, which confirms a longstanding AGPP position; implementation should include education campaigns in communities, and possibly partnerships with IPM and Farmer Field School Programmes in affected countries.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>17. Ordering and distribution of pesticides in containers of less than 50 litres be avoided by all parties concerned and that pesticides be purchased in metal containers of a large capacity (100–200 litres).</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 6: “... the widespread existence of non-standardized pesticide packaging and procurement ... have been a cause of concern for many [donors] and perhaps dissuaded them from providing such products... also ... cognizant of the impact logistics has ... smaller containers are easier to transport, do not involve risks of leakages during loading, unloading and reloading... filling and refilling spray platforms and equipment such as aircraft and high capacity vehicle mounted sprayers ... call for ... packaging / containers which are considered more manageable ... In this regard, it is important to involve beneficiary countries prior to making any decisions on the packaging/ containers to supply or not to supply.”</i></p>	<p>FAO accepts the recommendation, which reflects its standard guidance in procurement of conventional pesticides. Biopesticides such as Green Muscle® may require special procedures.</p>
<p>18. Drum crushers be introduced in all countries affected by the Desert Locust for the destruction of metal containers and recycling of crushed containers by foundries be promoted by the national locust control units</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>Accepted well in line with ongoing Obsolete Pesticides Programme including the Africa Stockpiles Programme.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>19. In collaboration with FAO and the Commission de lutte contre le criquet pèlerin dans la région occidentale (CLCPRO) member countries, an agreement be developed with pesticide manufacturers concerned for the recovery of their containers.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 7: "... an important arrangement that needs to be made far in advance of any product procurement and deliveries... additional costs will be involved ... early negotiation will certainly cut the cost as well as eliminates the need for an after-effect planning for recovery and rehabilitation of any left-over containers. ... need for ... encouraging suppliers and providers to agree on the recovery of surplus chemicals as well... recovery and rehabilitation of empty containers and left-over products at the national procurement level will eliminate the need for disposing off of dangerous and obsolete pesticides as well as curb the use of empty pesticide containers for storing food, water, animal feed or other personal items all together. Furthermore... suggests that all regional commissions, including CRC and SWAC and other DL-affected countries should be cognizant of the arrangements to be made with the vendors ... early on in the process. Without broader involvements, ... do not foresee a lasting solution to this, but rather a mere patch up."</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>This recommendation provides additional impetus to a dialogue that has continued for more than 5 years between FAO and the pesticide industry. Some progress in one or two cases has been achieved, but usually limited to pesticides themselves and not containers.</p>
<p>20. A study be undertaken jointly by FAO and the countries concerned to identify the reasons for the high costs of Desert Locust control operations in some of the affected countries, as a basis for the development of guidelines for the more efficient control of locusts.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>FAO accepts</p> <p>the findings of the Evaluation of very large differences in cost per hectare of control. The particular effect of the high costs of aircraft rental and flying hours should be clarified. A study or studies must be undertaken jointly by affected countries and FAO as the causes of this variation are likely to be historically and policy- contingent. A multi-country workshop on lessons learned would then be an effective means of concentrating those lessons on future contingency planning.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>21. It is recommended that:</p> <p>21a) An effective preventive Desert Locust control strategy be put in place in all the countries of the Western Region where seasonal breeding areas exist to reduce the risk of future outbreaks and upsurges, through the timely detection of a pre-emergency situation. The implementation of such a strategy could avoid crop and pasture losses, and considerably limit control costs by intervening at an early stage with limited scale control operations, and allow implementation of safer and environmentally friendlier control means</p> <p>21b) An autonomous and operational national locust control structure, with the authority to take technical and administrative decisions as regards Desert Locust operations, be created in each of the frontline countries. This structure must be granted effective financial, material and policy support by the governments concerned. The structure should be able to take full advantage of the material, financial and technical resources received during the 2003–5 upsurge.</p> <p>21c) An adequate national budget be allocated for the operation of the national locust control structure to ensure the sustainability of the preventive control strategy.</p> <p>21d) The EMPRES programme in the Western Region be effectively supported by the CLCPRO member countries and by the donors.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 7: “Recommendations 21a-e were endorsed by the DLCC with a note to the host-countries to ensure and uphold the fundamental issue of sustainability through adequate financial and administrative commitments to independent national locust control units entrusted with full authority to execute their fiscal as well as administrative responsibilities.”</i></p>	<p>FAO strongly endorses recommendations 21a-d, which add welcome support to FAO’s efforts to strengthen and ensure adequate funding for national locust units and support them to examine and adapt the experience gained in EMPRES in the Central Region to frontline countries in the Western Region.</p>
<p>21e) Countries in the Sahel exposed to Desert Locust invasions maintain a capacity to control locusts within the Plant Protection Services and ensure that the experience gained during the 2003–5 campaign is captured, disseminated and preserved, through appropriate avenues such as training.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>See comment at 21a</i></p>	<p>Endorsed</p> <p>Lessons learned from the experiences of Sahelian countries in 2003-2005 would also be relevant to some countries in the Eastern and Central regions</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>21f) The human capacity in acridology be strengthened for the timely replacement of the current Desert Locust specialists, many of whom will reach retirement age in the next 10–15 years.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006. <i>See comment at 21a</i></p>	<p>Strongly endorsed by FAO This will help FAO and partners in sourcing new funds to train a new generation of scientific and operational DL specialists</p>
<p>22. It is recommended that: 22a) The CLCPRO Secretariat role and responsibilities be reviewed and that it be provided with adequate resources to be able to effectively carry out its responsibilities in the medium and long term. The Secretariat should be the main contact with the countries in the region both during recessions and emergencies.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 8: "... 22a-c are in essence two recommendations: 1) redefining/realigning the roles and responsibilities of the CLCPRO and 2) providing it adequate resources for its short-, medium- and long-term activities which translate into emergency response during outbreaks, capacity strengthening at the national and regional levels and liaising between countries, donors, FAO and other partners ... these recommendations attempt to express the perceived gap created due to the dismantling of OCLALAV ... after the 1986-89 locust / grasshopper plague... it is not clear whether recommendation 22a is calling on CLCPRO to redefine its roles and responsibilities, reorganize itself as a new OCLALAV by taking up control operations as one of its core activities.</i></p>	<p>Partially accepted The CLCPRO Secretariat role and responsibilities should be reviewed including the two years since the end of the 2003-2005 upsurge. Substantial new resources in the form of the EMPRES –WR programme have been available, and CLCPRO activities, including contact with countries in the region, its outputs and some initial outcomes in member countries should be documented and analysed</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>22b) In the case of a new emergency, additional financial and operational responsibilities be delegated to the CLCPRO Secretariat, by member-countries, donors and FAO.</p>	<p><i>For what it is worth, strengthening CLCPRO and charging it with more responsibilities than it can handle at the moment is something that needs to be carefully studied. [DLCC Working Group] suggests that CLCPRO in collaboration with the member countries and the secretariat, including EMPRES WR program look into this and other options and come up with a clear description of its roles and responsibilities ... cross-cutting issues such as resource mobilization during emergency operations as well as capacity strengthening are applicable to CRC and to some extent SWAC."</i></p>	<p>Partially accepted In keeping with Recommendation 7, financial and operational responsibilities in emergencies should be delegated to the lowest level, which may often be CLCPRO, but could also be national locust units.</p>
<p>22c) In order to strengthen the CLCPRO and ensure a more efficient execution of its activities, the different components of the EMPRES Western Region programme be realigned immediately within the domain of the Secretariat in much the same way the Central Region programme was incorporated into the Central Region Commission structure.</p>	<p><i>See comments at 22a&b</i></p>	<p>Accepted in principle FAO notes that in the Central Region the components were realigned more than seven years after EMPRES was fully funded. While there should be no delay, the basic components must exist and be documented through evaluation before they can properly be incorporated. Two years of full funding may not yet be sufficient. This further supports the need for a Mid Term Evaluation of EMPRES Western Region.</p>
<p>23. It is recommended that: 23a) As a first step, the human capacity of the [FAO] Desert Locust Information Service, which is currently staffed by only one professional officer, be increased, while at the same time a review is undertaken of the critical mass needed in the Locust and Other Migratory Pest Group to carry out its wide range of responsibilities effectively.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 9: "did not identify any debatable issues with recommendation 23a and leaves it to FAO for further scrutiny and action."</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>23b) FAO and member countries provide adequate recognition and support to the DLCC and take full advantage of the Desert Locust Technical Group to review the needs for the development of improved Desert Locust survey and control means, and prepare appropriate proposals.</p>	<p>Category A +, Qualified Endorsement. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p>Page 9: “<i>sees implementation ... through various means including paying dues on time. ... the existence of a learning curve ... emphasizes the importance of debriefings by the previous attendees of the meeting and briefing for the new attendees at the institutional level... institutional memories will be retained ..., issues will be discussed more smoothly, and productivity will be greatly enhanced ...</i>”</p>	<p>Accepted in part The Desert Locust Technical Group was disbanded by the 38th session of the DLCC in September 2006. Fixed-term DLCC Expert panels on specific technical topics will replace the DLTG.</p>
<p>23c) Arrangements be made to enable FAO representatives, in the case of a new Desert Locust emergency, to collaborate effectively with and assist the countries in the steps to be undertaken in coordinating and mobilizing the necessary international assistance by presenting well defined action plans and proposals on how to implement these plans, and by determining the international support needed for them.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p>Page 9: “<i>While ... largely addressed to FAO, ... the recommendation will involve resources ... above and beyond FAO’s coffers ... acknowledges the importance of action plans, projects and calls for international support, which other recommendations ... discussed (e.g., 25, 28) ... the group emphasizes ... realistic and implementable action plans, projects and activities that rationally distribute roles and responsibilities.</i>”</p>	<p>Accepted in large part As discussed under Recommendation 7.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>24. It is recommended that:</p> <p>24a) In case of a new emergency, opportunities be explored for the establishment of multidonor regional funds in support of regional control programmes facilitating the effective implementation of future Desert Locust control campaigns. Due attention should be given to how donor visibility and preferences can be factored into such a multidonor arrangement.</p> <p>24b) FAO and donors explore the possibility of developing a mechanism that would allow flexibility in reorienting and reallocating donor funds at FAO with minimal administrative effort to respond effectively to emergencies as they surface or as the situation continues to evolve. Such a tool should be put in place during the budget negotiation process so that the project documents will explicitly capture the importance of flexibility.</p> <p>24c) In future, to assist affected populations, provisions be made in Desert Locust control project agreements, for part of the financial resources to be reserved for food aid and rehabilitation activities as needed</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 10: "... 24a and b are largely addressed to donors and FAO and call for better collaborations and actions. Recommendation 24c goes beyond the two groups. It also calls other UN systems that have the capacity to provide assistance, material, technical, or logistical.</i></p> <p><i>[The DLCC Working Group] recognizes inclusion of a very important element which was not directly incorporated under DL response operations as such. This is the issue of relief and rehabilitation to the affected populations...an important element that needs involvement of various actors including FAO's locust and emergency operation units, other UN organizations that deal with humanitarian responses and donors. FAO can also benefit from others that have been in complex emergency business and have accumulated substantial crisis-oriented field-based skills and experiences."</i></p>	<p>24a Accepted This largely echoes Recommendation 4.</p> <p>24b Accepted This recommendation is most welcome, as during later 2005 it became clear that funds were often no longer needed for pesticides and flying hours, but rather for reducing environmental and human health risks from existing stocks of pesticides. This led to FAO returning funds to certain donors which had been earmarked for pesticide procurement, while continuing to request funds for other aspects of the same DL campaign.</p> <p>24c Accepted Accords with CERF and other humanitarian funding precepts.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>25. It is recommended that:</p> <p>25a) Contingency plans be developed for the medium- and long-term management of the Desert Locust risk, including action plans for locust monitoring and control at national, regional and international levels. These action plans should indicate:</p> <p>i) the main activities to be undertaken (including those related to food aid and rehabilitation of the affected populations) and their provisional costs;</p> <p>ii) the available financial resources, their origin (internal budgets, external resources) and the activities that will be covered by them;</p> <p>iii) additional financial needs. These plans will be the basis for the preparation of annual work plans and budgets.</p>	<p>Category ambiguous. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Pages 10 – 11: “... emphasize the importance of contingency plans (CPs) and action plans at all levels – country, regional and international... includes relief and rehabilitation activities including food assistance in the event of large-scale impacts of DL invasions. It calls for CPs as the bases for appeals for funds, which should follow the IASC appeals guidelines. [DLCC Working Group] recognizes the importance of CPs and associated action plans for a better and effective undertaking of preventive as well as curative control interventions. These recommendations are directed to the affected-countries, regional entities such as CLCPRO, CRC and SWAC as well as donors and FAO... the primary role of donors indirectly stipulated here is to keep abreast of the progressive revelation of developing CPs and associated action plans, which will be presented to them by the former.”</i></p>	<p>Accepted enthusiastically by FAO</p> <p>This is a major part of the work of the EMPRES Officer now stationed in FAO HQs, in collaboration with Regional and National Locust Organizations and Units in all three regions.</p>
<p>25b) In future emergencies, funding appeals be based on well-defined contingency plans and follow the principles and guidelines endorsed for appeals by the Inter-agency Standing Committee (<u>IASC</u>).</p>	<p><i>See comments at 25a</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>25c) Strategies be adopted to ensure that locust control operations are carried out both in zones with high production potential, as well as in zones with low production potential, where agriculture is usually practiced by farmers with very limited resources.</p>	<p>25c duplicates recommendation 10. Deletion endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p>	<p>See comments for Recommendation 10.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>26. With respect to FAO's operational procedures two options are recommended for future action:</p> <p>26a) either FAO develops and introduces appropriate arrangements to address future Desert Locust emergencies in a more effective and expeditious manner.</p> <p>26b) or opportunities for outsourcing most of the operational responsibilities should be pursued.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 11: "these recommendations are exclusively within the FAO domain and that FAO should carefully study and deliberate on them."</i></p>	<p>Both options accepted, judiciously</p> <p>Streamlining procedures has been covered at recommendations 5 and 7). Regarding operational matters, as far as pesticide application is concerned, in DL campaigns this is already outsourced; prudent management should seek further opportunities for outsourcing especially when expertise is readily available: just as TCE is benefiting from seconded logistics staff from WFP, AGP should explore with those staff options for outsourcing logistics of pesticide, aircraft, and equipment delivery and discuss stand-by arrangements; further, impact assessment is likely to be better managed by academic or NGO partners.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>27. It is recommended that:</p> <p>27a) The DLCC be transformed from an essentially technical committee into a mechanism in which all parties (affected countries, donors and FAO) determine their joint interests and activities, and deal directly with donors to determine joint work programmes.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Pages 11 – 12: “[DLCC Working Group] sees the aim of recommendations 27a - c as a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the various actors prior to, during and post-DL emergency, i.e., institutional responsibilities. However, [DLCC Working Group] does not see DLCC by itself as a technical entity. ... given DLCC’s governmental representation, the group finds it important that delegates have full authority to discuss issues and formulate policies and procedures necessary to define and effectively execute its roles and responsibilities. “[DLCC Working Group] sees DLCC as a committee composed of host-countries, donors, and international institutions that provides an oversight to any important decisions pertaining to the DL ... did not see any external factors that ... impacted the interests of host-countries, donors and others.”</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>To discuss with other parties first to ascertain their intentions for DLCC and explore new potential goals for DLCC in context of upgraded UN Appeal mechanisms (like CERF).</p>
<p>27b) Regional Commissions meet regularly at a high level to ensure member country support for the decisions taken</p>	<p><i>Recommendation 27b is somewhat implied in other recommendations, which suggest that CLCPRO redefine its roles and responsibilities. If that recommendation is amenable to the Commission, then ... 27b can also be addressed within the larger context of the redefining process. [The Working Group] emphasizes that CLCPRO should give this and the preceding recommendations that are related to 27b due considerations and come up with a workable procedure on the practicality of a higher-level participation in its gatherings.”</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>AGP provides for facilitation as secretariat to regional commissions.</p>
<p>27c) A multilateral agreement for Desert Locust control be developed for the formal permanent engagement and support of all key stakeholders.</p>	<p><i>See comment at 27a</i></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>28. It is recommended that:</p> <p>28a) An appropriate action plan and legal framework be developed for the joint use of the existing control capacity in the Maghreb countries within the Western Region, under the supervision of CLCPRO.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 12 – 13: “ 28a - c are focused on improved regional collaborations and resource optimization... some sort of formal operational mechanism is put in place that will reinforce the north-south, south-south, and south-north collaborations in a more formal way [DLCC Working Group] agrees with this and believes that CLCPRO takes the lead in initiating dialogue among member countries in the region to pave the way for the formalization and legalization of such collaborations, which should ultimately be binding</i></p>	<p>FAO completely agrees with the Evaluation Team that the role of the Maghreb countries was essential in bringing the 2003-05 upsurge to an end. This included some cross-boundary activities and a good deal of donation of pesticides and expertise. Contingency plans and action plans for future joint cross-border operations would improve their effectiveness and efficiency while reducing environmental and health impacts.</p>
<p>28b) Agreements are established among the various countries in the western region to encourage, organize, facilitate and implement joint cross-border operations.</p>	<p><i>It is equally important that this issue is adequately discussed among member countries and between CLCPRO and member-countries and that the latter group is encouraged to take proactive stance in fostering and expediting the process.</i></p> <p><i>[DLCC Working Group] is also cognizant of the importance and mutual inclusions of cross-sectoral issues such as training, capacity strengthening, regional collaborations are others as common denominators for all three DL Commissions. Similarities between CRC and CLCPRO are more obvious and issues that are addressed to one can be applicable to the other. One may also observe some level of commonality with regard to SWAC, its current status appears to be limiting the extrapolation of the common denominators between the former commissions to the latter... the progressive evolution of SWAC should be closely examined and it too, should be able to benefit from the mutually inclusive revelations.</i></p>	<p>CLCPRO is the appropriate institution under which a legal framework for the joint use of existing capacities among countries in the Western region, and FAO agrees that the development of such a framework be carried out under CLCPRO.</p> <p>When a framework is in place, then the next step should be agreements among various countries in the region.</p> <p>As these agreements are negotiated, cost estimates based on a specific understanding of control approaches and investments in Maghreb countries should be obtained.</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>28c) Cost estimates are developed to determine the amount of donor assistance required to use the Maghreb control teams and aerial resources in the Sahel countries effectively in case of a new emergency.</p>	<p><i>[DLCC Working Group] is not quite convinced that the regional collaborations, especially the north-south collaborations should be funded by donors as suggested in 28c. However, it does recognize the importance of the presence of regional vehicles such as the Maghreb force that can be used as a means of delivering regional assistance ...</i></p>	<p>Cost estimates based on a specific understanding of control approaches and investments in Maghreb countries should be obtained whilst negotiating agreements at 28a&b.</p>
<p>29. It is recommended that:</p> <p>29a) A jointly agreed methodology to evaluate the socio-economic impacts of Desert Locust invasions be developed by the different authorities concerned.</p> <p>29b) A global intervention framework that addresses effective assessments of the socio-economic impact of Desert Locust invasions and control operations be established.</p> <p>29c) In case of a new emergency, economic, social and nutritional impact studies, integrating a broader spectrum of relevant disciplines and competencies, be carried out in a timely, systematic and multidisciplinary manner.</p>	<p>Category B, Complex, multi-dimensional, requires additional review, internal or external resources. Remitted for review by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p>Pages 13 – 14: “... 29a-c are related to recommendations 11 and 12 ...</p> <p>29a also assigns the responsibility to establish an agreed upon methodology to evaluate the socio-economic impacts of DL invasions. ... among the various partners. ... important that such exercises include methodical and rigorous studies on the impact of DL invasions on livelihoods of vulnerable communities and the national economy as well as the costs and benefits of control interventions needed. In addition, while engaging various partners in this matter is crucial, it is also equally important to see host-countries, regional commissions and FAO collectively come up with a strategy tools to help implement these recommendations.”</p>	<p>Accepted 29a-c</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>30. It is recommended that the affected countries:</p> <p>30a) Procure only pesticides registered with the Comité Permanent Inter-États de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) and create the necessary conditions for the appropriate use of these pesticides.</p> <p>30b) Take the necessary steps to strengthen environmental compliances and enforce the application of regulations and rules for the safer handling, use and storage of pesticides.</p> <p>30c) Avoid placing unnecessary pesticides orders and overestimating pesticide needs.</p>	<p>Category A, Simple: Few external resources required. Endorsed by DLCC in 2006.</p> <p><i>Page 13 – 14: “... since recommendations 30a-e and 31a-e have already been approved via a report and planned programs under the environmental implications of the DL campaign operations, it’s endorsement by the DLCC is a matter of formality</i></p>	<p>FAO management agrees with recommendations 30a – 30d , which are addressed primarily to the affected countries. FAO continues to seek to strengthen pesticide management in the field and at national policy level, in all its member countries. These recommendations provide a clear opportunity to link global obligations (of affected countries and donor countries) to regional, national, and local practice, and document those linkages.</p>
<p>30d) Strengthen the technical capacity of the QUEST (Quality, Environment, Health and Treatments) trained specialists in collaboration and agreement with the EMPRES Western Region programme and the CERES-Locustox in Senegal, and ensure their linkage to the national locust control units in order to undertake in-depth operational health and environmental reviews.</p>	<p><i>See comments at 30 a-c</i></p>	<p>30d Accepted FAO assisted in establishing QUEST teams, in training them, and in identifying new funding for them. This recommendation provides welcome support to this continuing initiative</p>
<p>30e) Pursue, in collaboration with FAO, CLCPRO, donors and pesticide producers, the establishment of pesticide contractual arrangements, including a pesticide bank mechanism, to reduce the accumulation of pesticide stocks and for the disposal of empty containers.</p>	<p><i>See comments at 30 a-c</i></p>	<p>30e Accepted Contractual arrangements to facilitate the prompt supply of technically approved pesticides in time to respond to locust outbreaks, while minimizing obsolete pesticide stocks, the divergence of locust pesticides to other targets, the disruption of national pesticide markets through flooding by locust pesticides, and reducing the health and environmental risks and expenses associated with transporting and storing pesticides for long periods. Some sort of financial mechanism or a “virtual” pesticide bank. (improved disposal of containers is covered by recommendation 18).</p>

Recommendations	DLCC Working Group Categories A, A +, or B DLCC Working Group Comments	FAO Management Response Accept, Partially Accept Recommendation FAO Management Comments
<p>31. Consequently, it is recommended that research studies aimed at the following issues are encouraged:</p> <p>31a) Improving operational Desert Locust monitoring and control techniques</p> <p>31b) Developing alternative control means.</p> <p>31c) Using technologies such as satellite imagery and differential global positioning systems (DGPS), that will greatly improve survey, monitoring and control operations.</p> <p>31d) Gaining better understanding of population dynamics of the Desert Locust during the solitary phase. and</p> <p>31e) Determining the overall impact of Desert Locust invasions on the economies of the affected countries</p>	<p><i>31a-e endorsed by the DLCC in 2006. [Hence DLCC Working Group] did not think additional assessment was necessary. See comments at 30 a-c</i></p> <p><i>Anticipated but missing issues and recommendations:</i> Many recommendations talked about human safety and environmental issues, [but DLCC Working Group] did not see any recommendations that would sufficiently address donors' procedural and policy requirements as well as concerns on these issues. The group considers these as high priority areas which need more attention during outbreak and recession periods alike. Human safety and environmental protection play a critical role in persuading or dissuading donor funding of DL activities and operations that are believed to have significant environmental implications. Donor assistance often requires appropriate Environmental Assessment be completed or at least initiated prior to funding any DL or other emergency transboundary outbreak pest projects without which assistance could be withheld. The group sees this as a significant omission and expresses its concern. ... similar recommendations for host-countries, FAO and other partners have not been included or addressed ... as a significant omission from the report. ... suggests that DLCC put out an observation addendum to the MER to the effect that donors', affected-countries', FAO's and other partners' environmental requirements are fully addressed prior to the implementation of activities and projects that are believed to have environmental consequences. This issue can be addressed through enforceable and applicable environmental regulations, policies and/or procedures that are documented and reside within the beneficiary or implementing entity."</p>	<p>31 a-e Accepted FAO concurs with the recommendations of the Evaluation and the endorsement of the DLCC and notes that biopesticides are being tested in field conditions.</p>