

**Session 3.2, Day 2. (1 hour; 40 minutes)**

1. The objectives are different for each group. Each will be expected to give feedback on Day 3.

The two groups:

1. **WG1 on Ownership and stakeholder engagement**
2. **WG 2 on Stage progression system: achievements, Outcomes, Benefits and Evidence:**

**A. WG1 on ownership and stakeholder engagement (Task 1)**

- Q1. Is the principle of co-regulation (stakeholder engagement from the bottom-up) supported?
- Q2. Is the balance between public and private roles and responsibilities well captured in Table 1 (risk ownership)?
- Q3. Initiating and maintaining engagement: What is advised in Stages 1,2 and 3?

Stage	How and who should initiate establishing the AB task forces?	What is advised for establishing and maintaining the Task Force and stakeholder engagement?
1		
2		
3		

- Q4. Supporting PMP introduction: what are the priorities for management training and capacity development?

Stage	Priorities	What forms of assistance are advised?	Who or what (categorise) should be the focus for training?
1			
2			
3			

**B. WG 2 on Stage progression system: achievements, outcomes, benefits, and evidence (Task 1):**

The outcome of Stage 1 is development and adoption of a national Strategic AB Action Plan. The outcome of Stage 2 is the adoption and implementation of AB action plans at enterprise and sector level.

The outcome of Stage 3 is that an effective national BS system is in place, through sufficient national application of the AB action plans- at enterprise level and supported by national BS safeguarding by public agencies.

Q 1. Reviewing Table 2:

Stage	What evidence would you want to see for measuring achievement?	Who and how should be responsible for evidence and monitoring progress?
1		
2		
3		

Assessment modalities:

Q2. When is self-assessment of Stage sufficient?

Q3. When would Joint Assessment (country and external review) or an External Assessment be valuable/advisable?

Q.4 FAST Track options.

The PMP is foreseen as a voluntary system, and countries may opt to use the PMP for national progress and to assist in gaining international support. What does the group feel about accepting "fast track progress" if a country considers it meets the criteria for entry into Stages 3 or 4?

Should such countries be required to demonstrate they fulfill the evidence for the lower stages? Who should evaluate their position?

Q5. Supporting the introduction of the PMP system.

What tools or support are needed to support national task forces to apply the PMP, assess progress, or give science support?

### Session 3.2: WG 1, 2 Global Plan of Action (Task 2): 15:50-17:15

This group has the following tasks:

1. To develop a vision statement for the Global Plan of Action
2. To discuss and develop the timescale, scope, and priorities for the GPA (*i.e.*, provide a 10-20 year framework)
3. To discuss and develop recommendations for the co-ordination arrangements, governance and oversight, and technical and scientific support
4. To discuss and develop recommendations for mobilization of funding and engagement of donors for supporting the GPA and the PMP application at national levels
5. Develop indicative timelines for the Global Plan of Action

Considering countries have a wide difference in resources for AB, estimate the range in time (years) it may take for stage progression

Time needed to complete Stage	Least resource category	Medium	Higher
<i>example</i>	<i>5 years</i>	3	3
1			
2			
3			

<p><b>WG 1: MC9-100 (main meeting room)</b>  <b>Task 1: Ownership and stakeholder engagement</b>  <b>Task 2: Global Plan of Action</b></p>	<p><b>WG 2: MC9-300</b>  <b>Task 1: Stage progression system: achievements, outcomes, benefits, and evidence (2 hours):</b>  <b>Task 2: Global Plan of Action</b></p>
<p><b>Chair</b>  <b>Rapporteur</b>  <b>Presenter</b></p>	<p><b>Chair:</b>  <b>Rapporteur:</b>  <b>Presenter:</b></p>
<p><b>Members:</b>  <b>BALIAO</b> Dan  <b>BELEMANE</b> Semoli  <b>BRUN</b> Edgar  <b>CHO</b> Miyoung  <b>JAW</b> Baboucarr  <b>KNIFFEN</b> Tim  <b>LEAÑO</b> Eduardo  <b>MELBY</b> Hans Peter  <b>MAC AOIDH</b> Eoin  <b>RICHARDSON</b> Belinda  <b>ROCHA</b> Itamar  <b>TRAN</b> Loc  <b>VILLALON</b> Jose</p> <p>BERTHE Franck  HANSON Larry  LAWRENCE Mark  REANTASO Melba</p>	<p><b>Members:</b>  <b>ALDAY</b> Victoria  <b>BRUMMETT</b> Randall  <b>CHADAG</b> Vishnumurthy Mohan  <b>CHRISTISEN</b> Kevin  <b>DE LA PENA</b> Leobert  <b>GALLARDO LAGNO</b> Alicia  <b>EL-SAWALHY</b> Ahmed  <b>LEONARD</b> Shivaun  <b>MYLREA</b> Gillian  <b>SORGELOOS</b> Patrick  <b>STENTIFORD</b> Grant  <b>TORGERSEN</b> Yngve  <b>WHALEY</b> Janet</p> <p>SUBASINGHE Rohana  SUMPTION Keith  McGLADDERY Sharon  IRDE Elena</p>

Problem of competence of competent authorities: If a sector is large and need PMP more than a CA could be involved. Involvement at governmental level is needed.

Trade between countries: Usually dialog is between CAs in different countries