

Rome, Roma, 1998



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

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

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

CONFERENCE CONFÉRENCE CONFERENCIA

Twenty-ninth Session • Vingt-neuvième session • 29º período de sesiones

Rome, 7-18 November 1997
VERBATIM RECORDS OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSION II
OF THE CONFERENCE

Rome, 7-18 novembre 1997
PROCES-VERBAUX DES SEANCES DE LA COMMISSION II
DE LA CONFERENCE

Roma, 7-18 de noviembre de 1997
ACTAS TAQUIGRAFICAS DE LAS SESIONES DE LA COMISION II
DE LA CONFERENCIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE DES MATIERES - INDICE

**FIRST MEETING
PREMIERE SEANCE
PRIMERA SESION**

(8 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION	3
13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97	
13. Rapport d'évaluation du programme 1996-97	
13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97	3

**SECOND MEETING
DEUXIEME SEANCE
SEGUNDA SESION**

(8 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	22
13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97 (continued)	
13. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 1996-97 (suite)	
13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97 (continuación)	22
14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	
14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	27

**THIRD MEETING
TROISIEME SEANCE
TERCERA SESION**

(10 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	49
14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1) (continued)	
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1) (suite)	
14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1) (continuación)	49

**FOURTH MEETING
QUATRIEME SEANCE
CUARTA SESION**

(10 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	80
14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (continued) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (suite) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	
14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (continuación) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)	80
III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	
III. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES	
III. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y ADMINISTRATIVOS	81
22. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters	
22. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques	
22. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos	81
22.1 <i>Review of FAO Statutory Bodies</i> (C 97/LIM/24)	
22.1 <i>Examen des organes statutaires de la FAO</i> (C 97/LIM/24)	
22.1 <i>Examen de los Organos Estatutarios de la FAO</i> (C 97/LIM/24)	81
II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	99
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (C 97/3)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (C 97/3)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (C 97/3)	99

**FIFTH MEETING
CINQUIEME SEANCE**

QUINTA SESION

(11 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	110
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (Arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	110

**SIXTH MEETING
SIXIEME SEANCE
SEXTA SESION**

(11 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	130
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (Arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	130

**SEVENTH MEETING
SEPTIEME SEANCE
SEPTIMA SESION**

(12 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	166
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	166

**EIGHTH MEETING
HUITIEME SEANCE
OCTAVA SESION**

(12 November 1997)

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)	
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)	180
14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (continued) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)	
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (suite) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)	
14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (continuación) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)	180
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)	188

**NINTH MEETING
NEUVIEME SEANCE
NOVENA SESION**

(13 November 1997)

ADOPTION OF REPORT ADOPTION DU RAPPORT APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME	193
DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART I (C 97/II/REP/1) PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PREMIERE PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/1) PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISIÓN II - PARTE I (C 97/II/REP/1)	194
22. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters 22. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques 22. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos	194
22.1 <i>Review of FAO Statutory Bodies (including Resolution .../97) (paras 1-7)</i> 22.1 <i>Examen des organes statutaires de la FAO (y compris la Résolution .../97)</i> (par 1-7) 22.1 <i>Examen de los Órganos Estatutarios de la FAO (incluida la Resolución .../97)</i> (párr 1-7)	194
DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART II (C 97/II/REP/2) PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - DEUXIEME PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/2) PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISIÓN II - PARTE II (C 97/II/REP/2)	194
13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97 (paras 1-7) 13. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 1996-97 (par 1-7) 13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97 (párr 1-7)	194
SEVENTH REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE (C 97/CG/1) SEPTIEME RAPPORT DU COMITE DES RESOLUTIONS (C 97/CG/1) SEPTIMO INFORME DEL COMITÉ DE RESOLUCIONES (C 97/CG/1)	195
<i>Draft Resolution: Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project (C 97/CG/1)</i> <i>Projet de résolution: Renforcement du projet FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1)</i> <i>Proyecto de Resolución: Fortalecimiento del proyecto FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1)</i>	195

**TENTH MEETING
DIXIEME SEANCE
DECIMA SESION**

(14 November 1997)

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)	
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)	
APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)	208
DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART IV (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)	
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - QUATRIEME PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)	
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE IV (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)	208
15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 - Approach (paras 1-6)	- General
Considerations (paras 7-10) - Substantive Priorities (paras 11-14)	
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 - Approche (par 1-6) - Considérations d'ordre général (par 7-10) - Priorités de fond (par 11-14)	
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 - Enfoque (párr 1-6)	
- Consideraciones generales (párr 7-10) - Prioridades sustantivas (párr 11-14)	208

**ELEVENTH MEETING
ONZIEME SEANCE
11ª SESION**

(17 November 1997)

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)	
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)	
APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)	216
DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART III (C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)	
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - TROISIEME PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)	
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE III (C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)	216
14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (paras 1-12)	
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (pars 1-12)	
14. Plan a plazo medio, 1998-2003 (párr 1-12)	216
<i>Draft Resolution: Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project</i> (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)	
<i>Projet de résolution: Renforcement du projet FAO 2000</i> (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)	
<i>Proyecto de resolución: Fortalecimiento del proyecto FAO 2000</i> (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)	216

CHAIRMAN

I call the meeting to order. Welcome to Commission II, the Twenty-ninth Session of Conference. I am particularly pleased, to see all of you who are in this room and I am sorry if it has not been possible to start this Session earlier.

It is for me an honour, a privilege, and a pleasure to have been chosen to conduct these proceedings. I shall be very ably assisted by two Vice-Chairmen. I am delighted to announce that Mr Paul Paredes, who is the Alternate Permanent Representative of Peru, and Mr Igor Marincek, the Permanent Representative of Switzerland, will be the Vice-Chairmen of this Commission. Mr Paredes brings experience, not only of FAO but of UN affairs in Vienna and in Geneva. Mr Marincek, I think, scarcely needs introduction to you. He is a well-known figure in FAO and has played an active and much respected role in its affairs over many years. I am delighted to have them with me as part of the team.

I propose to establish a Drafting Committee for the Commission, and I will make an announcement on Monday as to how that is going to be composed. We have before us in this Commission a formidable Agenda of work, covering the activities and the programmes of the Organization and we have five days in which to complete that work. I should tell you that on the decision of the General Committee, the Review of Statutory Bodies has been reassigned from Commission III to this Commission. The authority for that is in document C 97/LIM/7 paragraph 4 on page 3. I repeat that point, the Review of Statutory Bodies has been reassigned from Commission III to this Commission. So we have an additional Item of business which we will take after our consideration of the Programme of Work and Budget.

Our proceedings are very expensive to run, they are expensive to Member Nations in terms of the time of people who are sitting here and taking part in the debate. They are very expensive to the Secretariat and of course, ultimately, to the membership. Every dollar spent here is a dollar which is not spent on the frontline activities of the Organization. There are two clear implications of that, the first is that we must try very hard to start our meetings on time and complete them on time.

Secondly, we should exercise restraint in the length of our interventions. I hope that delegates who take the floor will try very hard to be concise, to the point, and to limit their interventions to something to the order of 5 to 6 minutes. It should, in my view, be possible for people to make the points they wish to make within that timespan.

I should remind you that if you want to provide views at greater length, it is always possible for you to deposit written statements which will appear in the Verbatim Record.

I hope to move fairly quickly through the first two items on our Agenda, that is to say Items 13 and 14, so that we can get on as quickly as possible to talk about our central task which is the Programme of Work and Budget. I had hoped that we might have been able to start the Medium-Term Plan today. Given that we have got off to a very late start this morning that may be over-ambitious but nevertheless, I make the point to you.

I should draw your attention, at this stage, to the procedures for formulating Resolutions. Resolutions have to be screened by the Resolutions Committee, before they can be examined by this Commission. Anyone who is minded to table a resolution should refer to Appendix C of document C 97/12 for guidance on the procedure to be followed. I will repeat that, document C 97/12, Appendix C contains guidance on the Formulation of Resolutions. Any delegation which contemplates putting down a Resolution should look, very early, at that document.

That concludes my introductory remarks. I may well repeat them this afternoon, so that they are clear to people who have not been able to be with us this morning. I will ask your indulgence for doing so.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION
II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION
II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION

13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97
13. Rapport d'évaluation du programme 1996-97
13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97

CHAIRMAN

If the Commission is content, I now propose to turn to our first substantive item of business which is the Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97. The documentation for this which of course is reflected in the Order of the Day is document C 97/4, which is the bound report itself, and document C 97/LIM/9. Those are the two documents which are before us. What we are invited to do is to note and endorse those documents.

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

The Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97 covers a range of subjects which were for the first time selected in consultation with Members of the Programme Committee. This was an innovation which was brought in by the Director-General and which has continued for the Programme Evaluation Report subjects for 1998-99 as well.

The Report has another innovation which we feel is useful, in that it includes the response of Programme Managers to the Evaluation Reports for their respective programmes. This is something that you will note from the Council Report which is welcomed by the Programme and the Council itself. I have to say that we find it an effective way of ensuring that the communications occur and that people understand what these Reports are about and, subsequently, take action on them.

You will also note the increasing use of external experts to assist us in certain evaluations. We are not religious about this in the sense that we do not think it necessary always to use external expertise. We think it is something that should be done on the basis of cost-effectiveness and when the expertise does not exist internally. But, for example, as regards Chapter 5 on Publication Activities of FAO, we had some very valuable assistance from Wye College and the University of London in assisting us to assess the publications, and in Chapter 4, the Review of FAO Special Relief Operations, you see a lot of input from the joint mission with the Government of the Netherlands which was looking at our emergency operations.

The Chairman has referred you to the LIM document which includes the Council's Report. The Council reviewed this Report at its Hundred and Twelfth Session in June 1997. It did appreciate the several improvements and it liked the inclusion, as I have said, of the Programme Managers' comments, and it also liked the concept of the Summary Assessment based on the Council criteria. However, it felt that the criteria could do with some revision and, in fact, that is an issue which is being taken up in the context of our review of the Programme Budget Process.

You will note that it wanted further improvement in the analytical content, particularly on the effects and impacts of FAO's programmes. It also encouraged the use of external expertise but, again, bearing in mind the cost implications, and it stressed the importance of improving the quality of programme design as a prerequisite for effective evaluation. And, this you see already being addressed in the papers on the Programme Budget Process.

The Council endorsed the recommendations of the Programme and Finance Committees with regard to two issues which came out in Chapter 5 - Publication Activities of FAO. The first was endorsement of the proposal to develop new ideas in the publication distribution system. Here, in effect, what we were proposing was to move away from automatic quotas for publications towards national publication accounts. Here countries would have an account with a credit against it, against which they would be able to draw down by ordering specific publications

which they feel could be of greatest value to them, rather than receiving an automatic allocation of publications which may or may not be of interest to them. This was in response to the fact that we felt that the current methodology is not sufficiently demand-oriented. We are not finding out what people want and, therefore, we are not necessarily using the resources in the best possible way.

There is a little bit of a problem, Mr Chairman. We are not yet in a position to make specific proposals to the Conference and, furthermore, we really believe any proposals we make should come back up through the Committees and the Council.

Unfortunately, this could mean a rather long delay before we can implement any improvements because the original decision for the current quota system was made by the Conference itself in 1963, where it decided to apply quotas for publications for Member Governments, related to percentages and not to sums of annual contributions. Now, it is a bit hard to know what flexibility we have but, if the Conference were prepared to agree, I would suggest that we have in the Report something that says that the Council can decide on behalf of the Conference on whatever proposals it receives from the Secretariat. It would, of course, report to the Conference on what it has done and the Conference would have the opportunity of making any decision it wished to on that point. This would allow us to present something to the Council in November 1998, instead of waiting for the Conference in 1999, before we could make any changes. So, you may wish to address that issue and see whether it is a satisfactory proposal.

I think I will stop there. The Report itself is self-evident and we are here to answer any questions. The Chief of the Evaluation Service responsible for this Report is on my right, and will also be prepared to answer any questions that the Membership may have.

CHAIRMAN

Can I reiterate Mr Wade's last point. We are being asked whether Conference would be content to delegate to Council, the authority to decide on a Secretariat proposal to alter the Publications Distribution System. Would you please consider that and address it in your interventions. It would be an extremely helpful step in terms of progress, to enable the Secretariat to move forward with that scheme if, of course, it needs general approval.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

As the first speaker, I would like to congratulate you and the Vice-Chairmen on their election. I am sure that although we have a lot to discuss and some very difficult issues to discuss, the Bureau will lead us most ably and capably.

In relation to the Programme Evaluation Report, I wish to be very brief. Australia has been intimately involved through the discussions, having participated in the Programme Committee itself. We think the processes that are being developed, the emphasis as highlighted, particularly in paragraph 51 in the document C 97/LIM/9, are ones that the Council has recognized and the Conference membership should recognize as building the basis for substantially improving the analysis of how the Organization is going - not in output terms, but in impact terms. So, we would support endorsement of the PER.

In relation to the point that Mr Wade raised, Australia would be very happy to see that delegation to the Council. It fits in, I think very much, with this idea that we are trying to improve the effectiveness of the Organization. We are asking for efficiency improvements, having those sit around simply because of the need to make the processes of the Organization, I think we must be as flexible as possible. So, I would strongly support that the work be done to produce a piece of paper that the Membership can look at, whether that could possibly be involved in, at least, preparation by May, to give the Programme and Finance Committees a chance to consider. I think that would be useful.

The Programme Committee has an obvious interest in this, having set the exercise on its way in some regards, so that may be another useful way, if timing and resources of the Organization permit, to give the Membership a further opportunity in the lead up to the Council. But, we would strongly support the idea that the Council be given the delegation to make a decision.

Lothar CAVIEZEL (Suisse)

Comme mon prédécesseur, je voudrais également remercier toutes les personnes qui ont participé à l'élaboration du rapport sur l'évaluation du programme 1996-97.

Tout en commençant par la première question que vous nous avez posée tout à l'heure, j'aimerais dire que la Suisse est favorable à mettre en place un processus de réflexion à la question qui nous a été posée. L'évaluation de la coopération technique des projets et des programmes tient une place importante dans nos relations avec les organisations internationales et avec la FAO en particulier. Nous considérons l'évaluation comme un exercice indispensable dans toute bonne gestion qui cherche l'efficacité et la durabilité, et qui veut en outre assurer la transparence tout particulièrement dans une période d'austérité financière. C'est la première fois que ce Rapport contient une réponse du Secrétariat aux recommandations faites pour les programmes retenus. C'était la Suisse, avec d'autres pays, qui avait à la dernière Conférence en 1995, demandé à la FAO de renforcer le contenu de l'évaluation, en particulier de faire une analyse plus systématique des effets et de l'impact des projets et programmes, d'évaluer la durabilité et de faire une analyse coûts/bénéfices des projets.

Nous attendons maintenant pour voir comment la FAO mettra ses recommandations en oeuvre aussi bien dans les projets et programmes en cours que dans l'élaboration de nouveaux projets et programmes.

Nous sommes conscients des trois types d'activités de la FAO, à savoir les activités normatives, les Programmes d'action spéciaux et les projets de coopération technique traditionnels. La Suisse et d'autres pays avaient également demandé à la FAO de réorienter ses activités vers les aspects normatifs, et de concentrer ses interventions sur le terrain, sur un nombre limité de programmes en fonction des avantages comparatifs de la FAO.

Nous sommes d'avis que les recommandations du Rapport d'évaluation du programme n'en tiennent pas suffisamment compte, en particulier dans le domaine de l'irrigation, des Programmes d'action spéciaux et des projets de coopération. Il nous semble, en outre, de première importance que notre Organisation définisse les types d'activités de terrain dans lesquels elle devrait s'engager en priorité en fonction du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, et qu'elle évite de fixer des objectifs trop ambitieux.

Nous espérons par ailleurs, que la concurrence croissante, en particulier des ONG, et des sociétés conseil privées, incite la FAO à constamment améliorer la qualité de ses programmes et projets. Il nous reste maintenant à nous assurer que notre institution apporte également un soutien aux pays en développement aussi bien au niveau de la bonne gestion des affaires publiques que du renforcement des institutions nationales.

Rolf AKESSON (Sweden)

It is encouraging to note the strong commitment to evaluation as an integral part of the management process that the Director-General expresses in his forward. Sweden fully shares the view that evaluation should be given high priority in the process of strengthening effectiveness, transparency and accountability, in particular at a time of financial austerity.

Our general impression is that the Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97 serves its purpose rather well. We appreciate the attempts to take an analytical approach and to limit the descriptive parts to what could be considered a necessary background. We welcome the sections on Programme Effects and Impact which, of course, should be the main objective of Evaluation. We

also appreciate the Recommendation sections as a logical final part of the process. This is a difficult exercise and much remains to be done as regards the precision of the analysis that was demanded by the Council in its Report as well.

The points in paragraphs 2.46 and 2.47 are well taken. They illustrate a common problem of international organizations acting as advisory bodies. It is also pertinent to the discussions to be held under Item 13 on the new medium-term planning model. The example in 2.46 concerns the overall impact of the Fisheries Major Programme on the world fisheries and fish stocks, but clearly it is relevant also for other parts of the Programme of Work.

The report asks for our reaction on the Summaries of Overall Assessments of performance in tabular form which is an innovation this year. There is always a risk or two over simplified complex issues, in making very short and formerly standardized summaries. On the other hand, a summary table of this kind facilitates the reading of the Report. This delegation's recommendation would be to continue the practice of making a Summary in tabular form, but to qualify the statements in the Table by comments in the current text. That could be done by slightly expanding and reorganizing the section on Programme Effects and Impact. We would also advise against the possible reluctance to use the lowest mark on the assessment scale. A few times the mark "less than satisfactory" seems to have been replaced by the euphemism "serious" or "critically important".

Regarding the second innovation, the response of programme managers, we find it useful, both for its intended purpose and for the message they may carry regarding the degree of interaction between the parties involved. In this connection, I would like to draw attention to a related topic, namely, self-evaluation, which sometimes is considered an indispensable part of good management. Consideration might be given to the possibility of including some indications concerning methods and procedure for self-evaluation in this Report, although clearly the Report primarily should deal with external evaluations.

Regarding possible improvements in future issues of this Report, I have two points to make. One on methodology and the other on the coverage of evaluation. In the UN System of rules and regulations, the term "evaluation" is defined as "a process that seeks to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, effectiveness and impact of an activity in the light of its goals and objectives". One basic problem of evaluation in FAO, as in many other organizations, is, and here I quote paragraph 6, that "Very few FAO programmes are so articulated as to have clearly-defined achievement targets and indicators, making it difficult to gauge the degree of achievement even in broad qualitative terms".

Similarly, in paragraph 1.69, we find the following statement, "As has been the general case within FAO, the Water Programme has not been designed with clearly-defined objectives and outputs, and a Work Plan for that achievement".

We find some exceptions, however, as indicated in the summary assessment's table on pages 18 and 39, where the objectives are stated to be, and here I quote, "sufficiently well-defined" and in the other case "generally clear".

The corresponding point on page 62 is that objectives are too broad and, judging from the management's comment, the Evaluation findings in this particular area seem to be somewhat controversial. The point to make here is that the improvement in Evaluation, and consequently, the reporting of Evaluation, are closely related to improvement in management in general, particularly improvement in the precision of defining objectives and targets. In some programmes, to judge from the statements I just quoted, it has proved feasible and we trust that it will prove feasible in other cases, as well.

The second area for improvements relates to the proportion of total activities that are covered by External Evaluation. In this context, I mean evaluations made by somebody not directly involved in the management of the programmes.

The Evaluation Reports in front of us cover some programmes which together stand for a very small part of the total programmes of FAO. Even if you take into consideration the evaluations made during the last six years or so, you will probably end up with a small proportion. It would be interesting to learn more about the exact figure, and it would be helpful in the future to have this information given in the Evaluation Report.

On the proposal by Mr Wade, regarding delegation to the Council of a decision on the new Publications Distribution System, we find it an excellent idea. This is an urgent matter and we support this wholeheartedly.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should not forget to say that we are extremely pleased to see you in the Chair.

Ms Laura A. WHITAKER (United States of America)

The United States reported on this Agenda Item, in some depth, at the June Council meeting and our statement is available for the Record. For that reason, we do not feel it necessary to reiterate all the comments we made at that time. However, we would like to briefly highlight key portions of our statement for the benefit, of our colleagues here today.

First, we would like to compliment FAO on the Report and on the innovations made in this key area of Programme Evaluation. We believe this is an essentially important function for FAO during a period when many Member Nations, along with FAO, are facing budget constraints, as well as increased demands on our resources. As we have stated over the past year, evaluating performance against clear benchmarks is essential, in order to determine how available resources can be best allocated to priority areas. In general, we consider the report an important step forward in strengthening FAO's internal Evaluation Process, and we strongly report the three principle innovations outlined in the document.

We also strongly urge FAO to focus on the important area of gender issues and identify ways to better tap the wealth of unused resources available to us all. This applies to FAO's efforts in hiring, contracting, programme development and implementation, and last but not least, in promoting the often forgotten interest of women farmers around the world.

We also support the Report's recommendations to build training components into all aspects of the work place, to increase cooperation with other entities, to set sharper priorities, to provide measurable objectives and timetables for projects and to recognize where FAO does or does not have a comparative advantage. These recommendations all reflect good sound principles of a productive efficient work environment.

In closing, we would like to respond to the request for constructive suggestions for improving future Reports. We respectfully suggest that you continue the innovations initiated with this Report and update any of the 1995 Council criteria that are subsequently amended, that you implement a system to evaluate all programmes, that you look at ways of better utilizing Evaluation Reports by including them in programme planning by FAO managers that you develop targets for future evaluations and factor findings into the Medium-Term Programme of Work and Budget, that you highlight the Special Programme for Food Security in the next Evaluation Reports, and that more emphasis be put on the trade implications of FAO programmes.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on what we view as an increasingly important function for FAO.

Alan AMEY (Canada)

Like many other speakers, Canada maintains that evaluation is a key function and should play an important role in the planning and budgeting process. We support the observations of the Hundred and Twelfth Session of the Council and the 77th Session of the Programme Committee on this Report.

Canada compliments FAO on the improvements made to the Report through the inclusion of comments by the programme managers and senior management, on the evaluators' observations, as well as the Summary Assessment of Performance against the Six Programme.

We are pleased with the expertise that FAO has developed in conducting evaluations. Nevertheless, it was clear that those evaluations covered in the current Evaluation Report, which involved outside evaluators, reflected a wider perspective than those conducted exclusively by the Evaluation Service. We would like to see more use of outside experts in future evaluations.

To improve the Evaluation function further, there is a need to identify more explicit outputs and goals against which to evaluate progress -- this is the same point made by Sweden. Recent efforts in the current Programme of Work and Budget in this regard are greatly appreciated, but should be developed further. Then we will be in a better position to assess impact achievement and overall cost-effectiveness. We are hopeful that the Strategic Planning Framework being developed will also facilitate the process.

We believe that programmes should be selected for evaluation on a strategic basis, i.e. to see why a particular programme is working well or poorly, as well as to see if a new approach is performing as it was designed to. Programmes should not be selected simply because it is their turn, or because they have not been evaluated for a while.

As we have given our technical observations at the June Council, I would like to expand this discussion in light of the discussion of the Medium-Term Plan of the Programme Committee, specifically, during the discussion of the document possible revisions to the Programme Budget Process and their implications, including the medium-term planning process covered under JM/97/1.

There were some suggestions that the role of the Evaluation Report might change to that of reporting mainly on the achievements of the new model of the Medium-Term Plan. While this may be a valid focus, we would not want to lose the ability of the Evaluation Service to examine problems or problem areas, or crosscutting issues, where the achievements are difficult to quantify, or the results have complex interdependencies. While the roles of all the main documents may be changing, we wish to maintain the good features of the current system while moving to a new system of planning documents. We particularly wish to see Evaluation remain as a key component of the new Strategic Framework.

With regard to the Publications Account, we are very much in favour, as is Australia and other speakers, to delegate the decision to the next Council a year from now. We might even think of delegating to the Programme and Finance Committees. I do not know, but I think a quicker method would be welcome.

Finally, I would ask that all publications be included in this Publication Account, not just hard copies but electronic copies as well, as this seems to be the way for the future in publications.

In closing, Canada considers that the evaluations are generally well carried out but there is room for improvement. More importantly they need to be integrated more fully under the programme planning and budgeting cycle. The good features of the current evaluation function should be built upon, and future planning documents and future evaluations should be chosen on strategic considerations.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAHER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

Like those who have spoken before me, I would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the excellence of the document that has been submitted to us. I would also like to congratulate Mr Wade for the clarity of his introduction.

Our delegation has looked at this document very carefully. We have looked at the Programme Evaluation Document for 1996-97, and this Report shows clearly that it is a considerable improvement on what we had in the past. Certainly, the method which is used for the drawing up of this Report is a great improvement on what went before. It is also useful to get the comments from the various administrative sections. However, we do feel there is always room for further improvement.

We would, particularly, like to refer to the analysis which is contained within the Report. We feel that we have here to look more closely at the design of programmes. There has to be a very clear idea as to what the purpose is of each programme, at the design stage. As a Member of the Programme Committee, Libya has already made its contribution in that body to the discussions on this Report. We feel that the work which has been undertaken by the FAO Secretariat is certainly praiseworthy.

I shall be brief and I would simply limit my remarks to seeking some clarification from the Secretariat and I would like this clarification. What exactly does it mean where it says that 'practically all documents are in the Organization's five working languages' but that there has to be a given amount of flexibility here. Could I be told exactly what is meant by flexibility in this context.

I have to say, though, I like the proposal that is made by Mr Wade that powers be delegated to Council when it comes to the quota system for documents per country. We should not await the next general Conference for such a decision to be taken.

In conclusion, we would support adoption of this Report.

Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN (Bangladesh)

I would like to compliment FAO on the Report for its clarity and its focus on key areas, its activities and the results achieved in three programme areas. The document C 9/74 is an improvement over the presentation last year.

The need for performance evaluation against clear benchmarks can hardly be over-emphasized. This kind of internal evaluation gives us opportunities to redefine, if needed, priority areas and the ways to achieve them. The need for FAO to continually assess its performance is more acute than ever due to the resource constraints within which it now operates.

We have a few general comments on the document. First, prioritization within each programme. A theme that emerges strongly from the Report is the need to develop clear priorities and strategies to achieve them. We welcome the steps that were undertaken in the biennium to make the programmes more focused than before. However, we believe that, in view of the responsibilities imposed on FAO in the wake of the World Food Summit and decisions taken at other international fora, FAO should concentrate more on those areas which help Member Nations to tackle the problems of food insecurity and hunger.

Secondly, there has been a clear reorientation of activities to its normative work like policy advocacy and information dissemination. We do not deny the need for such activities and FAO remaining a Centre of Excellence in food and agriculture matters. However, it is also necessary to keep in mind that we have resolved to reduce the number of undernourished people from its present level of 840 million to 240 million by the year 2015.

There is a clear need for incorporating this in FAO's future programme prioritization and strategy determination efforts. Unless steps are taken in this direction, institution - and capacity-building measures in many of the Member Nations will be seriously affected.

We would like to emphasize the urgent need to maintain a balance between FAO's long-term work on various programme areas and more direct interventions which address immediate food security concerns of many Member Nations.

Finally, we read with interest the comments by the senior management regarding the evaluation of programme areas. One thing that strikes us is the gap between the workload and human resources availability in the Organization. We strongly urge that this state of affairs be rectified.

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

Ante todo deseo felicitarlo a usted así como a nuestros distinguidos colegas de Perú y Suiza por su elección.

Coincidimos como los anteriores oradores respecto a la importancia que debe tener el proceso de evaluación como elemento que se va a incorporar en la planificación de las actividades de la Organización. Sin embargo estimamos que esto debe ser realizado con criterios amplios y flexibles considerando los contextos y las realidades del país y de los programas.

Sobre este tema deseamos también reiterar nuestra posición tradicional en el sentido de que las actividades normativas y técnicas de la Organización deben observar un equilibrio y un balance adecuados. En su momento creemos que la metodología respectiva debe ser puesta a consideración por las instancias respectivas.

Por otra parte apoyamos también la propuesta de que sea el Consejo quien tome la decisión sobre la propuesta de las cuotas nacionales respecto a las publicaciones. Aquí también deseamos señalar la importancia de que se considere, en su momento, la opinión de los Países Miembros respecto al proceso y a la metodología que deberá seguir la Organización en este sentido, considerando que la realidad de cada País Miembro y las necesidades podrían variar.

Por último y no menos importante, señor Presidente, deseamos señalar la importancia de que el español se mantenga como un idioma para todas las publicaciones de esta Organización.

Paul PAREDES PORTELLA (Perú)

En primer lugar, señor Presidente, quisiera felicitarle y señalarle que mi delegación está a su disposición sin ningún tipo de condicionamiento ni de tiempo. En segundo lugar, quisiera felicitar a la Secretaría por el trabajo elaborado para ese informe, y finalmente para apoyar íntegramente lo señalado por mi colega de México.

Señor Presidente, mi intervención la voy a dividir en dos partes. La primera se refiere al documento en sí, es la parte esquemática y la más corta, y la segunda hará una pequeña referencia al contenido que justifica nuestra percepción de la parte esquemática.

Pasando a la primera parte, nosotros creemos que este documento de la Secretaría está bien elaborado, creemos que ha habido una mejora respecto al Informe anterior y que en buena cuenta se han recogido las sugerencias hechas en el pasado. Creemos que el esquema está bien o sea, en cada punto se presentan los programas en sus características, se establecen los objetivos, cuales son los recursos y los resultados, cual es el impacto del programa en la realidad y finalmente cuales son los puntos que se pueden mejorar en cada caso. Nos parece bien ese esquema. Señor Presidente, si estamos tratando aquí de compartir ideas con el objeto de mejorar el trabajo, creo que sí debería haber una diferenciación de todo lógica a nivel de documento, de forma tal que se pueda ver con mayor claridad las actividades de emergencia, de aquéllas referidas al desarrollo. Para mi delegación es importante que un documento tenga esta precisión, porque de esa forma al leer el documento podemos ver rápidamente la orientación del mismo y la situación de recursos en cada área; creo que es capital para un documento de esta importancia.

En segundo lugar, quizá también sería bueno en este enfoque metodológico hacer también una diferenciación por regiones, diferenciar actividades en desarrollo de aquéllas de tipo de emergencia y de otro lado, lo que se refiere a regiones. Señor Presidente, voy a tratar de

justificar esto en una segunda parte que por supuesto se refiere a los trabajos de la FAO que en futuro será materia de otras intervenciones de la delegación de Perú en ese Comité. Pero al referirme al contenido del documento no pude dejar de pasar por alto algunos elementos, señor Presidente, que vale la pena también retomar. El primero que observo es, quizás, la necesidad de una mayor coordinación al interior de las dependencias de la FAO. Como delegado y Representante del Perú con años de experiencia en esta casa, a veces tengo esa impresión. Sería bueno que fuera explicitado ésto en el documento. Lo segundo que también observo es que debería haber una mayor apertura, apertura como ampliación, entre los mil programas o tareas que se asignan a la FAO, por ejemplo, el Programa PESA, las tareas que resultan de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, etc. Estos nuevos trabajos, y nuevas responsabilidades deberían ser correlacionadas repito, con mayores recursos financieros, técnicos y humanos. Porque en economía todo recurso es finito. La ampliación de responsabilidades si no implican un mayor incremento de la situación financiera, simplemente significará una desviación de recursos de las áreas destinadas a los programas de desarrollo, esto es capital retener; de otra manera no se hace el trabajo.

Quisiera agregar además que analizando este mismo aspecto, creo que los recursos deben orientarse más hacia las actividades en el campo. Mi representación da una preeminencia a las actividades en el terreno, ¿por qué razón? Porque es de esa manera que se observa el impacto del trabajo de la FAO en las economías en los países beneficiarios.

Creo que el perfeccionamiento y mejora del documento a partir del intercambio que aquí tenemos, debe orientarse hacia lo que serían las áreas de especialización de la FAO, áreas donde su infraestructura le permite trabajar mejor, es decir tanto la infraestructura instalada a nivel humano como a nivel material.

A juicio de mi delegación reitero que ese trabajo debe vincularse más a las actividades de desarrollo que hacia las actividades de emergencia, ¿por qué razón? Porque las actividades de emergencia pueden ser muy bien retomadas en el seno de otros organismos del sistema multilateral, mientras que la FAO es un organismo vinculado al desarrollo agrícola fundamentalmente y si hablamos de la orientación de la FAO como organismo internacional especializado, ésta debería ser en promoción del desarrollo agropecuario en los países beneficiarios.

Finalmente, señor Presidente, este aspecto está relacionado con otro que es crucial, y es que los productos del desarrollo, y los recursos, deben orientarse hacia el trabajo en el Terreno, antes que hacia la orientación de recursos en la Sede.

Señor Presidente, son contribuciones hechas con el mayor ánimo buscando siempre una mayor eficiencia en esos organismos con los recursos que se dispone, pero también teniendo en cuenta de que forma nosotros podemos concretamente darle una orientación al futuro a fin de que la FAO asegure su eficiencia en el escenario multilateral.

Daniel BERTHERY (France)

Je serai bref pour répondre aux questions posées, comme vous nous y avez invités. Je ne voudrais pas manquer, néanmoins, de vous féliciter pour votre élection à la présidence de cette Commission. Ma délégation souscrit aux recommandations du Comité du Programme approuvées par le Conseil et elle est satisfaite de l'évolution constatée et des innovations déjà introduites par la FAO en matière d'évaluation de ses programmes. Nous l'encourageons à continuer sur cette voie, en tenant compte des conclusions de ses évaluations.

Nous sommes intéressés par le nouveau système envisagé pour la diffusion des publications dans les différentes langues de l'Organisation, car nous sommes convaincus que le système actuel doit être amélioré. Nous sommes impatients de connaître le détail des propositions de l'Organisation à cet égard. Enfin, nous sommes favorables à la délégation de pouvoirs, qui pourrait être donnée au Conseil, pour qu'une décision rapide soit prise sur cette question.

Klaus GARCKE (Germany)

We also endorse the approval of the Council's Report, the Programme Committee's recommendations on qualitative parameters and impact being taken heed of. Germany had made comments on the Programme Evaluation Report through the Programme Committee and the Council.

We agree to the Secretariat's proposal of today to accelerate the modification of the Publications Quota System through delegation of decision-taking to the Hundred and Fifteenth Session of the Council in 1998.

Luigi FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)

Mr Chairman, first allow me to congratulate you on for such an important task and I am sure you will do an excellent job.

I would like to compliment the Secretariat for this improvement in management of the Organization and the innovations introduced, which we certainly welcome as we consider programme evaluation an integral part of good management and planning. Somebody speaking before me said that it is just a small proportion of FAO activities, but I would like to stress how important they are. I really would like to stress in particular the importance of science and technology -- shown on page 45 and following pages -- that should be enhanced and become one of the main priorities of the Organization as one of the essential elements of food security and agriculture and rural development. The Council should watch and monitor these strategic objectives and needs to enhance relationships with CGIARs and work more closely with IPGRI and other Rome-based organizations to which the Director-General made reference this morning in his speech.

I would like to make just a short reference to Chapter Four, "From Disaster to Development". This is something on which, for example, World Food Programme is concentrating and I think it is in need of better coordination, and possible integration of programmes and activities would certainly be welcome. I think that in this new approach to problems something we have to recall is always the mention of the South-South cooperation, and coordination is also something which the Secretariat does put some emphasis on.

On the point of delegation to the Council, I think it is also a very good idea. Due to the *échéance* of the Conference every two years, I think the Council should have more delegation of powers in its work, and it is certainly supported.

The last point, some delegation -- I think the delegation of Canada -- made reference to more use of external experts. That could be a good idea but we must not forget the budgetary implications of that measure. I think that the comparative advantage of FAO experts is still quite large, and we could certainly make reference to the internal knowledge and expertise. Of course, we have to ensure that this expertise is not shrinking or compromised by inadequate or under-utilized resources. I think we first have to make recourse to internal expertise and knowledge and then look to external experts, unless there are some excellent experts who provide their consultancy without any budgetary implications.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénégal)

Monsieur le Président, je voudrais joindre ma voix à celle des orateurs qui m'ont précédé pour vous féliciter, vous et les deux Vice-Présidents. Nous voudrions également féliciter toutes les personnes qui ont participé à l'élaboration de ce document riche d'informations fort utiles susceptibles de guider la Conférence pour déterminer les priorités du programme de notre Organisation.

Monsieur le Président, nous voudrions également, à l'instar de tous les orateurs qui nous ont précédés, souligner l'importance de l'évaluation en tant qu'instrument susceptible d'améliorer la

gestion de notre Organisation. Le présent rapport auquel nous avons déjà apporté tout notre appui est une preuve éloquente de l'importance de l'évaluation.

Monsieur le Président, à la lumière de ce rapport, nous nous félicitons des importants progrès réalisés par la FAO dans l'amélioration de la conception et de l'exécution de ce Programme en accordant une plus grande place à la participation plus effective des structures nationales des pays bénéficiaires. Si les activités normatives sont importantes, nous restons persuadés que la FAO doit poursuivre l'intensification des activités de terrain compte tenu de son expertise et de ses nouvelles orientations. Par ailleurs, si l'apport d'évaluateurs externes est une bonne initiative il n'en demeure pas moins souhaitable que, dans ce cadre, appel soit fait à des acteurs compétents des pays en développement.

Enfin, s'agissant de la proposition de Monsieur Wade, nous sommes favorables à la délégation de pouvoirs de la Conférence au Conseil pour permettre au Secrétariat de modifier le système actuel de distribution de la documentation.

Julian Alexis THOMAS (South Africa)

Mr Chairman, welcome, strength and courage to you and your two Vice-Chairmen in the task that lies ahead.

We would also endorse the Report that we have before us and the comments, the recommendations that came out of the Hundred and Twelfth Conference.

We would like to congratulate and thank the Secretariat for those involved in the preparation of this document that we find extremely useful, and a move in the right direction.

As most speakers have already emphasized, the need for evaluation is obviously fundamental. We would go along with that. We would go along with the suggestions that have been made in more specific terms about the importance of identifying criteria in projects for both monitoring and evaluation, the importance of choosing the right programmes to be evaluated in terms of priority and need.

Our main comment would be not to be over-hasty. There has been a call to widen this evaluation to more programmes, and that we would certainly agree with. However, being a first substantial attempt in the way it has been presented in this Report, and appreciating the extent to which this type of activity and document still has to be integrated into the wider functioning of the Organization -- it has been mentioned that important aspects would be to see how the fruits of this type of evaluation would, in fact, be integrated into programmes and the activities of the Organization -- I think we need to be careful not to be over-hasty. The question of methodology, of usefulness, of applicability, the old dictum of learning by doing, I think, should be respected so that we spend the Organization's time in as useful a manner as possible and in as efficient a manner as possible.

In looking at the approach to monitoring and how we are going to be integrating it into the activities and the decisions of the Organization, I would like to support the comment that has just been made by my colleague from Senegal about the importance of not forgetting the operationalization of the products of FAO's normative programme.

When looking at the evaluation of programmes, we will have to look at these issues, in other words their impact, in terms of space and time. Somebody, I think it was the Representative from Peru, mentioned the importance of looking at regions and, I think, Member Nations. The impact of different FAO programmes I think will be different in different areas, as we can expect, and in time in relation to the way programmes are implemented and, again, in relation to the receptivity, as it were, of different Member Nations and regions to FAO programmes.

I think it is important that we do not lose that dimension, or that we pay particular attention to it in devising and improving our methodology, our approach to evaluation.

Lastly, as far as Publications are concerned -- that is one chapter that we appreciated in Evaluation Report -- and the work done on trying to identify how FAO publications and information in general can have a greater impact, reach the right people and include the right information. A lot was learnt from that evaluation, and I think it also pointed to the fact that a lot more needs to be learnt. We believe that this is one of, if not probably the most important function of FAO, the generation, the synthesis of information, the analysis of information and its redistribution. We find it an extremely useful service of the Organization. We think that we have to take heed of what was said in that evaluation and not delay too long before we take another fairly in-depth look of the output of that particular activity, particularly given that it has been restructured recently.

In conclusion, we find interesting and innovative the suggestions as far as the distribution of publications and the new ideas on the table are concerned. We would also agree with those who have recommended that this type of decision be delegated to Council to try to improve the System as fast as we can in this respect.

Xu NANSHAN (China) (Original language Chinese)

The document C 97/4 submitted by the Secretariat and the presentation by Mr Wade have produced a fascinating evaluation on this Item.

During the period of evaluation, I think our Organization has achieved positive results. On the whole, we are very appreciative of the following activities undertaken by FAO.

First, FAO has successfully convened the World Food Summit, an event that has attracted world-wide attention and one having a long-term political significance. The Summit has provided a Programme of Action for developing world agriculture and eliminating hunger and malnutrition.

Secondly, FAO has further advanced the institutional reforms and has laid an excellent foundation for the revival of our Organization. Some reforms have met with initial success.

Thirdly, the Special Programmes led personally by the Director-General are progressing smoothly. These Programmes are of great benefit to the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries.

Fourthly, in the development and transfer of technology, FAO has played a positive role in promoting cooperation among Member Nations and has been promoting the use of new technologies among the developing nations.

Fifthly, FAO as a forum for world agriculture, as a data bank for agricultural information, has helped countries and populations suffering natural catastrophes in overcoming their difficulties. This is another example of our positive action.

Sixthly, the WAICENT Centre continues to play its effective role as it publishes a massive amount of data.

In particular, FAO is conducting, undertaking all these activities during a time of financial difficulties.

Of course, from the Evaluation Report we have also seen that, in the past few years, for reasons including financial ones, some of the Programmes have also been affected in their implementation. Some of the work that should not be eliminated has been cancelled. For instance, some authoritative publications have ceased to be published owing to shortage of funds. We hope that FAO will further increase its efficiency to reduce the negative impact owing to financial difficulties.

I would like to now speak on the format of the Evaluation Report.

First, we are in agreement with combining the Implementation Report with the Evaluation Report.

Secondly, I think that we should have an all-round description of the past activities but, at the same time, we should also stress the priority activities. I think the present evaluation has given us a good basis for evaluating past activities.

Thirdly, for reasons of economy, I think that certain contents which are repeated elsewhere could be taken out of this Report.

Fourthly, I think we should also quantify the evaluation so that we may have a more objective understanding of the implementation of our programmes.

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Argentina)

Señor Presidente, permítame, como lo han hecho otros delegados, felicitarlo por la Presidencia de la Comisión II de esta Conferencia. Estamos dispuestos a darle toda nuestra cooperación en el desempeño de sus funciones para tener éxito en las tareas de nuestra Comisión en esta Conferencia.

Quiero agradecer ahora a la Secretaría por la presentación del documento que es útil. Este documento de evaluación tiene la característica de intensificar las evaluaciones, la eficacia, la transparencia, y la responsabilidad en la gestión, que me parecen factores fundamentales para poder obtener programas adecuados y poder mantener y transferir la experiencia. Concretamente, en la evaluación tendríamos que tener una determinación clara de los objetivos y en función de ellos hacer una evaluación. Creo que este es uno de los puntos fundamentales para poder realizar las tareas de manera adecuada.

Yo estoy seguro que la evaluación con consultores externos y no solamente internos podría llegar a mejorar los resultados, pero también tengo la misma preocupación que el distinguido Representante de Italia en lo que respecta a las repercusiones presupuestarias que la participación de evaluadores externos en los programas pudiera tener. Yo creo que antes de tomar una decisión en este sentido tendríamos que tener una propuesta de la Secretaría, o pedirle que nos haga una estimación de costos de lo que podría ser en una primera instancia un programa piloto, reducido, para ver de que manera podrían utilizarse evaluadores externos y cuales serían los costos y de la forma que éstos afectarían a la Organización. Después de esto, entre todos nosotros debemos tomar una decisión al respecto, puesto que estamos en épocas de restricciones presupuestarias, y obtener así resultados distintos a los que nos proponemos si incorporamos evaluadores externos en grandes cantidades.

Creo también, como lo dijeron otros oradores, que sería adecuada una coordinación de actividades con los otros Organismos que están en Roma, en particular con el FIDA y con el Programa Mundial de Alimentos, sobre algunas de las actividades que aquí se establecen en el propio documento y, en particular, con algunas de las actividades de socorro a las que aquí se hace referencia.

Hemos tenido, como consecuencia de las restricciones presupuestarias, varios programas afectados que se ven en este documento y posibles programas afectados que se observan en el documento C 97/3-Sup. 2, sobre las actividades que se eliminarían, en el caso de que el presupuesto tuviera que ser inferior al nivel de Crecimiento Nominal Cero, que todos ustedes tienen en su poder. A mí esto me preocupa, señor Presidente, porque veo actividades que nosotros consideramos muy importantes, en particular quiero referirme al Programa 2.1.3 sobre Ganadería y otras actividades que se eliminarían si tuviéramos la penosa tarea de que el presupuesto tuviera que llegar a este nivel. Mi delegación, todos ustedes saben, tiene la misma posición que la de otras delegaciones del Grupo de los 77 en el sentido de apoyar un Crecimiento Real cero de presupuesto, que nos permitiría continuar con las actividades de la Organización.

Por último, señor Presidente, quiero referirme al tema de las publicaciones. Creo que desde el punto de vista administrativo tendríamos que transferir al Consejo la evaluación de este tema para poder analizarlo mejor, y ver de qué forma podemos mejorar la distribución.

Quiero hacer referencia a una muy buena información que dio la Secretaría sobre el fenómeno de “El Niño”, que es algo que a todos nos preocupa, por los efectos que está teniendo en la agricultura, en el comercio agrícola y en la producción. La Secretaría dio una muy buena información. Yo creo que esta información podría ponerse eventualmente en el sitio *Web*, en el *Internet*, porque esto favorecería que la actualización de esta información llegara a todos los Miembros de la FAO de forma rápida y eficaz, que están todos verdaderamente muy preocupados por las características de este fenómeno. Es un caso particular, pero es un caso que creo que hace a la distribución de la información.

Ultimo punto: me refiero al balance y al equilibrio entre las actividades normativas y las actividades operacionales de la FAO. Las actividades operacionales son verdaderamente fundamentales para la Organización y fundamentales en la receptividad que los Países tienen sobre las actividades de la FAO, de manera que no debemos de ningún modo descuidar este tipo de actividades que son, para todos los países en desarrollo, muy, pero muy importantes.

Inge NORDANG (Norway)

My delegation would like to welcome the Programme Evaluation Report and to thank Mr Wade for his presentation this morning.

The modifications introduced to the format and the presentation of the Report have greatly improved its value. The Report has become more analytical and less descriptive and the introduction of clearer criteria, based on the logical framework approach, is valuable. Assessing the Programme’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability against clearly-defined sets of achievement indicators is important.

My delegation agrees that the nature of many FAO programmes makes it more difficult to measure the degree of achievement than for investments projects, where performance indicators are easier to gauge. Nevertheless, as admitted in the Report, improvements can be made. We believe that concentration on fewer but larger field programmes might be one measure to improve the measuring of achievements.

Turning to the substance of the Report, which in our opinion is very important, I will limit myself to commenting on two programmes. On the Programme on Fisheries Resources and Agriculture, we agree that this Programme has made notable achievements in the analysis and dissemination of information on fisheries resources, in its contributions to International Instruments and Conventions and to the development and adaptation of stock modelling methodologies and guidelines for responsible fishing.

These are normative functions where FAO has demonstrated a clear comparative advantage. In our opinion, this strength should be utilized in the definition of the Fisheries Department’s approach towards its technical cooperation. We believe that the Fisheries Department has been successful in assigning field programmes, building on its normative strength. We have provided extra-budgetary funds to finance such programmes.

I do not think it is necessary to insist on the importance of the provision of agricultural aid in the immediate aftermath of an emergency situation. As FAO is the UN Agency responsible for this aspect of the UN System’s emergency response, it is essential to assess the extent to which the Organization fulfils these parts of its mandate. In this context, we find the review of FAO’s Special Relief questions is very timely. This evaluation clearly carries particular weight due to the fact that it could draw on the thorough Dutch evaluation, on their extensive support to FAO’s emergency activities.

I would like to highlight the evidence pointing to FAO’s comparative advantage in terms of quality and cost-efficiency in providing agricultural emergency aid.

The Report also highlights the need for FAO to improve its record in humanitarian aid, and we concur with the recommendation outlined in the suggested Plan of Action on pages 90 and 91.

Mrs Wafaa Mohamed YOUSSEF (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)

My delegation would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the work that has gone into this very excellent Report, the Programme Evaluation Report for 1996-97. This is an excellent document and it has been very well prepared.

I would also like to thank Mr Wade for his very clear introduction to this document.

My delegation has looked at this document, and we have seen that the new trend regarding evaluation has been followed. We would also like to support the recommendations at the end of each chapter.

My delegation supports the idea that we allow the Council to change the Quota System for publications because the next Conference will be two years hence. We would also like to say that all the documents which are produced by the Organization should be published in the five working languages.

Souhaib Deen BANGOURA (Guinée)

Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président. Comme mes prédécesseurs, je voudrais également vous féliciter ainsi que vos Vice-Présidents. Ma délégation voudrait féliciter la FAO pour le travail accompli quant à l'élaboration du rapport d'évaluation qui est basé sur des aspects concrets.

Comme l'a dit une délégation, l'évaluation est une composante clé compte tenu de l'objectif de la FAO sur le terrain. Monsieur le Président, il est important, comme prévu, d'associer les autres organisations telles que le FIDA, le PAM, etc. pour la sécurité alimentaire. Donc, ma délégation est sans ambages en faveur des propositions de Monsieur Wade.

Marcos NIETO LARA (Cuba)

Me permito ante todo saludarle y felicitarle en nombre de mi delegación por su elección para dirigir nuestros debates. Un saludo bien cordial al señor Wade por la presentación de este Informe que, como ya nos tiene acostumbrados, lo hace de manera brillante.

Quiero en primer lugar responder a la pregunta que formuló. Mi delegación está totalmente de acuerdo en que la Conferencia delegue al Consejo la decisión y la solución de lo relativo a la documentación. Dicho esto, señor Presidente, mi delegación quiere felicitar a la Secretaría por la calidad y pertinencia de este Informe que nos ha presentado, reconociendo que han sido introducidas mejoras muy adecuadas y que metodológicamente ha centrado su análisis en la medición de la eficacia, eficiencia y su relación en cuanto análisis de costos y beneficios de los programas evaluados.

La evaluación en sí misma, se considera una herramienta indispensable para el trabajo de la FAO, especialmente cuando sus actividades se llevan a cabo en un ambiente crónico de penuria financiera. Refiriéndonos a tópicos específicos del Informe, mi delegación quiere poner de relieve las recomendaciones formuladas en el Capítulo 3, Desarrollo y Transferencia de Terminología, y solicitar que se le dé especial atención a estos programas en particular en los tópicos (c) y (b). En el capítulo 4, que se refiere a las Operaciones Especiales de Socorro y que ha sido enfocado con mucha claridad, se evidenció que la FAO tiene ventajas comparativas para enfrentar y asistir en situaciones de desastre como parte de la ayuda humanitaria. Tiene además, dentro de esas ventajas, que muchas de las operaciones especiales de socorro que se realicen impliquen ulteriormente actividades de desarrollo para los Países Miembros y para las poblaciones beneficiarios.

Señor Presidente, esta Conferencia debería reconocer el trabajo que ha venido realizando el Servicio de Operaciones Especiales de Socorro y darle más respaldo para solucionar aquellas necesidades que se precisen en el párrafo 34 del documento C 97/4.

Finalmente consideramos que las evaluaciones externas son útiles pero vienen acompañadas de altos costos. Por otra parte, el Servicio de Evaluación de la FAO ha demostrado alta capacidad y transparencia para realizar esta misión.

Khairuddin Md. TAHIR (Malaysia)

Since this is the first time my delegation is taking the floor, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, and the Vice-Chairmen on your elections.

Secondly, we would like to thank the Secretariat for the preparation of such a useful Report. We believe that this Report will help FAO in its future programme design and planning.

Thirdly, concerning the new System of Publications Distribution, we support the decision to delegate this to the Council.

With regard to the future work of FAO, we are aware and have witnessed in the last few years a declining trend in overseas development assistance and financial contributions to multilateral agencies in the UN System, and FAO is not part of this event. This trend is disturbing and does not augur well for globalization and international cooperation. Given the situation, we believe that it is imperative for FAO, in its future work, to continue to study and evaluate existing and conventional approaches, mechanisms and programmes in resource mobilization.

While expanding partnership has been one of the strategies employed by FAO to enlarge its resource base in order to encourage investment in agriculture and to finance its programmes, for the future work of FAO's evaluation activities we would like to see an in-depth analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of these collaborative mechanisms. This applies in particular to the South-South technical cooperation mechanisms and Partnership Agreements, specifically to identify elements that prevent or hinder accelerated and successful implementation.

Efforts in this direction, we believe, will relieve some of the burden of FAO and our partners from the developed countries, as well as promote greater self-reliance and meaningful and effective collaboration among developing countries.

Shahid RASHID (Pakistan)

I would also like to congratulate you, as well as the two Vice-Chairmen, on your appointment to the bureau of the Commission.

I would also like to join other delegates who welcomed the improvements in the presentation of the Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97. I would like to thank the Secretariat for their efforts in this regard.

This Report is an important instrument to have a close look at certain programmes and activities and assess their achievements. We will continue to look forward to further improvements in this regard.

In evaluating these programmes, we also need to take into account the impact of not only the reform and the reorganization measures undertaken, but also the implications for the programmes in the light of the follow-up work to the World Food Summit.

In addition, we also need to constantly assess and evaluate the impact of the declining resources, especially for the Field Programme on the priority activities of the Organization.

We hope the Programme Evaluation Report will continue to provide us with the opportunity to undertake an in-depth analysis of the effects of the reduction of such resources for these programme areas.

We have noted, in general, the contents of the Report and find ourselves in agreement with the recommendations and conclusions which have been reached after a thorough analysis of the different aspects. We do commend the Secretariat for the methodology adopted in this regard.

We have also noted the comments of Management at the end of the chapters, and we find these very useful.

As regards the section on the Publication Activities, we appreciate the concern expressed for the proper targetting of these publications so that those who have the greatest need also have the easiest access.

We endorse the proposal for revision of the Quota Distribution System, so as to improve the distribution and to make it more effective. We also are in agreement with the suggestion that this be delegated to the Council so that a decision can be reached as early as possible.

Mlle Aicha RHRIB (Maroc)

Merci Monsieur le Président. Je suis très heureuse de vous voir présider cette Commission et je ne manquerai pas de féliciter les deux Vice-Présidents pour leur élection et le Secrétariat pour la qualité et la richesse du Rapport présenté. Le régime d'austérité auquel le budget ordinaire de la FAO est soumis ces dernières années, conjugué à la situation préoccupante de l'alimentation dans le monde, impose à cette Organisation une évaluation minutieuse de ses actions et de leurs impacts pour tirer les enseignements nécessaires et renforcer l'efficacité de son intervention d'autant plus que le Programme 1996-97 a coïncidé avec la préparation du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation et de la mobilisation du personnel de la FAO pour ce Sommet.

Dans cet esprit, Monsieur le Président, une étude du Rapport d'évaluation du programme 1996-97, qui a été établi dans un souci de réduction de dépenses budgétaires, de ralentissement, ajournement ou annulation de certaines activités, suscite les observations suivantes:

Chapitre 1 concernant le programme relatif à la mise en valeur, l'aménagement et la conservation des eaux. Le Programme n'a pas tracé des objectifs et des orientations précis à la hauteur de la problématique de l'eau et la diminution fulgurante de ses disponibilités, notamment en Afrique et au Proche-Orient. Des réalisations ont surtout porté sur la mise en place de bases de données et le développement de politiques de planification destinées aux instituts nationaux et internationaux au détriment d'actions concrètes sur le terrain. Ainsi, une part importante des ressources humaines et financières du Programme a été destinée à la mise en place de logiciels de bases de données, AQUASTAT et CROPWAT, qui sont certes d'une grande utilité pour une approche scientifique de la problématique de l'eau mais qui risquent de rester inexploités sur le terrain par manque d'institutions spécialisées réceptrices pour la plupart des pays en développement. Plusieurs pays en développement ont pu réussir leurs politiques de conservation et de maîtrise de l'eau. La capitalisation de ces expériences par la FAO, pour les mettre à la disposition des pays moins avancés dans ce domaine, est à prendre en considération pour les prochains plans.

Pour ce qui est du chapitre 3 concernant le Développement et transfert de la technologie, ce programme a été divisé en quatre sous-programmes: "Développement de la recherche de la technologie", "Coopération et coordination de la recherche", "Vulgarisation, éducation et formation", et enfin "Communication au service du développement". Cette division n'a pas permis une approche intégrée du Programme permettant la cohésion et l'efficacité des actions. A cet effet, il y a lieu de procéder à des études de cas pour examiner les actions et moyens à mettre en place pour cerner cette approche intégrée. Par ailleurs, les actions réalisées dans le cadre de ce Programme doivent faire l'objet d'un suivi et d'une évaluation d'impact pour mesurer le rapport coût/efficacité global vis-à-vis des bénéficiaires.

Chapitre 4, Examen des opérations spéciales de secours de la FAO, le rôle de la FAO dans les opérations de secours dans le monde est primordial compte tenu de l'expérience qu'elle a pu accumuler dans l'alimentation et le développement rural. Elle dispose d'acquis importants dans ce domaine par rapport aux autres organisations internationales. A cet effet, ce Programme doit bénéficier dans l'avenir de moyens financiers et humains supplémentaires suffisants pour

permettre une intervention rapide de la FAO dans l'attente que les pays et les autres organisations internationales se mobilisent pour apporter leur aide.

Pour le chapitre 5, Activités de la FAO concernant les publications, comme il ressort de l'enquête de la FAO sur l'utilisation de ses publications, les administrations locales en contact direct avec les agriculteurs, les organismes donateurs et les consultants, n'utilisent pas ou peu ces publications. Or, les publications de la FAO restent un instrument primordial de communication et de transfert de savoir. Pour qu'elles soient utiles, elles doivent répondre à une approche participative et ascendante visant comme cible le service officiel impliqué directement dans le secteur de l'alimentation, étant entendu que, dans chaque pays, l'information pourrait être répercutée sur les opérateurs par un effort interne. La diffusion des expériences réussies des pays en développement dans le domaine de la sécurité alimentaire est un exemple de thème qui pourrait susciter l'intérêt des acteurs cibles.

A ce propos, le Maroc note avec regret l'absence de toute publication FAO reflétant les acquis et les réussites qu'elle a pu réaliser dans le secteur de l'alimentation. Aussi, le Maroc souscrit à l'idée d'intégrer les conclusions du Rapport d'évaluation du programme dans le Plan à moyen terme.

En conclusion, Monsieur le Président, mon pays souscrit à la proposition de Monsieur Wade pour ce qui est de la délégation des pouvoirs au Conseil pour décider du nouveau Système de distribution de publications.

Nahi SHEIBANI (Syria) (Original language Arabic)

I as well, Chairman, would like to congratulate you on your election as Chair of this Commission, and I would also like to congratulate your two Vice-Chairmen.

My country's delegation thinks that this Report is very good, and we would like to congratulate the Secretariat for its preparation. The Secretariat has put a great deal of experience to bear on this, and I have to say that every time they improve on the Reports that they provide us. Looking at the proposals which are contained in this Report on all programmes, we would certainly like to congratulate them.

We would like to refer most particularly to the Water Resources Programme, because we think that this is of particular importance for us. We are countries where there is a shortage of water. We hope that in the future this would be able to be afforded greater priority so that countries can utilize their water resources more effectively.

We would also give our support to the proposal that we change the credit system for distribution of publications, given their great importance.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours.

La séance est levée à 12 h 45.

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)**13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97** (continued)**13. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 1996-97** (suite)**13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97** (continuación)**CHAIRMAN**

We are resuming this afternoon our discussion of Agenda Item 13, Programme and Evaluation Report 1996-97 for which the documents are C 97/4 and C 97/LIM/9.

I think we completed our list of speakers this morning but before we move on, may I ask if anyone else wishes to speak on this Item. I see that Poland, Kenya and Angola wish to take the floor.

Mrs Malgorzata PIOTROWSKA (Poland)

The Polish Government thoroughly observes and supports reforms and restructuring of FAO which results from recommendations approved during the FAO Council in 1994. The Director-General, Dr. Jacques Diouf, is a very strong supporter and energetic executor of these reforms.

Poland backs new initiatives of FAO, such as the Special Programme for Food Security, and "Telefood", which tend to be very instrumental in informing the international public on the scale and consequences of hunger in the world.

According to the commitments adopted during the World Food Summit, hunger should not exist in the contemporary world and Poland supports all programmes and efforts aimed at the liquidation of this defeat. These changes prove FAO's capability to adjust to new situations and conditions. Poland supports these reforms and actively participates in cooperation with FAO in organizing seminars and consultations for agricultural politicians to develop agricultural policies, legal and systems for market economies and principles for shaping institutions serving agriculture.

Poland's experiences can be shared with the developing countries. They prove without any doubt that hunger is not only a result of natural calamities, or lack of knowledge and skills in the area of production technologies. Poverty, low incomes, the unequal distribution, a lack or disturbances in the functioning of marketing institutions and land markets, and an excessive taxation for agriculture in the countryside are the main reasons for hunger. Poland, like many other FAO Member Nations, supports restructuring of the Organization initiated by the Director-General.

Two elements seem to be very important. This is decentralization and a balance between FAO normative functions and its operational activities. We do hope that discussions during the Conference will allow the Member Nations to define and agree on their positions regarding the Programme of Work and Budget for the next two years, based on the approved priorities of FAO activities. It shall be determined in which areas FAO technical assistance is the best and most efficient.

The Polish Government would like to use this opportunity to express our support and great appreciation for FAO normative activities, exemplified by the technical papers prepared for the World Food Summit. We highly evaluate this analysis and thesis of factors and conditions relating to world food security. Polish specialists also highly assess the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on World Food Security, and FAO programmes on food and nutrition, including Codex Alimentarius, which are fundamental for FAO's normative activities in the world food economy.

The Polish Government wishes to express its high appreciation for the Technical Cooperation Programme which are very important in the European region. TCPs allow and encourage the Member Nations to solve many urgent, technical and economic problems. TCPs are very instrumental and are perceived as an important source of FAO expertise in the long run, TCPs facilitate the raising of considerable funds and investment initiative.

F.N. PERTET (Kenya)

Mr Chairman, like the previous speakers, allow me to congratulate you on your election to the Chair.

My delegation is confident that you will steer the deliberations of Commission II to a successful conclusion. My delegation wishes, also, to congratulate the Secretariat for presenting to us for consideration an excellent and very useful document. We also appreciate Mr Wade's introductory remarks on the document.

I shall be brief in my intervention. We endorse the recommendations of the Council as contained in C 97/LIM/9. Further, we support the statements made by the distinguished delegates of Senegal and South Africa, as well as other previous speakers, especially on the need for FAO to enhance and maintain a balance between normative and operational activities and improvement on the system of FAO publications to Member Nations in hard copies, as well as in electronic form.

Kiala Kia MATEVA (Angola)

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Puisque ma délégation intervient pour la première fois, elle voudrait tout d'abord joindre sa voix à celles qui l'ont précédée pour présenter ses vives félicitations à l'occasion de votre élection et de celle de vos deux Vice-Présidents. Ma délégation est convaincue que la Commission II se trouve dans de bonnes mains.

En ce qui concerne le document que notre Commission est en train d'examiner, ma délégation va suivre le conseil que vous nous avez prodigué, c'est-à-dire se limiter au strict nécessaire. Elle se félicite pour le travail et les efforts déployés par le Secrétariat dans la présentation de ce document basé sur des aspects concrets en introduisant des éléments susceptibles d'améliorer la qualité et la gestion des activités de l'Organisation.

En résumé, ma délégation approuve le Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 1996-97 tel que consigné dans le document C 97/LIM/9. Je vous remercie.

CHAIRMAN

Before I ask the Secretariat to reply to the points that have been made. Does anyone else wish to take the floor? In that case, I will turn the subject to Mr Wade. The point is this, it is clear to me, as I am sure it is clear to everyone here, that there is very general endorsement and a warm welcome for the proposal that publications should be handled in a new way, as outlined by Mr Wade, and that the Conference should delegate to the Council the authority to take a decision on that. I think it is helpful to make that point clear before Mr Wade begins his reply.

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

To start, thank you very much indeed to delegates for what were very complementary and appreciative remarks. It is appreciated on our part that when you see something you like, you let us know. I should, of course, immediately pass on those compliments to the Evaluation Service of FAO. Mr Kato is the Chief of that Service. They are an excellent team and I am very lucky to be working with them.

As the Chairman has pointed out, thank you very much for the support to the idea that we have the Council look after the Quota System and whatever we come up with there. Regarding Australia's suggested that we should put it to the May Session of the Programme and Finance

Committees, we will attempt to, but I am not totally confident because the other big exercise that the same people will be involved in is the new Strategic Framework which has to go to the Programme Committee in May. So, we will try and do both jobs.

On the comments regarding a system to evaluate all programmes at a certain stage, selection of those programmes, selectivity in the coverage of programmes, etc, I will, if you agree Mr Chairman, when I finish, pass that question on to Mr Kato, the reason being that it is his Service that initiates the proposals for the things that we are going to evaluate each time, which then go on to the Programme Committee for consultation, before the Director-General finally makes a decision.

On the integration of the evaluation results into the planning process which was raised by Canada and some others, yes, it is very very important. Evaluation only obtains its value if the results of evaluations are in fact built into the work of future periods. We are applying a couple of techniques which we think are effective, and we are using them more and more. One of them you saw was, of course, to specifically involve the programme managers in the review of the evaluation results and allow them to have their say. This immediately improves the whole communication process on the results.

The other is, and for those of you who are not aware, the Evaluation Service is actually in the same office as the Budget Service and in the budget preparation process, we specifically pass the programme proposals to the Evaluation Service to ask them to review them. They review the definition of objectives, the purposes, the outputs, as well as the relationship between the outputs and the objectives established. They often go back to the Divisions themselves to try and have things more clearly defined or sharpened up, etc. In that, of course, what we are getting is the advantage of their evaluation experience being built in to the programming process. I think that this is an important step.

You saw from the Report, and it was echoed by many Members, that we need to see an improvement in the definition of goals and objectives. One particular example was the Water Programme, but it applies in general to our work and we recognize that. Efforts have already been made to try, and I think successfully so, to try and do that.

You will see that in the Programme of Work and Budget document, under Major Programme 2.1.1., you have the demonstration of the pilot test of the new programme model. In fact, the Division that is responsible for the water programmes specifically had a workshop on the problem of defining its goals and its outputs in 1995. They spent a great deal of time on this, and developed projects which they feel have really clear timebound goals and outputs with indicators. So, I think that the Evaluation Report referred to its being very solidly addressed.

They have also tried to make their programme more customer-orientated and less bound by individual disciplines, multidisciplinary, in fact, within the total work of that Division.

I think as an example of being more client-orientated, in response to Morocco's comments, it is worth noting that a major effort has been made on training courses to strengthen national capacities in water management, as well as in the development of policies to improve the effectiveness of water use in agricultural production. So I think you are seeing some practical benefits coming out of this process already.

I should like to address the delicate question of languages, a question which was raised by Libya, Mexico and Egypt, and in particular Libya's question as to flexibility. What do we mean by flexibility? This is a problem area to which the Programme Evaluation Report draws attention and I think, we certainly know, we have to do better - that is exactly what the Report is saying. But, I would like to make it clear that the flexibility concept is not about trying to find some sort of escape clause. It is about the fact that the idea that all publications should be produced in all languages, is not cost-effective and is not sensible.

For example, there was a publication on Natural Resource Management in the Mediterranean area. Now there is little point in translating that into Chinese because there is not a great demand for the subject. We have to be a little bit sensible about it. There are specific statistical documents which deal only with one region, and clearly it should only be published in the languages of that region. This is not to say, however, that we wish to renege on the principle that all documents should be published in all of the languages which are appropriate for that particular document.

On the point on the use of external expertise, I do not think we are on any disagreement on this. As you see, we do use external expertise and we all agree that this is often a very good way to get a fresh perspective on evaluations. I think we all agree that when you do consider using external expertise, you must also consider the cost.

The distinguished delegate of Argentina asked some questions about cost, and it is a little bit hard to give a definitive answer because it does depend very much on the specific activity which you are undertaking. It can be rather low. A good example is that the input to Chapter 5 on Publications Activities used by the University of London's Wye College, to read and evaluate 200 publications. I think the charge for the analysis and Report they produced for us was about \$ 20 000. This was a very important input to that Evaluation and I would say that was probably a cost-effective use of that amount of money. However, it can grow. Some years ago we did a series of almost completely external evaluations on the Special Action Programmes that we had at that time. They averaged about \$ 400 000 each, so you are starting to get into a rather expensive price bracket there.

There were many suggestions and ideas for improvement to the document. We have taken careful note of those, and we will take them on board. I will not attempt to address them here because I do not think that would be fruitful. If you will agree, I would like it if you would pass the floor to Mr Kato to answer that remaining question.

M. KATO (FAO Staff)

Several speakers spoke on the subject of coverage in the Programme Evaluation Report. I would just like to make a couple of points that may perhaps help.

One is in response to the question posed by the Swedish delegate, asking how many programmes we are actually covering. Just looking back over the past ten years, the 1986-87 document, there was another document called Review of the Regular Programme, a predecessor to the Programme Evaluation Report. Since then, there have been six editions, three in Review of the Regular Programme and three in Programme Evaluation Reports. We covered a total of 20 Sub-programmes, which is about one-fourth of the total number of Sub-programmes in the technical, economic areas, and three programmes out of 20 programmes.

Of course, this is a very low ratio but, in addition, I should point out that according to the format of the presentation we covered some 12 thematic subjects, such as the publication activities, the Special Relief Operations, activities linked to the Special Programme on emergency pest and disease control programmes. You may recall those. These thematic subjects are intended to cover, as much as possible, cross-programme nature of activities which are of interest to the Governing Bodies. Sometimes, we do respond to specific interest expressed by the Governing Bodies.

Now more generally, I'd like to address the question of coverage and in what way we should plan the coverage in the evaluations, which is very important matter. This of course, involves a number of related questions which are: in what depths we should report to you? How big should each report be? The fact that we have changed from the Review of the Regular Programme structure to Programme Evaluation Report was really to respond to the very clearly expressed desire of the Governing Bodies that these Reports be more evaluative and substantive, particularly in highlighting the effects, impact and sustainability aspects. So that means that in

moving into the Programme Evaluation Report, we have become more selective and I hope you find more in-depth. So, the really one important question we face is how to balance, in a very limited space, two conflicting needs. One is for in-depth analysis and then secondly, the need for balance, as much as possible, and wider coverage of the activities of the Organization.

We will take into account many of the constructive suggestions given to us, and we will explore various approaches possible, especially working closely with the Programme Committee. The introduction of a Strategic Planning Framework in the Organization, I think, would give us a very good framework to work on, both in terms of selecting topics, as well as any changes, modifications on format of reporting and some methodological aspects. I do not think I would be ready to go further than that, and I hope it will be useful.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you Mr Wade and Mr Kato for those helpful and clear responses. Before I sum up, does anyone wish to take the floor to pick up points that have just been made by the Secretariat? In that case I will move to my summing-up.

Twenty-seven people have spoken in this debate and what we have been talking about is a vitally important subject of institutional learning. It has attracted very wide interest and much wisdom based on practical experience shared among the Membership. We have had a range of constructive suggestions, we have heard some concerns and we have heard some warnings. I think we would all agree that the subject is moving forward successfully within FAO, but I think we would equally agree with the comment by the representative of Libya that there is room for further improvement. I am sure that point is well understood by the Secretariat.

Let me try and crystallize what has been said under five headings.

In the first place the Commission appreciated the improvements which have been introduced which have enhanced the Report's analytical content and its transparency, including, in particular, the clearer focus on Programme Objectives and Strategy, the inclusion of Programme Managers' Responses to each programme evaluation and the introduction of Summary Assessments on the Programme Performance based on the criteria for programme analysis, suggested by the Council.

Under the main heading, the Commission endorsed the Council's recommendations for further improvement of the Report's content and highlighted in particular the following things: first of all the need for more systematic analysis of the Effect and Impact of FAO Programmes; secondly, the Use of External Expertise in Programme Evaluation, bearing closely in mind the cost implications of doing that; thirdly, the further refinements in the criteria used for Summary Assessment.

Under the third heading, the Commission noted the on-going efforts of the Secretariat to address key deficiencies in the design of many FAO programmes, stressing in particular the importance of clearer formulation of objectives, priorities and implementation strategies and establishing a set of measurable performance targets, milestones and indicators, as well as effective feedback, especially for cross-cutting issues and lessons, from evaluation to programme planning and implementation, including, of course, feedback to the Medium-Term Plan.

Under the fourth heading, the Commission agreed with Council's recommendations with regard to FAO publications and, in particular, it decided to delegate to the Council the authority for making the necessary decision in implementing the proposed change in publication distribution from the Quota Distribution System to one based on a National Publication Account. The Commission highlighted the principle that all major FAO publications be issued in all five official languages, with appropriate flexibility.

Finally, and in conclusion, the Commission endorsed the Programme Evaluation Report, but at the same time emphasized the importance of fuller integration of evaluation into the programme

planning and management process of the Organization, of ensuring satisfactory coverage of FAO programmes and operations in evaluation work and progressive improvements in evaluation work, in line with the recommendations of the Programme Committee and the Council.

If you are content with that summing up, I propose that we conclude debate on this Agenda Item.

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

Estamos de acuerdo con su resumen. Quería saber si se ha incluido un aspecto al que muchas delegaciones se refirieron, sobre el hecho de que se observe un equilibrio entre las actividades normativas y de campo de la FAO. No sé si usted lo había señalado, pero mi delegación se refirió a éste. Creo que otras delegaciones lo hicieron y vuelvo a repetir, si usted lo señaló pido disculpas anticipadas.

CHAIRMAN

You have indeed pointed out an omission which I will be happy to rectify. You are correct that there were a number of references to that issue, and it is proper that they should be incorporated in the summing up.

14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

CHAIRMAN

May we therefore move on to our next Item of business, which is the Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003. This is Item 14 on the Agenda and the relevant documents which are listed on the Order of the Day are C 97/9, C 97/LIM/10 and, thirdly, a document which is not yet available but will be distributed as soon as possible, C 97/LIM/20, which is the report of the Council's deliberations on this issue.

I now propose to ask Mr Wade to introduce the Item. You have the floor, Mr Wade.

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

The Medium-Term Plan was considered, as you said, by the Council at its Hundred and Twelfth Session where, in fact, it raised a number of issues. The Council, and I am quoting from the Report of its Hundred and Twelfth Session, "the Council agreed that the Plan should be a tool for establishing agreement amongst the Membership on broad policy orientations and on priorities, it stressed that the prime purpose of the Plan should be to offer a strategic vision for the future, taking into account the universal character of FAO and the affinity between its normative and operational activities, based on careful analysis of the operating environment and the strategic choices open to the Organization, together with an implementation programme to carry this vision into effect". My reason for quoting this is that the Council then went on and requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the Programme Committee at its September Session, which would review and discuss the options of where we should go from here.

Let us be frank, what basically was being said was that the general feeling was that the Medium-Term Plan, as prepared, did not meet that requirement that it should establish agreement amongst the Membership on broad policy orientations and priorities. It was agreed we would not re-write the Plan at this stage, but that we would instead examine the process and come back to you with the process.

The contents of C 97/9 are, I think, completely valid in the sense that it does contain a valid list of priorities for the Organization. It does not, perhaps, meet your needs as regards a Strategic Framework for the future. So what I will do, with your permission, is concentrate on what the Secretariat proposes to do rather than concentrate on the content of the Plan itself.

In which case, we did present a paper to the Programme Committee and to the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees. That paper is not a Conference document, but it is available should Members not have already seen it. Its reference is JM 97/1. It was published in English, French, Spanish and Arabic, because that is the membership of those Committees. I apologize that it is not available in Chinese. We were a bit too late to try and produce it in Chinese. Please accept my apologies for that. If you need a copy, we will make photocopies of it to ensure that anybody who would like to look at it in more detail can do so.

I think it is worth going through exactly what the Secretariat was trying to propose.

The document we produced reviewed the current programme and budget process with a view to trying to identify the changes which would allow us to establish a process which was more firmly rooted in the strategic perspective, the longer-term perspective, because we saw immediately that one of the problems we were facing is that the six-year timescale in agricultural development terms is really inadequate. In fact, when you look at the strategic work we do in the substantive areas, we of course are looking at documents like AT 2010, 2015, many many years further ahead than six years.

We also wanted to look for a document which would meet your requirements, that it better convey the Organization's objectives to Governments, to the public and, of course, to the staff of the Organization. We had heard the loud and clear calls that we should strengthen the pertinence of our programmes, their impact and their cost-effectiveness. So we want a planning process that can address these issues. We clearly want to do the usual things of avoiding duplication and of streamlining activities. We also wanted to try to create a better integrated set of programme planning documents for your consideration because we have to satisfy your needs. If we fail to do that, then these documents become paper on the shelf instead of basic guidance to the Organization as to what it is trying to achieve and how it should go about it.

To give you a framework for the solution we proposed, can I mention what set of documents we intended to produce. The first was a Strategic Framework. This first document would cover from 2000 to 2015, so it is covering a 15-year period. We thought it could be updated some several times during that period. The Programme Committee's reaction was "well it should be updated on the basis that it is required to be updated". If some major event comes along which changes the strategic objectives of the institution, then of course that document needs to be updated, regardless of whether it is due to be updated or not. On the other hand it may last quite well. It may well be that it is sound and lasts for the entire period. However, in reality we would expect to update it every now and then, maybe every six years or so. We are hoping to produce the first draft of that document--and we mean draft because we believe that this is a document which will need to go through several revisions-- for May 1998 for the Programme and Finance Committee meetings in that month.

The next document in the set of Programme and Budget documents would be the Medium-Term Plan. So that would be the replacement of the document that you are actually considering today. We think it still should be a for six-year period, and we think it should be a rolling plan that is updated every two years. We will attempt to get the first version of that, the new version of that, to the September Session of the Programme and Finance Committees in September 1998.

Now, I have to say that we are very nervous about that particular commitment and the Programme Committee considered that this might be over ambitious. May I explain why? I will explain why by going on to the Programme Model. We are proposing, as you know, a new programme model which structures our work in programmes or projects with a six-year timeframe. You will see the first pilot test of that in the Programme of Work and Budget document for Programme 2.1.1, Natural Resources. Now what is important about that concept is that it develops a series of projects with clearly-defined, time-bound objectives to be met in this six-year timeframe--not necessarily six, some of them may be four, some of them may be a little bit longer, but six we see as being a realistic target. So we will have clear time-bounded objectives, we will identify the outputs that are to be produced to achieve those objectives, we will place the outputs within

particular two-year periods, within biennia in other words, and we will identify the resources required to support that process over the full six years and by biennium.

You can see immediately that you probably have the foundation there of your Medium-Term Plan because it is the six-year projects or programmes which will become the basis of the Medium-Term Plan. Now in describing this process to you, I am describing how it should be for the future. Obviously by September 1998, we will not have the new Programme Model fully implemented, therefore we cannot have a full version of the new Medium-Term Plan. So what we are now looking at is what transitional techniques we can use to produce something that is equally valid and useful, but which can do so within the constraints of the fact that we are in a transition period.

That takes me to the third document in the series which would be the Programme of Work and Budget. Now it seems to me that if we get this right, we will have a sound Strategic Framework which is adopted by Member Nations. We will have a Medium-Term Plan covering the six-year period and contributing to the strategic objectives with clear programme objectives for each programme or project within it. We will have done, in fact, our homework on the programme side of the Programme of Work and Budget. So the document that you now know as the Programme of Work and Budget will become much more of a budgetary document. We would hope shorter, more concise and probably much more orientated towards the budgetary aspect than towards the programme aspect which we should have been satisfied in the earlier documents.

Finally, our set of Programme and Budget documents will also address the *post-facto* reporting and that would include the Programme Evaluation Report which will address selective in-depth evaluations of what we have been attempting to do and the impact we have had, and then secondly a Programme Implementation Report which will be more about the application of resources and the outputs produced in a quantitative sense rather than a qualitative sense. Now some questions have been raised about the utility of this last document, and we recognize we do need to look at it more closely to make sure that it either retains its utility or, alternatively, if it is not useful, eliminate it.

There is already a suggestion on the table which is to combine the Programme Implementation Report with the current Annual Report. The Annual Report is a sort of glossy which is quite useful for a public relations purpose. Then we have the annual statements of accounts, which come to the Conference and then we have this Programme Implementation Report. The thought is that it may be quite useful to bring these together into a single biennial reporting practice which would address the entire programmes of the Organization.

That is an overview of what we see as being the framework for a set of Programme and Budgeting documents which would try and address the concerns of the Council at its Hundred and Twelfth Session. However, what you will see in there that is new, of course, is the Strategic Framework and the document that the Programme Committee addressed was, in fact, examining the process that the Secretariat was proposing to follow. If you will bear with me, I think it will be worth going through that process with you so that you have a fair understanding of what it is that is being proposed.

By way of introduction, the Secretariat did go out and try and get some intellectual support for its efforts. We had an expert paper prepared by Dr Robert Smith who is, in fact, the author of a book on strategic planning and was a Director of the Civil Service College in the UK. He produced a paper on "Best Practice in Strategic Planning in the Public Sector" for us. That is only available in English, I am afraid, and it has been made available to Members of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee. If anybody is interested personally in having a copy, of course I would be more than happy to make it available. We also drew heavily on the work of Mr Bryson who is the author of a book entitled *Strategic Planning for the Public and Non-profit Organizations* published in 1995 in the United States. This I have to say we found very helpful because of its particular recognition of the need to take into account the political aspect of strategic planning. It does not make it a simple quantitative analysis. It says that we need to

recognize that in this process there is, what he calls, political reason and that you have to be able to take it into account. In fact he uses a particular technique or concentrates on a particular technique to do that, and I will come back to that.

The steps that we have derived from the work of these two experts that would apply to FAO are as follows:

The first one is to identify the Organizational Mandate. That in a sense is rather straightforward. We have a Constitution which states what our mandate is and that cannot change unless you, the Member Nations, change the Constitution. On the other hand, the point that these writers make is that your mandate is always subject to influences arising out of the demands of the stakeholders as events occurs. In our case, the examples you can see immediately are UNCED, the outcome of UNCED Agenda 21, etc., the outcome of the World Food Summit, and FAO's role in that process. So you can see that there is a whole series of conferences, meetings, deliberations occurring which do not change the mandate, but do tend to influence which parts of it you must give priority to in the forthcoming period. So this is the first step that we will undertake.

The second step, and this is the step I was referring to when I said that Bryson insists that you need to take into account political reason, is what is called an Identification of Stakeholder Requirements. Stakeholders are defined as any person, group or organization that can place a claim on the organization's attention, resources or output, or is affected by that output. It is a very broad group of people and organizations, but there is increasing recognition that public institutions must broaden their view of the group to whom they are in some way accountable. Now, of course, FAO's primary stakeholders are the Governments. There is no question about that, but an initial analysis that we carried out in the paper also identified, for example the United Nations System itself and the other Agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions, of course, the CGIAR and its centres, Non-Governmental Organizations and Inter-Governmental Organizations, donors, the bilateral donors and the multilateral donors, civil society and the private sector, which probably can be grouped with the NGOs. We did identify the media. I have to say the Programme Committee felt that that was not necessarily valid and, at this stage, we would not intend to pursue that particular stakeholder. We identified food consumers and farmers and producers including, of course, women. But we also recognized in our own analysis that to be able to contact those stakeholders was not terribly realistic, and we would have to rely on the analysis, or the identification, of stakeholders' reactions in the form of NGOs and civil society to be able to try and capture the likely views of farmers and producers, etc. Finally, there is the Secretariat itself. The Secretariat in the form of its technical officers, its management and of its staff associations.

So these are the stakeholders whom we feel we have to approach. We have to identify the criteria by which the stakeholders judge us, this institution, and judge our performance - how well the Organization performs, in their perception. How are we going to do that? We grouped the stakeholders as follows, first of all with regards to Governments, the Member Nations themselves, we believe we can put reliance upon the constitutional structure of the Organization, its Governing Bodies. For major partners, such as the UN, the various funds, UNDP etc., the programmes, especially WFP of course, the Bretton Woods institutions, CGIAR etc., we believe that we will have to be a bit careful because the conventional process of circulating draft documents can be a bit fruitless, I should say. So we are looking for new ways to try and get really serious communication with these institutions, perhaps through teleconferencing; so that ideas can be discussed and we can get some real feedback. Civil society at large, which includes a vast array of actors, is a particular challenge, but we have had some success recently in running "e-mail" conferences. So we are looking at that as a possible approach to that particular group. That would include the private sector, it would include NGOs, and some of the IGOs would fall into that category as well. Finally, of course, we have the staff and the Staff Representative Bodies. Clearly part of this exercise comes from inside the institution, and the staff have to be totally involved in this process and they would be.

That takes us to the next step which is to prepare a Draft Mission Statement. Now can I say it is very much a Draft Mission Statement because both of the writers say, this could be done now or it could be done later, the sequence of events is something which you can vary depending on the circumstance. But it is probably a good idea to try and start getting something crystallized on paper, even if you know that later on you are going to have to change it. It could be in the form of four or five objectives reflecting the priorities to which the large majority of stakeholders can subscribe. This is what you are looking for. It involves, however, immediately going beyond the global exercise of seeing those for the institution and starting to carry out this exercise within the Departments of FAO. Each Department will then have to start doing this exercise themselves within their mandate, for their stakeholders and developing their mission statement which presumably will result in sub-objectives for the main strategic objectives that we develop in the Draft Mission Statement. That also requires, and someone raised this this morning, the necessity to look at it from another dimension which is the regional dimension. It is clear that the strategic objectives for our European Members are different from the strategic objectives from our African Members. So we have got to try and get this dimension into the process at the same time, and here we would, of course, be consulting our regional offices who are in the best position to identify for us the regional priorities in this process.

I think simultaneously with that process we will be able to start two other exercises. The first is to perform an Analysis of the External Environment and the second is to perform an Internal Analysis of the Institution itself.

Now, in looking at the External Analysis, we sort of see two aspects to it for this institution. The first is the need to foresee new developments and trends in world agricultural development, and in the food security situation. For example, if we were doing this fifteen years ago, we would have correctly identified what was going to happen in globalization of trade and would we have responded to it satisfactorily. Because that is what you are trying to do, you are trying to see what is going to change that the institution needs to address, that it needs to adapt to, that it needs perhaps to acquire new skills to be able to accommodate. So it is that sort of thinking and here, of course, we would be relying on the work we already do in documents such as AT 2000, etc.

However, the second aspect of the External Analysis is the Conventional Analysis of Opportunities and Threats - this is the normal terminology. The document actually has the terminology "Opportunities and Hazards" because there was some sensitivity inside about there being threats. It is a rather unusual terminology but it is the same thing. Here what we should be doing is looking to see what is happening out there that would affect how we respond to the externalities of the institution. So we would go through the political, economic, social and technological areas of activities, if I can call them that to try to see what is happening outside that represents opportunities for the institution. For example, scientific advance is a simple one to understand; that is, the advances in telecommunication capacity, videoconferencing which are critical for global institutions and their being able to perform. If you identify these as opportunities, then you recognize this is something where you need a strategy to be able to take advantage so that your comparative advantage is maintained.

There are also threats, and you should recognize them. There is, for example, the perception of the United Nations System. It has declined. There is no question that over the last, how many years, the idea in the public mind of the UN is something that is not as hopeful as it was. We have got to do something about that. We have to recognize that threat, because it means the political support from the public is not what it used to be, and we have to do something about it.

So, the External Analysis will identify these two aspects. That is, the expected changes in trends in agricultural development and in the food security situation, and also the opportunities and threats which face the institution that should result in some strategic issues being identified.

The Internal Analysis is the other way round, inward looking, looking at the Organization. We put it in the form of two questions. The first question is what are the things about the Organization now, in its performance, structure and style which could impede its ability to fulfil

its mission? You are being asked to do a critique of yourself. What are the things that are preventing you to perform. Then secondly, there is the more positive view. What are our core competencies? What are the abilities or actions which we can be relied upon to perform well? With knowledge of these two things you are again in a position to start making judgements about whether you can respond to the strategic objectives that you are starting to clarify more and more, and if you cannot respond, what are the strategic issues that you should address to allow you to do so?

I am sorry I have been so long, I am nearly there, you will be relieved to know.

The final step in the Strategic Framework is to actually identify these Strategic Issues and Actions. In each case we want a succinct description of the Strategic Issue. We want the factors which make that issue a fundamental challenge for the Organization to be identified, and we want a statement of the consequences of failing to address each issue because we will not be able to address all the issues. We are going to have to put some aside, and we are going to have to concentrate on some.

We should, in fact, end up with a document that will have an overview of those issues, that is, the issues affecting agricultural and rural development in the medium to long-term, derived from FAO's own assessments; a re-statement of the Mandate taking into account the emphases arising from the decisions from major international conferences; an identification of the stakeholders and their expectations of the Organization; a summary of the outcome of the external and internal analyses, with a statement of strengths and weaknesses and of threats and opportunities which should include, I think, the identification of opportunities for alliances with other institutions, a very important part of the analysis of opportunities; a Mission Statement containing a small number of high-level strategic core objectives supported by the next level of strategic objectives; definition of strategic issues that fall outside those core objectives, actions which have to be taken, that are not so much towards the objectives but about what the institution has to do to put itself in a good position; we hope, resource implications in broad terms -- and here I would like to be a little bit careful because I am not sure how easy that will be; and then, in the case of each of the strategic objectives, a first attempt at identifying the indicators which would be used to measure and monitor whether we are making the necessary progress.

That is the small task which we have set ourselves for May 1998. We do not expect to produce for you in May 1998 a final document. We expect however to have carried out a considerable amount of analysis and to be able to provide you something to -- if I may say -- get your teeth into and we expect you to tear it apart, argue over it and to give us instructions about improving it and taking it on to its next stage. I imagine we will go through several redrafts before we get it right.

I think I would like to stop there. I have taken enough of your time. I am sorry I have been so long, but I think a lot of Members feel this is a very important issue and therefore worthy of our time. I would just comment that the Council, in reviewing the report of the Programme and Finance Committee, thought there should be some flexibility in the implementation of the proposed changes, but it recognized the importance of a thorough preparation of the Strategic Framework and of having an intense process for its formulation and development involving all stakeholders. That is the conclusion of the document which will, in fact, be C 97/LIM/20. It is the only statement which refers to this issue, so the absence of the document is not a serious constraint to your debate.

CHAIRMAN

Let me recapitulate a number of points on what we are considering this afternoon, and where we have got to.

We have two documents, and are expecting a third. The documents are the Medium-Term Plan and two associated documents. Mr Wade has taken what I regard as the very appropriate and pardonable liberty of inviting us to consider these documents alongside a set of proposals which

have been made in an exceedingly important paper. This is a paper that has gone to the Programme and Finance Committees, paper JM 97/1. That is not, as Mr Wade says, a formal Conference paper, although it has, of course, been very widely distributed and, I know, commented on.

If I may say so, the absence of that paper ought not to hinder our discussion of what is contained in it, since we have just been given what I can only describe as a dazzling and very clear introduction to the approach which is set out there. In doing that, Mr Wade mentioned a number of texts on which the Secretariat has drawn in working out their own ideas for this approach.

I will personally echo what he says about the paper written by Robert Smith, *Best Practice in Strategic Management*, and I am delighted that the Secretariat is prepared to make it available. It is, in my judgement, the best single short introduction to strategic planning that has been written, well-worth your attention, if you have time, even your attention over the weekend.

We have a set of documents which relate to what has been done in terms of planning within the Organization so far. We have a Medium-Term Plan which, in effect, is largely set, and we have also been invited to give our attention to a set of proposals developed since the June 1997 Session of the Council for a new approach to Strategic Planning within the Organization.

I think that is all that need be said by way of introduction. Indeed, the introductions from the platform have already been very long, but I would hope helpfully so.

The floor is now open for comment.

E. Wayne DENNEY (United States of America)

We are very grateful to Mr Wade for his extremely valuable introductory remarks. They coincide very much with the essence of the comments we want to make on this item.

As we noted during the June Council meeting, the current version of the Medium-Term Plan has undergone several changes in tone and focus. In recent years, as both FAO Members and the Secretariat tried to get comfortable with the Plan, we have congratulated the Secretariat on a series of gradual, albeit slow, improvements. While the 1998-2003 Plan does contain some valuable information, is presented in a concise fashion and discusses several priority areas that we can support, we generally believe that it is not well-focused. It falls short of providing us a vision for the future. It does little more than restate arguments for the next Programme of Work and Budget.

We are pleased to see that the document concludes that the Plan will have to be implemented in a period of budgetary constraint. We agree with that conclusion. The Plan has several positive features, including the attention given to developing appropriate policies, the need to give more opportunities to women, the emphasis on agricultural research, biotechnology, trade liberalization, science-based standard-setting, and the importance of expanded partnerships, but we believe there is over-emphasis on the World Food Summit and food security, narrowly defined as FAO's primary focus, and not enough attention on other recent international conferences, which the World Food Summit complements.

FAO Governing Bodies also have sent us a number of important signals on future programme direction, which are not well-reflected in the document under review.

As the international community in the UN System committed in 1992, by promoting sustainable development as their broadest priority objective, the World Food Summit further assisted by giving us a broader understanding of what constitutes food security. This large erosion and multi-disciplinary approach is inadequately addressed in the Medium-Term Plan under review, nor is adequate recognition given to the vital importance of FAO's normative functions in contributing to world food security.

We find that much of the beginning portion of the document concentrates on areas where FAO may not have a comparative advantage, while the last half of the document does not give us

enough indication of where FAO is heading, beyond what we know from reading the proposed Programme of Work and Budget.

For these reasons, and as reflected in Mr Wade's comments earlier, we believe that time is right to move to strategic budgeting in subsequent revisions of the Plan. Through the efforts of the Programme Committee and its Joint Meeting with the Finance Committee, a number of innovative ideas have evolved which this Conference must seize upon.

By employing a larger-term Strategic Framework of perhaps 12 to 15 years, and integrating it with a programme-based Medium-Term Plan and budget-oriented Programme of Work and Budget, we will have a useful family of planning documents. This approach should enable us to dispense with both the Programme Budget Outline, as well as the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

Moreover, by moving the timing of the technical committee meetings earlier in the year of the Conference, they will be positioned to address programme priorities and thereby provide meaningful input into the next biennium's Programme of Work.

These changes are significant and will require a lot of adjustment, both by Members and by the Secretariat, but we believe time is right for imaginative change. The Conference needs to send a clear signal on this matter.

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

Ante todo deseamos agradecer la exhaustiva y bien centrada presentación que hiciera el señor Wade sobre éste que consideramos es un Tema muy importante. Nos reservamos el derecho a participar en una instancia posterior del debate conforme evolucione.

En este sentido estimamos que el Plan a Mediano Plazo constituye un documento útil ya que presenta un horizonte claro sobre las perspectivas de la seguridad alimentaria y los desafíos a plazo medio. En este contexto resaltamos la necesidad de intensificar la respuesta de la FAO a los problemas agrícolas y alimentarios en el mundo, a cuyo propósito establece este texto tres condiciones básicas que queremos resaltar: primero, la movilización de recursos; segundo, la aproximación de la FAO a sus Estados Miembros; y tercero, la ampliación de la cooperación. Compartimos las orientaciones estratégicas que a mediano plazo propone el texto, particularmente el párrafo 53 en el que se enuncian las características que debe tener el nuevo modelo de agricultura, así como el párrafo 54, en el que se establecen las tres esferas que deben orientar las tareas de la FAO en el mediano plazo.

Con respecto al párrafo 81 del documento en el que se establece una mayor participación de las Organizaciones No Gubernamentales y del sector privado en las actividades de la FAO a partir de 1998, consideramos que dicha participación es de particular importancia. Sin embargo, estimamos que ésta debe darse en coordinación y en el marco de los gobiernos correspondientes.

Lo planteado en el párrafo 85 entorno a la concurrencia de Organismos Multilaterales y Bilaterales a las actividades de la FAO, es de una particular relevancia, en especial por lo que respecta a los organismos financieros y al propio PNUD.

Señor Presidente, quiero ahora referirme a la propuesta que se abordara en la reciente Sesión Conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas. En este sentido estamos de acuerdo sobre la necesidad de elaborar un documento global y de largo plazo en el que se especifiquen las estrategias de la Organización con una visión más amplia a la que actualmente se establece. Ello porque apoyamos, como lo señalamos en el tema anterior, el proceso de planeación de la Organización. Definir un marco es un aspecto que consideramos importante. Creo que la tarea que señaló el señor Wade es un ejercicio que la Organización debe emprender, pero sin embargo con algunos elementos importantes.

Primeramente queremos resaltar el hecho de que se debe establecer un marco muy bien definido, como él lo señaló, con actores y participantes bien claros y también con plazos. Él estableció que

para mayo de 1998 podría tener un primer borrador. Él se refirió a los accionistas que en el documento del Consejo sobre las Sesiones Conjuntas de esos Comités llama en español “partes interesadas”, que a lo mejor es un concepto, por lo menos en español, más adecuado pero desde luego aceptamos el enfoque del señor Wade. Queremos resaltar en este sentido el carácter intergubernamental de la FAO. Yo creo que la participación de los Gobiernos debe ser el centro de este ejercicio. Si bien desde luego, como lo señalamos, no descartamos la posibilidad de otras participaciones, de otras observaciones, queremos enfatizar este elemento de la participación.

Otro aspecto que consideramos importante es el hecho de que en este ejercicio se mantenga el espíritu y la redacción de los Textos Básicos de la Organización. Creo que el ejercicio no debe dar pie para un nuevo ejercicio de reformas; creo que éste se debe mover exclusivamente en el plano de la estrategia, en el plano del marco formal, legal actual de la propia Organización.

Otros dos aspectos que consideramos importantes serían el aporte regional, o sea pedir a las conferencias regionales la opinión sobre esta estrategia de largo plazo, así como también resultaría positivo seguir un ejercicio similar al que se hizo para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, que es el hecho de establecer posiblemente una Consulta Nacional sobre lo que cada Gobierno pretende o percibe que la FAO debe realizar en el siglo XXI en un largo plazo.

Estos son elementos iniciales que mi delegación quería señalar y, vuelvo a reiterar, nos reservamos el derecho de participar en una fase posterior de este mismo debate a la luz de las participaciones de otros países.

CHAIRMAN

Mexico, thank you very much indeed. I note that you may wish to take the floor again in the light of the debate.

Ulf SVENSSON (Sweden)

I would like, if you would accept, to speak after the statement that will be made on behalf of the European Union and its Member States by the Netherlands.

J.J. NEETESON (Netherlands)

I would like to give a very brief reaction today.

The European Union and its Member States very much welcome the clear introduction by Mr Wade on the new programming model, based on the document submitted to the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees. We find the content of the new programming model very interesting. We especially appreciate Mr Wade's elaboration on the Strategic Framework.

In the June Session of the Council, the European Union stressed the need to include strategic components in the medium-term planning process.

I would like to come back on Monday with a much more detailed reaction and, at that time, speak on behalf of the European Union and its Member States again.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you, the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union.

With the agreement of the Commission, I will now give the floor to Sweden.

Ulf SVENSSON (Sweden)

Let me first express my support to the statement just made by the Netherlands on behalf of the European Union and its Member States.

Let me, through you, Mr Chairman, express my thanks to Mr Wade for the excellent presentation of a very important issue.

We are talking about a new programming process in FAO -- a very ambitious one. We are talking about addressing the major opportunities and hazards in the first 15 years of the next millennium. Strategic issues will be defined, so-called long-term strategic objectives will be adopted. Strategic priorities and strategic action for the first 15 years of the next century will be addressed. These are major political issues. They will have to be dealt with actively by governments. Let me, first of all, express my full support to Mexico, talking about national preparations like before the Summit, before we go to decisions of such major long-term policies, and decide where this Organization will go in the start of the next millennium.

I am very impressed with the professional way in which the Secretariat has addressed this problem of preparing the first draft of this important political document, the *FAO Strategy for the year 2000 to 2015*. Although we had expected nothing less from FAO, still, whenever such a brilliant document comes, like JM 97/1, you are happy as a delegate.

Mr Wade stated that, among all stakeholders, the Governments are the most important and, for sure, they are. It is we, the Governments, which will decide on this Strategy. We will listen of course to the civil society, to the private or corporate sector, to the NGOs and the IGOs, but we will take the decisions.

I fully agree with what Mr Wade said, that this has to be addressed within the constitutional structure of FAO. Ultimately, it is the Conference which will have to decide upon these most important policy matters. It has to go through the Council.

We think, also, it has to go through the Committee on World Food Security, and the other technical committees, where Governments will give their views on more precise matters. We fully agree with Mexico that this will have to go through, not only the regional committees, the regional secretariats, the FAO Secretariat, but primarily through Governments, through the Regional Conferences, and we would like to have this matter high on the Agenda of the Regional Conferences, for instance, in Europe, in May of next year.

We think that no more than that is needed to prepare on these highly vital issues, where each Government has its own assessment of the future trends and problems that we will meet and how to address them. If that could be given even more precision and based among the population, and the administrative structure, such as through a national preparatory process, they will have to be brought in early in the day in preparing this important document.

We think of a structure within the constitutional structure of FAO that was tested in the preparation for the World Food Summit. In a year's time, we all met, all Governments, all Members of the FAO, and we negotiated hard-to-reach document, the Summit Plan of Action, which we were all behind, all involved in. It is our document, we are the owners of that document, we negotiated it. It also addressed major issues, some of the major challenges before the next millennium and, now, in preparing for broader issues in the Strategy for FAO, we should use a similar process within the constitutional structure of FAO.

It is too narrow and too little just to relate to the Programme Committee. It is elected by Governments, but still it is only a few persons, and here all the Membership will have to be involved, will have to be the owner of this process.

We would therefore suggest that an *Ad Hoc* Working Group be set up, open to all Members of FAO, in the same way as the Committee on World Food Security served as the body for inter-governmental negotiations between all the Members of this Organization. We think that group should meet for an organizational session and lay down the terms of reference in its Programme of Work to reach, in time, an agreed Strategic Framework so that it can be adopted by the Conference in 1999.

We think that there might be a need for one more negotiating session in the autumn of 1998 and two, one in the spring and one in the autumn, of 1999. It could be too little because the issues are very important and there will be differences, but we will be able to resolve them through a

consensus, the way we did before the World Food Summit. We will all be actively involved, and we will all be the owners of this process and its important outcome.

We know also from the Summit that all countries will have to be actively involved and, therefore, that resources will have to be mobilized to secure a full participation from the developing countries, from capitals. We have to mobilize the necessary financial resources for that, and it is up to us primarily to ask donors to make all efforts to do that. Otherwise, the four sessions will have a budgetary implication of about US\$ 800 000 for the two-year period, US\$ 200 000 per conference. About the same amount will have to be raised in order to secure one participant from each developing country from capitals.

There are other stakeholders who were mentioned by Mr Wade, and I refer to the UN System and the Bretton Wood Institutions. We know that the Secretary-General of the United Nations presented very important proposals last July and that a process has been set in train in New York, involving Governments in inter-governmental negotiations on reforms of the UN System, including all the Agencies.

We think, from the Swedish side, that it is very important that this inter-governmental process go on not only in New York, but also here in Rome, in FAO, because we know very well, here, both Governments and FAO, what is needed and what should be done by this Organization. Then there will be very useful and creative interaction between the inter-governmental process open to all the Members of FAO here, and in the governmental process among the diplomats in New York.

Let me once more say a great thank you to the Secretariat and I hope that we will be able, from this Conference, to launch the inter-governmental process to negotiate and agree on the important document, the long-term Strategy of FAO, so that it can be adopted on the threshold of the next millennium by the next Conference.

Ni HONGXING (China) (Original language Chinese)

I should like to begin by thanking Mr Wade for his very detailed introduction.

We have carefully examined the text of the Medium-Term Plan for 1998-2003 and as everyone knows, the period we are covering here is one where FAO is faced with both challenges and opportunities. Throughout the world there are 800 million people who are suffering from hunger. The situation of hunger and malnutrition is a very serious scourge. The increase in production and the improvement in trade conditions is a very serious challenge with which we are faced.

Last year we successfully held the World Food Summit. This gave a great boost, helping to accelerate development in the world. In developing countries in particular now we have established a key goal, the establishment of world food security. The international community is very concerned because of the situation of malnutrition and it is taking measures to overcome these problems. These are opportunities which we should grasp.

We believe that the Medium-Term Plan, which we are discussing, has been prepared on the basis of these challenges and opportunities. It has provided the major guidelines for the work of our Organization in the two or three years to come. We are highly appreciative of this approach.

I have a few specific remarks I would like to add. First, it follows from the Medium-Term Plan that FAO has established as priorities, the protection of the environment and food security and is preparing to provide services for policies and financial support. We support this programme.

Secondly, obtaining resources is a very important task if we are to reach the goals fixed at the World Food Summit, to help developing countries develop their own agriculture. I am very pleased to note that in the Medium-Term Plan, FAO has made this a priority and we trust that it will step up this work in order to achieve concrete results.

For several years now, governments' assistance has been decreasing to 0.25 percent of the GNP. It is considerably less than the 0.7 percent which was established in 1987. We hope that countries will reverse this trend, and help others develop their agriculture.

In order to increase efficiency and introduce technical reform we agree with the measures undertaken by FAO to achieve these results. We believe that clear results can be achieved.

The Medium-Term Plan is a rolling Plan, and it is important that the various plans be linked together. The preparation should follow a pattern. We do not need to recommence all the work on every occasion.

Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN (Bangladesh)

We thank the Secretariat for providing us with an excellent document, which is the Medium-Term Plan for 1998-2003. This document provides a clear view of the challenges facing us, as well as identifying areas where actions are required to be concentrated. The brevity of the document is praiseworthy.

In general, we agree with the strategic orientations and the three groups of activities identified to guide FAO actions in the medium-term.

We are in complete agreement with the view expressed in the document that sustainable food security envisages a new development paradigm which is less concerned with movements in GDP but with reduced poverty and people's participation, while at the same time conserving the natural resource base.

However, it is not clear from the Plan what concrete steps will be taken to remove food insecurity of the vast number of landless, resource-starved, marginal farmers in the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs).

Production intensification is important but insufficient to help this helpless majority. Equitable distribution of productive resources and creation of productive employment opportunities both off and on farm are important. Unfortunately, the new model of agriculture mentioned in paragraph 53 does not incorporate this criteria.

We would also like to make some specific comments on the programme orientations in the medium-term perspectives. Assisting countries in implementing the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and attention to expanded aquaculture production are moves in the right direction.

FAO assistance to LIFDC countries in Asia in aquaculture as part of an integrated farming system has brought positive results. In addition, to help these countries integrate themselves with international trade, FAO should assist through technology diffusion, products safety and quality control measures.

With regard to forestry, we are willing to lend our support to FAO in implementing its major programmes. We agree with the assessment that in the management of forest resources, a balance among environmental, economic and social objectives must be maintained. Harsh economic realities in the LIFDCs which encourage deforestation and consequent loss of bio-diversity, have to be kept in mind while FAO undertakes programmes for these countries.

Also important are issues of community forestry development and capacity-building measures in less developed countries.

We also support FAO's continued efforts to encourage Integrated Pest Management and Integrated Plant Nutrition systems as a means of increasing production efficiency and of reducing production variability.

We urge that TCP and the Special Programme for Food Security be given special considerations, and efforts should be made to increase allocations under the Regular Programme budget and extra-budgetary arrangements.

The Special Programme, we believe, is an appropriate initiative for LIFDCs and it is expected to reorient the investment priorities of national governments and multinational funding agencies towards agriculture and food production.

One final comment we would like to make relates to quantification. Currently, the Programme achievements are not accurately measurable. We appreciate the new programming approach developed for Programme 2.1.1, Natural Resources. We request FAO to consider transforming a few more of the selected programmes of action into a set of quantified goals and measurable indicators of performance.

Luigi FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italie)

J'ai longuement réfléchi sur cet excellent document et j'en ai longuement parlé avec mes autorités, qui m'ont donné beaucoup d'éléments que je voudrais soumettre à l'attention de cette assemblée. De plus, le Directeur nous a donné pas mal de "*food for thought*" et d'éléments ultérieurs d'intervention, mais, si vous me le permettez, je ferai mes observations après que la Délégation des Pays-Bas aura parlé au nom des Pays Membres de l'Union européenne.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you Italy. I take that to mean that you would wish to speak after the Netherlands has intervened, as it would wish to do so on Monday. Is that a correct interpretation? It is. Thank you for that clarification.

Khairuddin Md. TAHIR (Malaysia)

The Malaysian delegation congratulates the Secretariat for the documents prepared related to this Agenda Item and the excellent introduction by Mr Wade.

The Medium-Term Plan provides the Strategic Framework and charts the path for agriculture development activities for the coming six years.

The Medium-Term Plan, as anticipated, draws substantially from the commitments of the World Food Summit's Plan of Action, which the international community and Member Nations have agreed to implement collectively and individually.

The Medium-Term Plan should also address, in a comprehensive manner, the key elements essential for creating an effective, enabling environment that will make agriculture productive, attractive and sustainable.

In addition, FAO must continue to identify key policy issues in agriculture, either at national, regional or international levels, that will contribute to global food security and equitable international trading systems.

In an era of globalization, trade liberalization and economy integration, decisions and actions by a country, region or even individuals or happenings in one part of the world may have adverse consequences on others or other regions. In this regard, the Medium-Term Plan, as well as the long-term strategic framework, should also reflect, where appropriate, recent global events and phenomena, either natural or caused by human intervention, which have long-term effects and impacts on agriculture, international food trade and the environment and the operational framework as to how FAO and Member Nations should address these events and phenomena. Examples are the *El Niño* and forest fires, in particular in Southeast Asia, which have immediate and long-term impact on productivity and income.

In this regard, it is also essential for FAO to further assess its strategic alliances with other UN and international agencies, in particular those dealing with climate, human health and the environment. Innovative new arrangements with these agencies, in our opinion, will result in better monitoring, coordination and planning programmes to address these newly-emerging challenges. We believe that through regional and international commitment and cooperation initiated by FAO, effective strategies and action plans can be formulated and implemented to meet these challenges.

Finally, Malaysia would also applaud the efforts currently undertaken by FAO in upgrading information and communications technology and infrastructure, which make FAO's information

and data bases more accessible to Member Nations. Likewise, FAO should also consider providing advice and technical support to Member Nations in upgrading their capacity and capability in their agriculture information technology so as to facilitate greater information flow and sharing, which would be useful for our planning purposes.

In conclusion, let me allude to what the Director-General said this morning and put our limited resources to maximum use. He said this morning that we do not lack or need more meetings, plans and conferences, but the resources and political will to implement the plans that we already have and the commitments that we have made in our conferences and meetings.

Shahid RASHID (Pakistan)

The Medium-Term Plan for the six-year period, 1998-2003, indeed has been in our hands for the last six months. We have commented on it before. I do not wish to repeat what was said earlier.

Suffice it to say that we endorse the programme priorities and support the emphasis and orientation of the Plan, including its thrust for activities for follow-up to the World Food Summit.

Although FAO is not alone in the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action, this Organization does have a leading role. We believe that it would have failed in its responsibilities if it had shirked from orientating its programmes with the aim of achieving food security, especially in the Low-Income Food-Deficit countries.

We, therefore, fully support this thrust and would seek an even more clear correlation between the programme priorities and the need to convert the World Food Summit objectives into concrete action.

As regards to the strategic planning process, elaborated with such eloquence by Mr Wade, we welcome this initiative. In principle, we are appreciative of the outline of the process envisaged, leading from a fifteen-year strategic region through a six-year Medium-term Plan and a biannual budget-free framework.

At this stage, of course, we are eager to see how this process will be structured and will evolve. We would, however, like to stress that this process should be carried out through the existing Bodies of this Organization within the constitutional framework.

Creation of new mechanisms or setting in motion elaborate negotiation processes, which may prove expensive and time-consuming, may not serve the desired purpose. Of course, inputs from all relevant actors and partners, particularly from national Governments, FAO regional bodies and other institutions in the System should be actively solicited so that a strategic region is a comprehensive one, a realistic one. It is one that is able to meet with the aspirations and needs of developing countries as a new century begins.

Herijanto SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia)

The Indonesian delegation has always considered the Medium-Term Plan to be extremely important as it constitutes the principal policy of FAO and it provides the framework for the biennial Programme of Work and Budget.

In this regard, I believe that the Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 has been designed to enable FAO to meet the emerging trend and challenges, as well as the need of its Member Nations.

The Medium-Term Plan would also address measures to be taken by FAO to carry out the mandate given by the World Food Summit, that the number of hungry and undernourished people is reduce by half by the year 2015.

Since the major problems of food security are global in nature, we firmly believe that they can only be effectively dealt with through international cooperation and constructive programme implementation, as mandated by the World Food Summit.

Having said that, my delegation is of the view that this should also be further elaborated in the Medium-Term Plan.

As to the new model of programming, which has been eloquently elaborated by Mr Wade, my delegation sees the merit of the proposal. We share the view of the distinguished delegate of Sweden, who pointed out it is a major political issue.

Therefore, we would like to see the detailed course of action proposed by the Secretariat. We consider that the view of the major stakeholder in the Organization, that is the Governments, should be listened to before subsequent steps are taken to adopt that framework.

In this regard, we would like to entertain the view expressed by the delegate of Malaysia in pointing out the new challenges facing this Organization, including the World Food Summit objective to reduce the number of hungry and undernourished people by half by the year 2015.

In conclusion, the Indonesian delegation would like to reiterate its strong commitment to enhance and strengthen FAO and its activities.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

I will break my presentation into two areas, the first being the content of the Medium-Term Plan as it stands at the moment. The second to try and take up some of the points that Mr Wade has made and has been brought up in interventions, so far, by my colleagues.

On the Medium-term Plan as it stands at the moment. Australia, while noting that there are certainly some elements of prospects and challenges which have been included in the document for the Organization in the period 1998-2003, these are not adequate in terms of their breadth or the associated depth of analysis, in terms of the impact they will make for achieving organizational objectives. So for us, the Medium-Term Plan document as it stands at the moment, as my United States colleague suggested, falls short of providing us with the necessary vision and in many ways, a large part of it, is simply a restatement of what was contained in the Programme of Work and Budget. This, for Australia, was why we were so interested in the work done following the Council Meeting in June of this year. The inadequacies which were evidenced in the Medium-Term Plan have then been addressed.

This brings me to the second part of my intervention. The new Medium-Term Plan as part of a broader strategic framework, as described by Mr Wade, would certainly be something which would bring vision to the Organization. His very detailed outlining of the elements of such work, the identification of stakeholder interests, the preparation of a draft mission statement, key objectives, are all elements that are going to be crucial, if this Organization is really going to be able to take up both the challenges of partnerships and the challenges of resource constraints which have been mentioned.

However, despite what I think is going to be a very professional input from the Secretariat, I think, as we realized in our discussions with the Programme Evaluation Report, that there is scope for drawing on expertise beyond the Organization. That I think this is not just a matter of the Organization asking questions of a wide range of stakeholders but in fact, using the expertise of some outside experts to provide us with additional input, so that there is an opportunity for the Secretariat's work to be widened, to be deepened. This is so that when we are looking at this crucial Strategic Framework and the documents which may flow from it in a new planning process, we have the best opportunity to understand from all angles what things are stopping the performance of the Organization. What are the core competencies that it does well and will take it through to meeting the challenges that we are all aware of. The World Food Summit is certainly one, but there are many others that are needed to ensure that this Organization maintains itself as a Centre of Excellence.

The Swedish proposals provide some very interesting ideas and I would certainly like to think that we could have the weekend to think about this a bit more. I think that there is such a wealth

of information being brought up here that the European Community and Italy, I can well understand, wanting time to just try and digest it, and I would hope that there is opportunity.

In conclusion, I would feel that we would be doing the Organization a disservice, at the moment, if we were to do a little more than note the Medium-Term Plan we have at the moment. It has been, I think, overtaken in the six months since it was originally produced.

Let us recognize that for the next two years with whatever process we put into place to bring us towards more of a strategic vision for the Organization, we have largely coloured in a Programme of Work that will give us sufficient to take us through to a point of the Thirtieth Session of the Conference in November 1999 where, I hope, all of the strands of the work that is being outlined here this afternoon can come together to give us a point of departure into the next millennium.

CHAIRMAN

I should say immediately that I am very sympathetic to your point that we should have an opportunity to come back to the discussion of this subject next week, and I will revert to that in due course.

Mrs Malgorzata PIOTROWSKA (Poland)

We find the document Medium-Term Plan very well-prepared, giving a clear analysis of the present situation immediately after the World Food Summit and a comprehensive outline of the priority programmes to be pursued in the medium term.

While we are surprised and disappointed with the limited goal set by the World Food Summit, halving the number of undernourished people by the year 2015, we have come to realize that the goal reveals a realistic and common-sense approach to the problem and avoids the temptation of pretending that we can do more than that. The conclusion of the World Food Summit only reinforces us in the conviction that FAO's priorities, and equally that of governments, must be carefully chosen.

While the overall strategic orientation for sustainable food security is rather vague, we agree entirely with the goals set for FAO's activities in Fisheries, and find them clear and well formulated. There are certainly goals that not only FAO, but all efficient nations should adopt as their own.

In view of the very serious rate of forest destruction, especially of the tropical rain forests through felling and now increasingly by burning which appears to be alarmingly out of control in Asia, we again find FAO's goals in the field of forestry vague, bordering on being timid. Clearly, a much stricter approach is called for to hinder the rampant forest destruction taking place. One wonders though, if FAO is the right organization to tackle that problem. The international concerns for conserving the forests are great, but the responsibility for stopping the destruction falls on the Governments on whose lands they grow.

With regard to resource mobilization, we are pleased to learn that as a result of the World Food Summit, the Special Programme on Food Security is attracting outside funds. This is especially important in view of the uncertainty surrounding the possibility of full funding for FAO's regular budget. Although the other idea behind decentralization is undoubtedly sound, it is clear that the process itself has not taken place without some destruction. We are not convinced of the benefits derived from all the new Sub-regional offices, but are willing to wait and see.

We certainly agree with the emphasis laid on integrated soil water plant nutrient management and reclamation of problem lands, salinity control, etc., but would like to ask the following question. In view of the recent Conference on Desertification held here at FAO in September, and the fact that the Convention on Desertification took effect this year, why is there no mention of soil erosion problems in the Medium-Term Plan? Surely, soil erosion must be considered one of the most serious threats to the existence of man with around 20 billion tons of good humus soil being lost to the sea every year.

With regard to crops, while we certainly subscribe to the approach including Integrated Pest Management and the emphasis on Plant Genetic Resources and seed production, we would like to ask the following question. As it should be clear to all that in order to go head in food production in the decades ahead, we need above all more productive plant varieties, how is it possible that in FAO's Medium-Term Plan there is no mention of plant breeding as a priority? FAO needs to take up plant breeding as the first priority for the future. This is not the time to hide behind the CGIAR System, and pretend that this most important priority can be left to what we could almost call a private club.

Certainly, Governments have no control over the CGIAR institutes and the priorities they choose to set for breeding the crop varieties of the future. Either FAO, as a co-sponsor of the CGIAR, must exercise much stricter control of these priorities or it must launch its own worldwide network of national plant breeding programmes in all the major crops, as well as assisting with the breeding of important local basic food crops.

The livestock priorities are mostly well-formulated, but we wonder why the use of grassland resources for ruminants is not given more emphasis. It is clear that the expected increase in demands for growing and cultivated crops which are certainly better converters of soil resources into food on a per-hectare basis than ruminants will put increasing emphasis on ruminant production on grasslands, and marginal and mountain lands unsuitable for crop production.

With regard to agricultural application of isotopes and biotechnology, we find these priorities highly relevant to the work of FAO but we wonder why there is no mention of the fact that this particular programme is operated jointly with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Are the authors of this document not aware of the fact that there IAEA pays two-thirds of the programme costs of the joint FAO/IAEA Division, and that a majority of the staff are IAEA staff members? We feel that FAO should be proud to have this highly successful programme operated in a manner unique in the whole UN System, jointly with another major UN Organization and should not, for some reason, try to hide this fact.

With regard to the Nutrition Programme, we agree in general with the priorities outlined, particularly the emphasis on Codex, related work and the assembly and dissemination of information on nutrition.

Regarding food quality control, our delegation certainly supports the measures to be taken but would like to ask why there is no mention of the new international training and reference laboratory sponsored by FAO and now being completed in Austria. We would like to have more information about the status of this laboratory, and the intended medium-term role foreseen for it in the field of both food and pesticide control.

In the field of fisheries, we feel that FAO must give more attention to the fish harvest outside of territorial waters in an effort to avoid excessive fishing of endangered stocks of such fish as the giant blue tuna fish, as well as the North Atlantic cod and various flat fishes. There is also a need to enforce strict rules concerning the dumping of unwanted or juvenile fish into the sea.

With regard to research and technology development, we wonder if FAO in the Medium-Term Plan, in the coming century, should not become more research-oriented. FAO should consider supporting, guiding and coordinating agricultural research, through international networks, based on the very positive experience gained in the ESCORENA programmes, as well as in the coordinated research programmes of the joint FAO/IAEA Division.

Finally, we would like to support very strongly the medium-term priorities set-up for Women and Populations. We do feel that the future of our rural areas in Europe, and undoubtedly elsewhere, will depend, to a large extent, on how women and rural families will take the initiative in creating more employment opportunities, smaller industries and rural tourism to complement and enhance rural activities and increase household incomes.

Ronald ROSE (Canada)

Let me begin, as many others have, by thanking Mr Wade for what was in fact an extremely clear explanation of what is a very complex concept. We found the introduction to be particularly useful.

Canada supports the usefulness of a Medium-Term Plan as such. A plan should be a key document for the future of the FAO. We recognize that major changes will be taking place in this and in other planning documents in order to develop a more strategic approach to the planning and budgeting process. Our concerns with the current Medium-term Plan 1998-2003 are similar to those of previous speakers, particularly the United States and Australia and were fully expressed during the Hundred and Twelfth Session of the Council in June.

In a summary statement, Mr Chairman, we believe that the Medium-term Plan was, in fact, too inward looking, and not sufficient attention was paid to external influences that will, in fact, impact on the work of the FAO.

These concerns were, in fact, echoed by a number of countries at the Council in June and in response to the request of the last Council meeting, FAO has proposed a change not only to the Medium-Term Plan but to all of the planning documents. We support these proposals and thank FAO, the Secretariat, for producing the document with possible revisions to the Programme Budget process and their implications, including the medium-term planning process. A rather long title but perhaps, a rather difficult subject.

We were particularly pleased to see such a rapid turnaround to Council's request and such a high quality product. We support the main thrust of the approach outlined in that document.

We also support the conclusions reached by the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee at their September session and support a more cautious application of the new programming model on a trial basis or at least until the implications of the Strategic Framework upon the organization of FAO's work are better known and better understood.

The move towards resort based planning is a very positive move which has been undertaken by many countries and is being instituted in several multilateral organizations. We agree that by concentrating on a few long-term objectives, the essential aims of the FAO can be more clearly defined. Through such planning documents, as a Medium-Term Plan, the outcomes can be defined and clearly linked to the longer-term goals, creating a result-based culture and instituting proper training as a challenge that will probably require time to implement satisfactorily. However, to repeat, the move towards results-based planning is a positive move which we strongly endorse.

Finally, Mr Chairman, as others including yourself have mentioned, some interesting proposals have been made this afternoon and we would wish to reserve the right to return to this issue later during the debate if necessary.

Michel KOUTABA (Burkina Faso)

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Nous avons avec attention examiné le document que malheureusement nous avons reçu scéance tenante; n'empêche que, en les parcourant, nous avons constaté que certaines des priorités, des préoccupations de nos États, notamment le Burkina Faso, sont prises en compte.

Seulement nous ne voyons nulle part apparaître la maîtrise de l'eau qui constitue pour nos États aujourd'hui, nous pays sahélien, le Burkina Faso, une des priorités des priorités. Et là, nous l'avons signalé comme position commune de nos pays africains, lors des conférences préparatoires au Sommet de la FAO l'année passée. Donc, nous tenons à relever ce *gap* parce qu'aujourd'hui tous nos États s'attachent à la mobilisation de l'eau en parlant de gestion des ressources naturelles. Si les pays asiatiques aujourd'hui arrivent à des productions importantes, c'est parce que l'eau est mobilisée, c'est parce que l'eau est bien gérée. C'est pour cela que nous le relevons, et nous souhaitons que ce document soit enrichi en prenant en compte cet aspect.

CHAIRMAN

Let us now pause and consider where we are. We have been discussing since before 15.30 hours, a subject which was slated for discussion throughout Monday, so we are well in advance of ourselves. We have had 14 speakers on a subject which this morning attracted 27. I think I can safely say that we have not nearly done justice to that. A number of people here this afternoon have said that they would wish to revert to the subject, and I have had other messages to that effect. What I therefore propose to do, with your agreement, is to adjourn the session now at 17.00 hours and to return to it at 09.30 hours on Monday morning.

I should say that I am sorry that more people were not here to listen to Mr Wade's explanation of the proposed new Strategic Framework, and I am more than a little tempted to ask him to repeat his explanation on Monday morning. I shall reflect on that over the weekend, and no doubt he will have some points to make to me in that connection.

With your agreement we will now adjourn until 09.30 hours on Monday morning.

The meeting rose at 17.10 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 10.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.10 horas.

CHAIRMAN

I am, in a moment, going to repeat some of the procedural points I made when Commission II launched on Saturday morning but before I do that can I draw your attention to the fact that the discussion of the Medium-Term Plan, which we are resuming this morning, would be greatly helped if all of you are in possession of the paper, which is not a formal Conference paper but, nevertheless, is extremely important to this subject. Many of you will already have it but if you do not, there are copies outside and I suggest that it would be helpful for those of you who do not have it to get copies, as soon as possible. The document number is JM/97/1 and it has an extremely long title. The title is: Possible Revisions to the Programme and Budget Process and their Implications, including the Medium-Term Planning Process. I hope everyone will be in possession of that paper by the time we resume substantive debate on the Medium-Term Plan. The importance of that will become clear, when we come back to the Item.

Procedural points, I apologize to those who were here on Saturday for repeating these but I think the orderly conduct of business would be helped if I were to do so. The first thing I should say is that this Commission has two Vice-Chairmen, Mr Paul Paredes Portella, who is the Alternative Permanent Representative from Peru and Mr Igor Marincek, who is the Permanent Representative of Switzerland. I propose to establish a Drafting Committee. I will announce later on today, or at the latest, tomorrow morning the composition of the Drafting Committee.

We have a very considerable volume of business in front of us, notably, the Programme of Work and Budget. We have to conclude our deliberations within the allotted timespan. The implications of that are very clear. It is important that we try very hard to start our Sessions on time and I am afraid we are getting off to a very late start this morning. Secondly, it would considerably assist the efficient conduct of business, if people would try hard to keep their interventions brief and to the point.

As you will know, but I nevertheless repeat the point, it is possible for written statements to be deposited, which will appear in the Verbatim Record. Those of you who have a lot to say on the subject might like to consider whether some of it, at least, could go into a written statement.

I should also say that the interpreters would be extremely grateful to have copies of statements which have been prepared in advance and it is in everyone's interest, not only the interpreters, that the process of interpretation should be as efficient and effective as possible. So, if you do have written statements, would you please let the interpreters have copies of them.

I need to draw your attention to the procedures for formulating and handling resolutions. Resolutions have to go through the Resolutions Committee before they can be examined on the floor of this Commission and that is a process which takes some time. Time is also needed for Resolutions to be translated and tabled. Anyone who is minded to formulate a Resolution needs to bear that in mind. There is guidance on this process in document C 97/12 in Appendix C which deals with the question of handling resolutions.

Finally, I should say -- and this is a point I did not say on Saturday morning -- that I intend to set up a Group of Friends of the Chair to discuss issues related to the Programme of Work and Budget. I have not yet decided quite how to do that, but if there are people who would like to be involved in that process it would be very helpful if they would speak to or send a message to my Secretariat as soon as possible. If you would declare an interest in being involved in a Friends of the Chair process, please let my Secretariat know. I will then announce, in due course, how that process is going to operate.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)

14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1) (continued)

14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1) (suite)

14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20; JM/97/1)
(continuación)

So much for the procedural points relating to the work of this Commission. We now come back to our discussion of the Medium-term Plan which we began on Saturday afternoon at 15:20 hours. This is a rather complicated set of issues and it involves looking at four documents. I hope you now have all four, having been alerted to the importance of document JM/97/1.

I have to say, with no disrespect to the Secretariat that I, myself, find the relationship between these documents not immediately apparent and I will, therefore, do my best to explain the connections between them, so that we can have an effective debate. Mr Wade will correct me if I am wrong but the relationship, as I see it, is as follows.

There is document C 97/9 which looks like this. This is the Medium-Term Plan. It was produced in April and nothing has happened to it since then. That is the first document. That document was discussed by Council at its June meeting this year. That is to say at the Hundred and Twelfth Session and the Report of the Council on that Item is in document C 97/LIM/10 which came out - - I think I am correct in saying -- on Saturday.

So, the second document in this sequence is C 97/LIM/10 and that contains the reactions of Council, in June, to the Medium-Term Plan. I draw your attention, in particular, to paragraph 60 of C 97/LIM/10. It is so important that I will read it out. "The Council requested the Secretariat to prepare a paper for the Programme Committee at its September 1997 session which reviewed and discussed the options for an adapted medium-term planning process. The Programme Committee would then put proposals to the Council at its session, immediately before the FAO Conference, and the Council would put a recommendation to the Conference."

So, that is what happened at the Council, in June this year. The outcome of that further work and consideration appears in two other documents. The work that the Secretariat was requested to do, is in document JM/97/1 -- that is the one with long title, which I have already mentioned -- and that was a document that was produced during the summer, by the Secretariat, initially for consideration by the Programme and Finance Committees and in due course by Council and ultimately, by this Conference. So that is the third document in the series.

The fourth document in the series came out on Saturday afternoon and that is, C 97/LIM/20 and it has, in some ways, what is a rather surprising title: Amendments to the General Rules of the Organization and Financial Regulations on the Programme Budget Process. The reason why it has that title is that the proposals for a new planning and budgeting process would require amendment or, at least as envisaged, to the Rules of the Organization. So that is why C 97/LIM/20 has a title which refers to amendments of the General Rules. If you look at page 2 of that document, C 97/LIM/20, you will see the Report of the Programme Committee discussion in September of this document. That appears in Section B of this document, and there are three paragraphs, and what the Programme Committee had to say is really rather important.

So there are four documents and I hope that the relationship between them is now tolerably clear. The Medium-Term Plan is the start, C 97/LIM/10 is the next one in the sequence, the third one is JM/97/1 and C 97/LIM/20 is the fourth and last contribution to the process. That brings us to where we are now.

Having led you through that small forest, I hope successfully, I would now like to turn to Mr Wade to recapitulate a very helpful introduction which he gave when we began this Session

on Saturday. I apologize to those of you who have heard it before, but I think that the subject which is of some intensive complexity would benefit from that recapitulation.

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

After your introduction, I think what I should do is simply concentrate on the process we intended to follow and have proposed to the Finance Committee for a document which we have entitled as being the Strategic Framework. The Strategic Framework is proposed to be a document which looks out to the next fifteen years and tries to identify, in effect, what FAO's role would be over that period.

The idea that is new in all this process, is not strategic planning *per se* but the fact that we have recommended that we take the Medium-Term Plan as it stands today and which is the Agenda Item you have before you and split it into two documents. One document which would be the Strategic Framework looking at this fifteen-year period, and then a second document which would still look at a six-year periods, and that second document would still be entitled a Medium-Term Plan.

The reason we went in this direction is that we found that one of the problems with the current form of Medium-Term Plan, in preparing it every two years, inevitably meant that there was a large degree of repetitiveness in, at least, the strategic side of the plan because not much changes in two years when it comes the broad issues of agricultural development.

We, therefore, felt that you would get a much better analysis and a much better document if, less frequently, we presented our ideas for the longer term period of about fifteen years. So this was the reasoning behind the creation of the Strategic Framework.

I mentioned a few seconds ago that this is not new to FAO and I would like to emphasize that. It is not that we have not had any formed strategic planning, it is that a strategic plan as a separate document has not existed with that title. But, for example, you will find on the document desk an example of the Forestry Strategic Plan which COFO asked be brought to your attention. It is just there for your information but you can see that this sort of work is being undertaken. However, what we also feel is that the methodologies that have been applied by different Departments and by the Organization as a whole needed further attention. Therefore this document JM/97/1 specifically describes a process that we will go through to develop this Strategic Framework. I will concentrate just on that process and not on the other documents which come into the whole package of Programme and Budget documents.

The first step, I should just briefly mention is that we obtained this methodology by looking at the expert opinions on appropriate methodologies for public sector strategic planning, and we have drawn on one British and one American source. If anyone wants the details of those, they are quoted in JM/97/1.

The first major step in the process is to identify Organizational Mandates. In the case of FAO, this is not a very difficult step because we have a very clear Constitution which states what the Mandate is. However, the experts in this field draw your attention to the fact that, although you may have a formal Mandate, emphasis within that Mandate over a given period of time can depend very much on what is going on elsewhere in the world. In particular, in our case, we believe that we must somehow take account of what is happening in other international fora. Obvious examples include the outcome of UNCED, Agenda 21 and FAO's role as Task Manager in Chapters there. The World Food Summit, of course, is itself something that must influence our work, etc. So you can see there are a number of things happening that should be taken into account in identifying the Organizational Mandate.

Having completed that step, the next step that is recommended is to Identify Stakeholder Requirements. This word 'Stakeholder' presented us with some difficulty, but in the end we adopted it because it does seem to represent, rather well, the idea that there are a number of people and institutions which have a concern about what the Organization is doing.

Stakeholders are defined as any person, group or organization that can place a claim on the Organization's attention, on its resources or on its outputs or is affected by those outputs. We carried out a preliminary analysis of what our Stakeholders might be or who they might be and for those of you who have the document JM/97/1, paragraph 29 has a small graphic which shows the sorts of Stakeholders that we believe would be applicable to FAO. You will see that there are, of course, the Governments themselves. Let us be very clear from the beginning that there is no question that Governments, the Member Nations of FAO, are the primary Stakeholders. That is not in question.

We have, however, other Stakeholders whom we cannot afford to ignore: The United Nations System itself, the funding programmes, the Specialized Agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions, and the CGIAR. Then, moving a little bit out of the UN System itself, we have the Inter-governmental organizations and the Non-governmental organizations, the IGOs and the NGOs. We also have civil society, and the private sector becoming increasingly important in this process.

In FAO's case, a very important Stakeholder are donors. Of course, these may also be represented as Governments, but they also have extra representation in the fact that they are a source of resources for the Organization's extra-budgetary programmes. You will see from that graphic that we also put down the media as a potential Stakeholder. For your information the Programme Committee was not at all enthusiastic about that idea and generally, we will not treat the media as a Stakeholder *per se*. We also saw farmers, producers, and consumers as being Stakeholders but when we come to how we work with stakeholders, to understand their views of the Organization, you will see that they represent a rather special problem. Last, but I would say not least, you have the Secretariat and the staff of the Organization, also very important Stakeholders.

The Stakeholder Analysis is significant because what it does is that it allows the Strategic Framework to be developed with the political context in mind. One cannot ignore the political pressures on the institution and try and write this up as a straightforward intellectual exercise. The intellectual aspect has to take into account the rational political needs of the Stakeholders.

The analysis, in fact, should be trying to recognize the criteria by which the Stakeholders judge the institution and its performance and how well the Organization performs in their perception; that is, in the perception of the Stakeholders. This tells you a lot about what you are and what you are not doing, in terms of satisfying Stakeholders' needs. This implies dialogue with the Stakeholders themselves, so we must have some modality for dialogue with the different types of Stakeholders. That modality will vary.

Clearly, with governments who are Members of this Organization, we have a very clear structure which is provided by our Constitution and we would propose to use that. For major partners, such as the UN and the United Nations funding funds and the programmes, including WFP, of course, the Bretton Woods institutions and the Specialized Agencies and, I think, also institutions such as CGIAR and IFAD, we would propose not to rely, solely, on the conventional technique of circulating documents. This has a great risk that the document gets circulated and you do not get any real dialogue going because there is not enough communication in that process. So, we will try and establish video-conferences with groups of experts from these institutions, so that we get some real feedback on what they think of us as a performing organization.

For civil society, at large, and I am including there the NGOs and some IGOs, we would propose to try and take advantage of a technique which has been used quite successfully recently, that is the concept of "E-mail conferences". We have not worked out the details of this, but that is the sort of technique that we see ourselves using to get some opinions from that sector. For staff and their representative bodies, we would of course follow the normal practice of going through our Staff Associations and through the Organization hierarchy, in consulting technical staff as to their views, and as to what should be happening in a Strategy.

The final group, farmers and producers, women and consumers, I think we have to be realistic. We cannot reach them directly in this sort of analysis, so we are going to have to rely on our work with NGOs, with the civil society, through “E-mail conferencing” techniques, to try and get some feedback in that particular area.

I have spoken somewhat at some length on the Stakeholder Analysis because we do consider it to be important. However, that and the Mandate should give us sufficient to produce the next step which is a first draft of the Mission Statement. Can I mention that both of the authors that we were looking at to provide some guidance on methodology indicated that this Draft Mission Statement should be seen as just that, a draft. It could even be left for the moment and done a little bit later in the process, but they recommend attempting it at this stage.

It would be in the form of four or five strategic objectives and it should consist of strategic objectives to which the majority of stakeholders subscribe. We would have hoped to have taken it through the Departmental structures, and have sub-objectives which support those strategic objectives coming from our Departments.

We would hope also to have consulted our regional structures so that the different strategic objectives are weighted differently for the concerns of different regions. As I mentioned on Saturday, clearly the strategic objectives for the European Region are likely to be different, or at least concentrated in different areas from those of Asia or Africa. So in the end we are looking for a Draft Mission Statement which reflects the global needs of the Organization, but which also takes account of regional interests.

Once we have a draft Mission Statement, we will then go on and carry out two separate analyses. The first one will be an Analysis of the External Environment and the second one will be an Internal Analysis. In talking about the External Environment, we see two aspects which need to be addressed.

The first, is to foresee new developments and trends in world agricultural development over that ten-to fifteen-year period. That is a very tall order but, of course, it is part of FAO's business in preparing documents like AT 2015 and also, in our work on the State of Food and Agriculture. We are always looking at this issue. In fact one of the reasons that the fifteen years makes some sense is that it runs in line with the revision to AT 2015, 2030, etc. It is a very important part of the issue because if we go back fifteen years and say, if we had done this exercise effectively fifteen years ago would we have recognized the importance of the upcoming Uruguay Round and the globalization of trade and did we, in fact, respond sufficiently and correctly in anticipating those requirements? That is probably an example, by the way, where we did not do too badly but you get the point. The point is to try to really see well ahead to see what issues will affect us.

In addition to looking at that aspect, we also need to do the External Analysis from the point of view of those things which are changing in the outside world that affect us, outside agricultural development. So, looking through the areas of the political, economic, social and technological environments, what is happening that is likely to cause us to think about changing directions.

The classic terminology is “Opportunities and Threats”. What Opportunities are out there for us and what Threats are out there for us and how we should we respond to both? A good example, I think, of an Opportunity is the absolutely extraordinary progress being made in international communications. That is very important for an international organization and we must take advantage of that because it will really improve our capacity to respond to Member Nations if we do so.

An obvious Threat, for example, is the public perception of the United Nations System at the moment and of FAO. Here we have a problem whereby our usefulness to society at large is not recognized as well as it should be. So that is something that we ought to address. So those two examples would be the aspects which would be handled by the External analysis.

The Internal Analysis would address two questions. The first is what are the things about the Organization at present, its performance, its structure, its style, which could impede its ability to fulfil its mission? In other words, what are the things that are preventing us doing a decent job at the moment? First question.

The second question is: what are the Organization's core competencies, what abilities or actions are there on which it can be relied to perform well? By recognizing these so-called "strengths and weaknesses" to use the classical terminology again, you again put yourself in the position of addressing the strengths and reinforcing them, and of addressing the weaknesses and trying to make sure they are eliminated or, at least, reduced.

By the time we have completed these four significant steps, that is the Mandate, the Stakeholder Analysis, the External Analysis and the Internal Analysis one should have a great deal of information about the institution of where it stands in the world, and where it is perceived to stand. At that stage, we will try to identify the strategic issues and actions which need to be taken.

We define these as the fundamental policy questions, or the Critical Challenges or Opportunities which face the Organization. They could involve its: Mandate; they could involve the Mission; they could involve the level or the mix of services; the clients it serves; who funds what we do or issues about costs, or any number of these.

For each Strategic Issue, we will try and prepare a succinct description of the issue itself. We will put down the factors that make this issue a fundamental challenge to the Organization. So, why are we considering it to be strategic? Then, the Statement of the Consequences of failing to do anything about it. We have to recognize we will most certainly recognize more Strategic Issues than we can handle. At that stage, we are going to have to say that we have our Core Strategic Objectives, and we have these Strategic Issues which we choose to address because they are important. These ones we will take the risk and we will not address them, or we will give them lower priority. The outcome of that, should be a document which we have called the Strategic Framework.

Paragraph 51 of the document lists the contents of the framework. Of course this is provisional, but I think it is a good indication of what we intend to provide. It should, first of all, contain an overview of the key issues affecting agricultural and rural development, in the medium to long-term. It should have a restatement of the Mandate, taking into account the emphases arising from the decisions of, for example, other international conferences, etc. It should have an identification of the Stakeholders and their expectations or needs. There should be a summary of the outcome of the External and Internal Analyses, including a statement of Strengths, Weaknesses, Threats and Opportunities.

This would include identifications of opportunities for alliances with other institutions, which we see as a very important part of our specific position in the whole business of agricultural development.

There should be, of course, a Mission Statement containing a few high-level or corporate Strategic Objectives, supported by the next level of Sub-Objectives, coming from the Departments. There will be a definition of the Strategic Issues, which we intend to address, and then there will be the strategy itself for achieving the Core Objectives and for addressing those issues.

We propose, at this stage, to have broad implications on resources, but I am not quite sure how we will handle it. We hope very much to try and include, where possible, monitorable indicators for each strategic objective.

Mr Chairman, I think I would stop there, if that is okay with you. If you feel there is something else I should cover, I will do so but I have spoken for rather a long time and I think that should be sufficient for the present.

CHAIRMAN

I do have one question, which I think it would be helpful to elucidate at this stage, and that is the content of the Medium-Term Plan as you envisage it in this adapted process.

The document makes reference to the Medium-Term Plan becoming, in effect, a Corporate Plan for the Organization. Corporate Plans conventionally do two things: they set out what the Organization is going to deliver to its clientele -- however that may be defined -- but they also deal with the issue of organizational change and management change needed to improve the delivery process. Is it envisaged that the Medium-Term Plan, as reflected in these papers, will cover both of those areas?

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

You will find that this part of the paper in the Medium-Term Plan is less explicit. There is a reason for that.

It is a two-year revision of a six-year rolling Medium-Term Plan. We are concerned to try and find a way of giving the Governing Bodies what they need, in the form of a Corporate Plan, about what we intend to do, but in such a form as it does not repeat the entire six-year programme every two years, because otherwise it becomes another document that would be very hard to read.

Our thinking on that aspect was to take into account the fact that if, under the new programming model, you have six-year programmes and projects, every two years you will only have a few of them that are new. Roughly speaking, on average, two-thirds of them will be already started; some of them will have started in the previous biennium and some of them will have started in the biennium before. You will have one-third which are brand new to this particular biennium. The rolling Medium-Term Plan will probably concentrate on those new areas of emphasis and it will tend to be largely a programme document.

Can I come back to your question a bit indirectly? What we have been describing in the Strategic Framework is certainly aiming, principally, at the programme objectives of the Organization. It is not attempting to carry out an administrative management review for every fifteen-year period. However, it is clear that, if you look at programmes and you look what is going on and you do an Internal Analysis and then an External Analysis, you will often find strategic issues which require you to look at other aspects of the institution apart from its programme. I will give you an example: one strategic issue which this institution faces at the moment is the cost of supporting its field programmes; it is higher than we would like it to be and you would like it to be. I see one of the strategic issues coming out of the first framework being how can we reduce the cost of supporting field programmes. Everybody agrees we should be doing the work, but how can we make it more cost-effective. That would involve addressing issues such as efficiency, streamlining - it may even address structure, I do not know. It will lead to strategic issues being stated in the framework and, subsequently, somewhere in the Medium-Term Plan, presumably some actions other than pure programme actions, which need to be taken to improve that particular situation.

In answer to your question, Mr Chairman, the document will not concentrate on organizational change or "change management", etc. It will, of course, inevitably bring in these issues as they arise from the strategic planning process.

I hope that answers the question satisfactorily.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you for the very lucid and helpful introduction to the issues.

If we might now go back to the papers, can I draw your attention again to C 97/LIM/20, because this is the paper that brings us to where we are at the moment.

On page 2, there is the report of the Council consideration of this issue. In summary, the Council welcomed these proposals. The Council agreed that flexibility would be required in the

implementation of the proposed changes. It recognized that the full-scale application of the process required formal action to amend the Basic Texts and, as a result of that last point, a proposed amendment to the General Rules has been put to the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters for their consideration. It now appears before us as a Draft Resolution to the Conference.

One of the action points to be considered here is whether we are content with that Draft Resolution.

We began debate on this subject on Saturday afternoon. Eleven delegations spoke, three indicated that they would wish to speak today.

What I propose to do is to give the floor to the three who indicated they wished to speak today, and will be happy to hear from other delegations who also wish to take the floor.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

On behalf of the European Community and its Member States, I would like to express our views on the Medium-Term Plan. I will also address the new programming process, as discussed in the Council last week.

The Medium-Term Plan is an important vehicle in setting the direction for the Organization to take in the next century. It should have vision and list the priorities, based on a strategic concept. The context in which the Medium-Term Plan should define the role to be played by FAO is that food insecurity is a problem of poverty, low productivity, lack of purchasing power, isolation of rural areas, as well as a result of poor storage techniques.

Food security and sustainable development are essentially two sides of the same coin. In our view, the general orientation for assessing FAO's role should consist of the following elements.

Firstly, the universal character of FAO should be reflected in its priorities, as well as the scope and coverage of its activities.

Secondly, the Organization should be a Centre of Excellence in the field of food, agriculture, forestry and fisheries, which, in our opinion, means that it has a leading position in partnership with others in these policy areas and is capable of reacting adequately to international developments.

Thirdly, it is essential that FAO cooperate and coordinate within the UN System and with other UN organizations and, of course, especially those organizations here in Rome.

Fourthly, priorities should be derived from internationally-agreed positions, such as the areas of Agenda 21, for which FAO is the Task Manager, and the functions allocated to FAO in the Plan of Action of the very important World Food Summit.

Lastly, the budgetary framework in which FAO must operate provides an increasing need to establish priorities in its Medium-Term Plan and to be selective in the issues on which the Organization maintains, or develops, a leading position.

With respect to the policy context, we believe that the strengths of FAO, as well as all other Specialized Agencies, are to be found in their normative and advisory roles, highlighting the need for synergy between its normative and operational activities. Its operational activities should, in any event, rest only on the comparative advantage criterion in order to avoid duplication with other UN Bodies.

In the present Medium-Term Plan, a large number of different programmes and sub-programmes are mentioned, all of which are indicated as important. At technical committees and Council, we have thought a clearer differentiation between programmes of high priority and low priority. We, therefore, call for the introduction of an acceptable ranking system to assign priorities to components of the Medium-Term Plan.

At the session of the technical committees earlier this year, where the respective parts of the Medium-Term Plan were discussed for the first time, the European Union already indicated what the high and low priorities for the Organization should be. At this stage, we want to emphasize the important normative function of assisting the formulation of fisheries and agriculture policies, globally as well as in the framework of the regional fisheries bodies.

Implementation of the Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries, particularly through strengthening regional fishery organizations, is of the utmost importance.

In the field of forestry, FAO should support the international dialogue on sustainable forest management, including criteria and indicators in line with its role of Task Manager for the Forestry Chapter of Agenda 21. It should continue to provide normative and strategic support to international forest initiatives, such as on-going efforts towards an internationally-binding instrument for forests, as well as assist and support countries with the development and execution of national forest programmes.

We are somewhat disappointed with the small section on Governance in this document. Streamlining the Governance mechanisms is an on-going process for any UN Organization and, in FAO, we have the process of review of Statutory Bodies initiated in 1996. However, the governance of an organization also includes the higher categories of Statutory Bodies and the organizational structure of the Organization.

A Medium-Term Plan with vision should also deal with the various aspects of Governance.

The European Community and its Member States take a very positive view of the proposals for the new medium-term planning. We view this new programming process as crucial for the further strengthening of this Organization. We fully agree with the usefulness of a longer-term strategic framework, which should be a dynamic policy document, applying well-recognized strategic planning principles. Obviously, medium-term planning, programming and budgeting, and programme evaluation, should form a part of the new programming model, reinforcing the coherence between these elements. We feel that elaboration and implementation of the new programming model are of overriding importance for FAO, and we therefore wish to see it strengthened and accelerated.

To conclude, in our opinion, the formulation and development of a strategic framework and, subsequently, a new Medium-Term Plan, should be an intensive process involving all stakeholders, including Member Nations, management and staff of the Organization, other international organizations, NGOs and the private sector, of course.

Of course, we establish and manage in a way that will encourage the widest possible ownership of the outcome.

I would stress that it should include an inter-governmental process with negotiations taking place in a suitable forum. As far as timing is concerned, we should aim at completing this process before the next Conference.

CHAIRMAN

May I just clarify the basis on which that statement was made? Was it made on behalf of the Netherlands, or was it made in your capacity as acting presidency of the EU?

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

As I stated at the beginning of my statement, I was speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, as acting presidency.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much for that clarification.

Luigi FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)

Of course, I am following the Dutch declaration on behalf of the European Union.

I heard on Saturday the previous interventions and criticisms, with great interest. I think the delegate from the United States of America said that the document was not well focussed, there is not enough indication on where FAO is heading. I heard that the document falls short of a strategic vision and in need of external auditors -- I think it was Australia that said that. There was also some criticism that it was too inward-looking. I think the Canadian delegation made this reference.

In other words, it is in need of review and reform.

Since I entered the Foreign Service ages ago, I have heard about the need for reform. In my last multilateral post as Ambassador to OECD, I recall periodic meetings of Heads of Delegations in a very charming village near Paris, just a kind of brainstorming on how to improve the Organization and how better to reform it. I am not aware of outstanding results.

Now, of course, reform has become a *leitmotiv* in the UN, but I would say that FAO already started the process of reform in 1994. I doubt that any group of external experts could reach a better analysis than the one contained in document JM 97/1, to which you just referred, Mr Chairman.

Under the present conjuncture, I would say the whole multilateral system is under scrutiny, criticism and requests for reform which, in my view, is on the whole an unfortunate symptom of a more inward-looking, foreign-policy approach to foreign affairs, of increasing distance from adherence to the creative period that followed the Second World War. I recall that very good book by Dean Acheson on *Present at the Creation*.

Apart from the fact that FAO has already started its reform, I believe the best reforms are made from within. I should like to draw your attention to paragraphs 9 and 10 -- and paragraph 10 is the one to which Mr Wade just referred -- of the document JM/97/1.

I believe that document stated, among other things, that the Organization's staff are the greatest asset of the Organization's performance, closely linked to their experience and institutional memory. Reforms from outside, imposed by third parties, risk remaining theoretical and not implementable, whereas from inside we have ways and means to act through institutional bodies and, if necessary, *ad hoc* contact groups, which are also referred to in this document.

(continues in French)

Permettez-moi, Monsieur le Président, de citer la réflexion ou maxime d'un grand écrivain français du 18^{ème} siècle, Luc de Vauvenargues qui disait : "Il est plus aisé de dire des choses nouvelles que de concilier celles qui ont été dites". Ou bien, d'une façon plus brutale, ce que Tacite a écrit dans ses Annales : "*Acribus initiis, incurioso fine*" (comme la plupart des plans de réforme, il a été initialement accueilli avec ardeur; mais une fois la nouveauté cessée, le schéma s'est terminé en rien).

(continue en Anglais)

The new planning model adopted by FAO has been appreciated by my authorities, for its strategic orientation and for its priority programmes and, for each programme, the focalization of priorities based on engagements and objectives of the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit. That will facilitate FAO's action to promote food security with Rome-based UN organizations, which are not mentioned enough in this document, in our opinion, and with other UN Agencies.

We particularly appreciated the new Model of Agriculture which aims to promote a tighter correlation, both vertically and horizontally, between agriculture and other economic activities, and to enhance a partnership between farmers and producers, as well as to promote women's conditions in development.

We want also to confirm Italian traditional support for the Special Programme on Food Security for Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, even if some questioning could be helpful to convince also the most hesitant countries of the positive results and potential of the Special Programme.

I have elaborated a kind of questionnaire with five points that, if you do not mind, I could distribute to the Secretariat and this could be the occasion for some discussions among ourselves, just to save time from the meeting, but if you want, I can just read it. I will put it in your hands.

Another point I would like to raise is the importance of visits in the field, like the one that the World Food Programme organized in China. It was most helpful for all the participating countries, in judging the costs and the advantages of different local offices at regional, sub-regional and FAOR levels.

The last point is the new interest of civil society and NGOs. I recall the meeting with Italian Parliamentarians on the occasion of the Summit. We helped to give a very good and positive image of FAO's working system and aims.

Last, but not least, "Telefood" was not only a success from a financial point of view, but was also a success for the image of FAO, and was repeatedly for an entire day brought to the attention of the audience.

On Forests, and the Task Manager of Forests, I think the European Union has already spoken, so I will not draw on that.

Peter FERGUSON (New Zealand)

Like other delegations, and indeed this has been acknowledged by the FAO Secretariat itself, we think that the Medium-Term Plan, document C 97/9 before us does not fully meet the needs in a strategic planning sense of the Organization over the next six years and beyond. We are, however, most encouraged by the subsequent planning documents, particularly JM 97/1, which the Secretariat has prepared.

New Zealand has long stressed the need for FAO to exercise rigorous discipline in the use of its resources, and to gain the maximum value from them. For this reason, we have been fully supportive of the management reforms and efficiency proposals that the Secretariat has put forward and has been in the process of implementing over the past two years. We see this process of reform as an on-going effort to achieve efficiency gains, not simply as a cost-cutting exercise, and for FAO to attain and maintain international best practice in the areas of its recognized expertise.

Relevant strategic planning is a vital element in this process to give the Organization a clear sense of its direction and purpose in the management of its human and financial resources and to allow it to anticipate and adapt to changing circumstances. We were, therefore, most encouraged to hear the extensive comments made by the Director of Programme, Budget and Evaluation, Mr Wade, in this room last Saturday and again this morning, on the new approach the Secretariat plans to take in consultation with Member Nations towards developing a comprehensive and integrated strategic planning process for the Organization's future.

We note from Mr Wade's comments and from document JM 97/1, that this will include a number of key documents such as a Mission Statement, a Strategic Framework, a Medium-Term Plan that identifies objectives, outputs and resources needed and a Programme of Work and Budget that takes full account of these aspects to name some of the areas in which the Secretariat proposes to act.

Identifying the Organization's stakeholders, its opportunities and hazards and instituting measurable performance indicators and the programme evaluation measures in the planning cycle, are all positive signs of the new sense of direction by FAO.

New Zealand fully supports the new strategic approach outlined by the Secretariat to its planning processes. We believe these innovations will make the Organization more accountable to

Member Nations for the way limited resources are allocated and will ensure that appropriate priorities are set and monitored. It will also ensure that the vital normative and field work, undertaken by FAO, is done so more effectively.

I could add that the New Zealand Public Service, like some others, has been through this change in organizational thinking and practice, over the past decade. We have found it a very positive and satisfying process for staff and stakeholders alike and it ensures that not only our resources are allocated effectively, but it also instils a renewed sense of purpose and direction throughout the organization involved.

Mohamed KHALIFA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)

First, I would like to congratulate you for the Presidency. We also thank Mr Wade for the presentation of the Medium-Term Plan for FAO. This Plan, which is to be implemented over a six year period, is worthy of our discussion and examination to make it a comprehensive Plan.

Egypt wants to focus on the following priorities. First, we note the importance of concern for the Medium-Term Strategy and Human Development, which is embodied in training, for human resources have proved to be much more important than material resources. We find the training activities are of a priority importance for the Plan.

Secondly, we wish to emphasize the need for complementarity between FAO and other organizations, be they governmental or private sector, so that in the light of the limited material resources, all resources will pour into the programmes to focus on training and guiding.

The optimal use of water which is a limited resource, use of agricultural inputs to take into consideration genetic factors, focus on husbandry and high-quality produce and combatting pests, and on comprehensive management for crop improvement are other factors we feel are important. Concern should also be given to post-harvest programmes, including storage and marketing, to improving genetic qualities of the husbandry sector, to the complementarity between different husbandry produce sectors, such as, health and vaccinations. Other health care, and complementarity between agricultural produce and animal produce.

We should also focus on developing fisheries and pesticides and devote our attention to agricultural industries, particularly in light of the WTO, to forestry and combatting pests and support small farmers without mechanisation and women in development.

Lothar CAVIEZEL (Suisse)

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Comme d'autres délégations, nous remercions également Monsieur Wade pour sa présentation sur des propositions de modification de la procédure de budget-programme et conséquences, y compris sur le mécanisme à moyen terme. Nous apprécions tout particulièrement la déclaration qui vient d'être faite ce matin par la Communauté européenne.

A notre avis, un lien actuel entre l'exercice de l'établissement du Plan à moyen terme et celui du Programme de travail et budget est aujourd'hui encore insuffisant. Il nous manque un cadre stratégique comme plusieurs orateurs précédents l'ont déjà souligné. Nous sommes donc, d'une façon générale, favorables aux propositions du Secrétariat contenues dans le document JM 97/1 et examinées par le Comité du Programme en septembre dernier concernant une modification éventuelle de la Procédure du budget-programme et les conséquences. Nous y voyons *a priori* deux raisons pour la formulation d'un cadre Stratégique pour le long terme.

Premièrement, cette formulation répondra à la question de savoir quelles devront être les priorités d'action de la FAO après le Sommet. Grâce à ce dernier, la FAO est aujourd'hui mieux placée pour faire cet exercice qu'auparavant. A notre avis, les activités de la FAO devraient être rendues cohérentes avec le Plan d'action du Sommet. Deuxièmement, si le Sommet a été une réussite, c'est parce que les Pays membres ont pris une part très active dans sa préparation et dans la négociation de la Déclaration et du Plan d'action. La participation intense de tous les Pays

membres à ce processus a été un facteur décisif pour leur engagement et leur identification avec les résultats du Sommet. Nous avons tous contribué à leur formulation. Nous sommes donc tous propriétaires du résultat et nous pouvons tous en être fiers. La tâche de fixer les grands objectifs stratégiques et d'assurer une cohérence dans les documents soumis aux organes directeurs appartient aux Pays membres. Nous avons donc tout intérêt à adopter un processus similaire à celui qui nous a menés avec succès au Sommet, c'est-à-dire un processus permettant la participation de tous les Pays membres; une telle démarche donnera une plus grande influence à la FAO et par là-même une meilleure position dans la compétition future pour les ressources qui deviennent de plus en plus rares.

Nous soutenons les propositions qui visent un processus itératif de rationalisation de la documentation d'appui aux organes directeurs, où il s'agit d'établir un cadre stratégique qui permettra d'apporter une plus grande cohérence dans les documents mentionnés dans le document JM 97/1. Le cadre stratégique visera donc, comme présenté dans ce document, à fixer quatre à cinq objectifs fondamentaux correspondant aux priorités stratégiques visant à réaliser des objectifs de la sécurité alimentaire et du développement rural durable, sur lesquels une grande majorité des partenaires peuvent s'entendre. Ceux-ci devraient permettre d'apporter une plus grande transparence et une justification plus précise des propositions qui figurent dans les divers documents.

En dernier, je voudrais insister qu'à notre avis, il est important de tenir compte des nouvelles orientations élaborées par la communauté internationale dans les grandes conférences internationales en vue de préciser la mission de la FAO. L'objectif devra être une plus grande coordination, collaboration et division du travail avec les organisations internationales.

Chrysanthos LOIZIDES (Cyprus)

Allow me to begin by expressing the appreciation of my delegation to Mr Wade for the excellent adaptation of the subject and to the Secretariat for preparing the Medium-Term Plan.

Indeed -- I am sorry to say that we had not the chance to see the other documents, so my comments are limited to C 97/9 -- this document covering, in a brief but comprehensive way, the overall activities and priorities proposed for the forthcoming five year period, is generally responsive to the Declaration and the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit. Certainly, the Plan itself is only indicative for the broad policy orientations, aiming to achieve sustainable food security. However, being the first Medium-Term Plan, after the World Food Summit, it is expected to be decisive in the realization of the commitments endorsed by the World Food Summit, provided that a balance will be found between the expressed requirements and the level of financial resources needed to meet these requirements.

In the light of the current financial difficulties of FAO, as well as the worldwide pressure on public expenditure, the persistent efforts of the Director-General for mobilizing additional resources, together with the search for broadened partnerships to reinforce FAO's scarce resources, can be considered a key element in the implementation of the objectives of this Plan. For this reason, these efforts deserve wide encouragement and concrete support.

Under the current conditions, the prospects for food security in the near future, namely in the developing countries, do not appear to be encouraging at all. In reviewing the tabulated figures, on page 2 of the same document, it is understood that until the year 2010 there will be only a slight decrease in the number of undernourished. In this connection, we are in full agreement with the views expressed in paragraph 4 of the document.

Referring to the Programme Priorities, which are presented in Chapter 3 and tabulated at the end of this Chapter, under major programmes, *vis-à-vis* the respective World Food Summit Plan of Action commitments, we have no difficulty to register our support to these priorities. As a matter of fact, the almost two-hundred priorities listed on pages 22 to 43 of the document do mostly

correspond to the wide range of programme activities that FAO is already undertaking or is planning to undertake, in the near future through its biennial budgets.

Surely, all these programme activities or priorities as named in the document, are well justified and very useful indeed. But, when planning the FAO's post World Food Summit work, especially within the framework of a Medium-Term Plan, we are of the opinion that particular emphasis should be placed upon the specific measures or activities of high priority, such as: the increase of food production and productivity through the sustainable use of natural resources, especially soil and water resources; the improvement of access to food, namely by the hungry or undernourished; the increase of food supply, including national food, at affordable prices, particularly in the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries; the improved access to productive resources, especially in the rural areas and; the provision of necessary services to needy countries, such as, the development policy assistance or advice, farmers' training, extension services and others.

Certainly, the multidiscipline activities derived from these seven commitments cannot be implemented by FAO alone. We are fully aware that FAO's mandate is more closely related with Commitment 3, and only partly with the rest of the commitments. The latter, presuppose the involvement and cooperation of a large number of partner institutions, namely those of the United Nations System and the Member Nations as well. We are also aware of the multi-dimensional nature of the follow-up to the World Food Summit. The fact is that the historic event of the World Food Summit has been initiated and completed here in this building by FAO and its Member Nations.

This Organization, being the world's Specialized Agency for food and agriculture, has already initiated the post-Summit activities, through its regular programmes and the Medium-Term Plan. It has, also, initiated coordination activities with its Member Nations and the various international bodies for implementing the World Food Summit Plan of Action. To achieve these needs, the concrete and continuous support is needed from all of its Members.

CHAIRMAN

I note that you are addressing yourself simply to document C 97/9. The next speaker on my list is South Africa.

Julian Alexis THOMAS (South Africa)

I will try to follow your request to be as brief as possible. Our delegation would endorse the Medium-Term Plan that is before us. As has already been indicated, this Medium-Term Plan is a re-write of the previous one, mainly taking into account what came out of the process and outcome of the World Food Summit and the Rome Declaration which, we feel, refocus things as far as FAO is concerned. In that respect, the document that we are addressing is a significant improvement on its predecessor.

My delegation, like others, would have preferred perhaps something better, certainly better as far as we are concerned. We would have preferred more emphasis, for example, on water management-issues surrounding water use in agriculture, livestock and related rangeland matters which are of fundamental importance in our country and, I think, in most of Africa as well and terribly important as far as the rural economy is concerned. We would also have liked to have seen more emphasis on assistance for countries to prepare themselves for the next round of trade negotiations.

On the other side of things, we would like to emphasize the importance of Chapter 4 in the document, the paramount importance of human resources in achieving the objectives of FAO, in other words, in improving the human resources, in providing the human resources of this Organization with the means of meeting the objectives.

Having said this, we feel that the document, the Medium-Term Plan, presents a balanced presentation of priorities in terms of Member needs and in terms of the FAO mandate. I think you will also already have deduced from my presentation that what we are trying to say is that, as others have pointed out, planning instruments change, they improve continuously, and I think the comment made by Mr Wade in this respect this morning was very important. We keep on moving towards a better situation, and let us bear this in mind before we think that we are confronted with a dramatic change here, either in outcome or in process.

We would agree -- in the spirit of wanting to improve the process, the planning framework within this Organization -- with the proposals that have been made in the document JM/97/1, in the initial comments that were made by the June Council, in the presentation made by Mr Wade this morning, and in the comments referring to document JM/97/1 made by the Programme Committee and the Finance Committees.

The nature of the components and the ways in which they will link and interact strike us as a significant improvement on the existing framework. Coming to the first component, certainly the first component in the table on page 3 of JM/97/1, in other words the Strategic Framework, we would just like to make the comment that this is the obvious starting point of the process. It is a very key element to the process and it hence needs to be treated in a thorough and adequate manner. We would like to support the approaches that have been suggested to do this, the approach suggested by the Secretariat this morning that are designed to ensure capturing all relevant issues and trends to reaching all Stakeholders and achieving ownership of the Strategic Framework. These are considered sound and realistic. We think we should proceed in a systematic and cautious manner.

My delegation would seriously question the need for a new, elaborate, time-consuming and, hence, costly structure to do this as has been suggested by some Members. We feel that the Organization already has a sound basis for looking towards the future. Let us start with the Medium-Term Plan, we have got that, we have got the comments that have been made to improve that Medium-Term Plan. We have got the vision of Agriculture 2010, the AT 2010 document. We have got similar exercises that have been conducted by other organizations, international agencies included and, of course, we have the outcome of the World Food Summit process that also added significantly to this context and content of information both internal and external to the Organization.

We therefore feel that there is sufficient to proceed without any dramatic changes as far as this Organization is concerned. We are against shifting excessive resources to planning when we consider that the main constraint to achieving FAO's objectives, at present, lies more in the area of implementation, in meeting objectives than in spending more time on deciding what needs to be done.

We would also like to suggest that the exercise before us is not at the same level or magnitude of the exercise that we went through for achieving our Rome Declaration at the World Food Summit. We consider that some of the techniques, some of the approaches that were used would certainly be included, and certainly should be taken into account in an FAO exercise but we do not think that we are talking about the same magnitude of exercise.

Lastly, I think, let us not be seduced by the significance of this idea of a new millenium and that this is the time to change or that there would be great expectations in two or three years time when we move into the year 2000. I think that we need to keep our feet on the ground, we should go forward together. We, in a practical way, would prefer going forward into the new millenium with the engine of this Organization firing on all cylinders and with a full tank of gasoline rather than spending too much time on designing a new car.

Mme Béatrice DAMIBA (Burkina Faso)

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président, de me donner la parole. Je voudrais tout d'abord et, à la suite des orateurs qui m'ont précédée, remercier Monsieur Wade pour la présentation qu'il a faite tout à l'heure, qui était véritablement une photographie commentée de la réflexion que nous menons au sein de la FAO avec les Pays membres en vue d'améliorer les processus d'élaboration des plans, des programmes et des stratégies.

La délégation du Burkina Faso voudrait reconfirmer l'intérêt d'un Plan à moyen terme pour six ans, de même que la démarche qui passe par stratégies, plans, programmes, qui est un processus véritablement clairvoyant que nous soutenons, ainsi que le processus d'élaboration du cadre stratégique, qui nous est proposé ici. Ma délégation tient à féliciter le Secrétariat pour l'élaboration du document du Plan à moyen terme qui est un document agréable à l'exploitation, donc du point de vue de sa présentation, même s'il peut encore être amélioré, comme l'ont déjà dit plusieurs orateurs. En tant que Plan d'orientation, le contenu d'un tel document permet de prendre de l'avance, de voir venir et d'anticiper éventuellement ce qui facilitera sans doute les assises des prochaines programmations et des prochaines élaborations des budgets de notre Organisation.

Le Burkina Faso voudrait voir insister sur les priorités suivantes dans le Plan à moyen terme. En ce qui concerne notamment les ressources humaines, l'expérience nous montre au Burkina qu'il faut miser sur les femmes d'abord; les femmes qui produisent jusqu'à 80 pourcent des denrées alimentaires, cela a été précisé dans le document, mais qui sont généralement négligées lorsqu'il s'agit d'éducation, d'encadrement, etc. Je voudrais pour cela faire une suggestion. Dans le document JM 97/1 en page 7, il y a une tentative de présentation graphique des parties prenantes de la FAO, et je vois en bas à gauche, "agriculteurs, producteurs y compris les femmes". Bien sûr, que c'est "y compris les femmes", je pense, parce que les femmes sont aussi agriculteurs et producteurs, mais s'il s'agit de mettre en relief le rôle des femmes, c'est ce que je crois, je propose qu'au lieu de dire "y compris les femmes" comme si c'était une race à part, peut-être "particulièrement les femmes", ou bien "notamment les femmes".

Et l'autre ressource humaine sur laquelle nous voudrions voir mis l'accent, ce sont les jeunes. Bien sûr, il y a un paragraphe dans le Plan à moyen terme se rapportant aux zones rurales, et la nécessité donc de combattre l'exode rural et de fixer les populations dans leurs terroirs. Je proposerais qu'on mette une phrase s'adressant particulièrement aux jeunes. Cela aussi, c'est en me basant sur l'expérience que nous faisons en ce moment au Burkina Faso, dans le cadre d'un programme que nous appelons "Fixation des jeunes dans leurs terroirs"; et je vous assure que les

premiers résultats sont très encourageants, parce qu'on a constaté que beaucoup de jeunes qui migraient dans les pays voisins, pour aller se faire embaucher dans des emplois saisonniers, restaient, se fixaient chez eux, avec des possibilités de gagner plusieurs fois plus que ce qu'ils allaient chercher ailleurs ou bien dans les grandes villes.

Et l'autre partenaire important, c'est la société civile, qui est déjà aussi mentionnée, et je souhaiterais qu'on mette également l'accent sur la part de la société civile. Nous avons pu vérifier le rôle important que peut jouer cette société civile et notamment au moment du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation et puis tout récemment dans le cadre du *Téléfood*.

Ma délégation voudrait également qu'un point, un accent particulier, soit mis sur la part de la communication, de la formation, de l'éducation, donc de toutes ces personnes, et particulièrement encore une fois les femmes et les jeunes, pour assurer la durabilité des projets et des programmes.

Un autre point sur lequel d'autres orateurs m'ont aussi précédée, c'est la maîtrise de l'eau. Il y a un paragraphe sur la maîtrise de l'eau, et en tant que pays sahélien, je sais de quoi je parle, l'eau est vraiment une denrée précieuse et sans laquelle aucune activité humaine n'est possible. Et avec l'eau, beaucoup d'espoir peut exister et nous aimerions qu'on développe davantage le rôle important de l'eau et la nécessité de la maîtriser. Si, effectivement, on prend en compte ces quelques priorités que je viens de citer, je pense que les résultats ne se feront pas attendre du point de vue de la production et donc, du point de vue de la sécurité alimentaire, qui est l'objectif principal auquel nous visons tous.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénégal)

Nous voudrions remercier le Secrétariat pour la qualité de ce document riche en informations, et qui met en évidence les perspectives et les enjeux, définit les orientations, fixe les priorités de l'Organisation, en tenant dûment compte des résultats du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation.

S'agissant des enjeux, ma délégation partage le point de vue exprimé sur le chapitre y relatif, et notamment aux paragraphes 19 à 21, et un peu plus particulièrement, les mesures préconisées pour améliorer le sort des femmes rurales. Nous voudrions également appuyer les orientations stratégiques contenues dans le document C 97/9, notamment en ce qui concerne le recours à des experts nationaux proches du terrain, mais à la compétence confirmée. Ce qui permet de réduire les coûts de projets et de réaliser ainsi des gains d'efficacité recherchés par tous.

De même, nous soutenons les activités de mobilisation pour un soutien accru au Programme spécial de sécurité alimentaire, qui constitue à notre avis une réponse concrète au problème de sécurité alimentaire dans bon nombre de pays en développement. A cet égard, Monsieur le Président, nous souscrivons pleinement à la proposition de campagne promotionnelle telle que *Téléfood 97*, pour non seulement sensibiliser l'opinion publique mondiale sur la problématique de la faim dans le monde, mais également récolter des fonds destinés à financer des projets du PSSA. Nous ne manquerons pas d'ailleurs de revenir sur cette question plus tard, lors de nos travaux, certainement. Globalement, nous soutenons les priorités annoncées au Chapitre 3, entre autres dans le domaine de la protection de l'environnement.

Etant ressortissant d'un pays agressé par la sécheresse, et à la suite de la tenue en octobre dernier, ici même, au siège de notre Organisation, de la première Conférence des parties à la Convention de lutte contre la désertification, nous notons avec satisfaction que la FAO compte poursuivre la collaboration interministérielle pour la mise en oeuvre de la CDD. Et à la suite du point de vue exprimé par l'Ambassadeur du Burkina Faso, nous voudrions partager ce point de vue.

En matière d'assistance aux Etats Membres, nous souhaiterions, de manière plus spécifique, que l'accent soit mis sur le renforcement nécessaire de l'assistance de la FAO aux pays en développement, en prévision des négociations commerciales multilatérales. Là, également, nous souscrivons entièrement à ce qu'a dit le Représentant de l'Afrique du Sud.

Et demain, sur le Programme de travail et budget, nous aurons l'occasion d'ailleurs de revenir plus en détail sur toutes ces questions, mais en attendant, Monsieur le Président, après avoir remercié Monsieur Wade de sa brillante introduction du document avant-hier, nous voulons exprimer notre point de vue sur le processus d'élaboration du document de stratégie 2000-2015. Ma délégation, comme beaucoup d'autres qui se sont exprimées sur la question, est favorable à l'élaboration d'une stratégie à long terme, dont l'idée au demeurant avait été lancée par le Directeur général. Toutefois, nous estimons que le processus devant aboutir à un tel document devrait être participatif, n'engendrer aucun coût supplémentaire et surtout observer le processus interne de la FAO. Sur la participation, Monsieur le Président, nous partageons le point de vue exprimé par le Mexique samedi, quant au coût; on a avancé ici le montant de 800 000 de dollars, financés par des contributions volontaires pour permettre la participation au processus de deux membres des pays en développement loin de la capitale. Monsieur le Président, cette idée est généreuse, elle est également certainement séduisante mais, au moment où les ressources de l'Organisation se tassent, on pourrait pour une fois consacrer ces sommes au financement par exemple de petits projets d'élevage ou d'aquaculture pour un coût moyen d'environ 10 000 de dollars par projet dans les pays en développement. En tout état de cause, Monsieur le Président, les Etats Membres devraient être suffisamment informés sur ce processus et invités à donner leur avis avant qu'une décision ne soit prise.

Gheorghe APOSTOIU (Roumanie)

Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi de vous féliciter pour votre élection en tant que Président de la II^{ème} Commission. Je ne voudrais pas manquer de remercier M. Wade pour l'introduction ou plus précisément pour les deux introductions aux documents soumis à notre débat. Document de politique générale, le Plan à moyen terme présenté par le Directeur général, et les autres documents connexes du Secrétariat, après des métamorphoses successives, arrivent aujourd'hui pour un nouvel examen dans un climat marqué par le ralentissement de la croissance de la production agricole mondiale et la régression de l'aide alimentaire, un climat où l'optimisme doit être bien maîtrisé. Ajoutons à tout cela les avatars de la réforme, la question des ressources et les rigueurs de concevoir une stratégie dans les conditions de la globalisation, et nous aurons, probablement plus claire la dimension des efforts nécessaires pour mettre en scène les acteurs d'un Plan ou, comme l'a affirmé M. Wade, d'un cadre stratégique, c'est-à-dire les grandes orientations, les priorités et les moyens.

Monsieur le Président, le Plan à moyen terme ou le cadre stratégique, nous devons accepter que nous sommes devant l'examen des lignes directrices qui vont marquer à l'avenir la politique de notre Organisation. Les recommandations faites par le Conseil et par les comités techniques au long de l'année ont été généralement retenues par le Secrétariat dans le document C 97/9 et surtout dans les documents connexes.

La délégation de la Roumanie souscrit à beaucoup de priorités et d'activités déjà prévues dans la forme actuelle du Plan à moyen terme. En même temps nous apprécions le commentaire de M. Wade concernant l'avenir du Plan, c'est-à-dire de considérer le Plan dans un processus de redéfinition.

Nous partageons également les observations et la déclaration de la Communauté européenne. C'est à nous, les Etats Membres, et à nous, décideurs politiques, de concilier de manière optimale nos impératifs nationaux de développement avec les priorités et les possibilités de notre Organisation. Pour satisfaire ces objectifs, qui se sont révélés parfois divergents, nous devons aider le Secrétariat à revoir l'ordre des priorités et à trouver ainsi une voie réaliste et pragmatique de la mise en application du Plan à moyen terme, en respectant aussi bien nos besoins que les contraintes globales. Au plus, la délégation de la Roumanie considère le Plan à moyen terme comme un cadre de coopération entre l'Organisation et les Etats Membres et qu'il est inconcevable de mettre en place des initiatives nouvelles qui n'obtiennent pas l'assentiment de ceux-ci.

La FAO a, à cet égard, une responsabilité importante de faire l'inventaire des besoins de ceux qui mettent leurs espoirs dans la coopération et dans l'assistance de l'Organisation. La FAO doit aussi développer sa capacité d'expertise et de réaliser périodiquement un bon diagnostic de la situation mondiale de l'agriculture pour bien cibler ses moyens de coopération avec les Etats Membres.

En soulignant les dimensions positives du Plan à moyen terme ou du cadre stratégique, la délégation de la Roumanie aimerait insister, néanmoins, sur le rôle de la FAO de promouvoir et de faciliter les mesures appropriées au point de vue économique, à travers ses propres programmes et opérations dans le cadre d'une large coopération avec les organisations internationales, les gouvernements et la société civile.

Vu ses nécessités, la Roumanie est intéressée à voir un progrès réel de la contribution de notre Organisation en matière de transfert de technologies en vue de renforcer le processus de développement, les capacités humaines et institutionnelles aux niveaux local et régional.

Il ne fait aucun doute, Monsieur le Président, que le contexte de la réforme en ce qui concerne les ressources financières gouvernementales n'est pas particulièrement favorable pour l'agriculture. Au moment où les budgets publics de la plupart des pays sont soumis à des pressions croissantes, nous sommes appelés à trouver des moyens de compensation dans la coopération. La FAO peut, en ce sens, offrir un cadre favorable. Une dimension importante de la FAO est en matière de mobilisation de ressources. Notre Organisation devrait continuer son dialogue avec ses sources internationales de financement dans le but de soutenir les plans stratégiques nationaux et de financer des programmes de sécurité alimentaire.

D'autre part, la FAO doit fournir des avis en matière de politique et promotion des investissements et nous aimerions voir ce rôle bien concrétisé dans la mise en application du prochain Plan à moyen terme. Finalement, la délégation de la Roumanie partage l'opinion qu'il est important de veiller à ce que la bonne expérience acquise soit maintenue dans le cadre du futur Plan à moyen terme. Tout ceci n'atténue pas nos appréciations pour l'effort du Secrétariat et du Directeur général de nous présenter un document de perspectives bien articulé.

Rabi Bahadur BISTA (Nepal)

As I am speaking for the first time here in Commission II, on behalf of the Nepalese delegation, I would like to congratulate you on being the Chairman of Commission II.

While we would like to endorse the Medium-Term Plan in general as it is proposed, however, without much elaboration I would like to be direct and to the point and therefore express our concern on the document in the following manner. I am unable to see strategy and programme clearly spelled out for the least developed countries. Otherwise, in my opinion, FAO will not be doing justice to a country like Nepal and my presence here would be questioned by many in Nepal.

With regard to food security, we would like to see a linkage between food security and gender issues. Equally, a linkage should also be expressed between food security and poverty. In my opinion, there is nothing much on poverty alleviation, not as much as I would have liked to have seen. Being a forester, I must also say that resource information is not a constraint in forestry. It is in fact the management planning of the forestry resources which has to produce more, cater for the local needs and increase exports of forestry commodities, help agriculture, conserve the biodiversity and enhance the local economy.

In this context, nowhere in the document do I find any mention of biodiversity conservation, whether it be agricultural biodiversity, life-style biodiversity or forestry biodiversity. Water management strategies required are just enough for, what we call in Nepal, a mountainous country, integrated sub-watershed management planning. It is in fact a holistic approach, blending agricultural, forestry, biodiversity conservation, watershed management and others including, income, employment, and related activities. The success of this programme is that it is

implemented through the participation of watershed users group, so somehow in terms of water management, some strategy like what we have adopted in Nepal I would have liked to have seen.

Mapela NGA-MA (Congo, République démocratique du)

Monsieur le Président, nous aussi tenons à vous féliciter pour votre élection en qualité de Président de cette Commission II. Nous vous félicitons aussi pour la façon dont vous dirigez nos débats. Comme l'ont souligné les délégués qui ont parlé avant nous, ma délégation estime que le Secrétariat a produit un bon document qui traite le Plan à moyen terme pour la période allant de 1998 à 2003. Ma délégation voudrait aussi féliciter Monsieur Wade pour la présentation de ce document.

Ceci dit, la délégation de la République démocratique du Congo pense que tous les débats portant sur les questions de planification des activités de la FAO doivent tenir pleinement compte du principe que Monsieur le Directeur général, Jacques Diouf, appelle dans l'avant-propos du document portant la quote C 97/9, je cite: "Le difficile processus politique par lequel les Organes directeurs doivent trouver un équilibre entre les besoins exprimés et le niveau de ressources que les pays membres sont prêts à mettre à disposition de la FAO doit être respecté." Fin de citation.

Monsieur le Président, on ne peut pas à la fois vouloir une chose et son contraire, c'est-à-dire, comme vous le savez, il y a exactement une année dans ce même bâtiment de la FAO, lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, nous avons décidé de tout mettre en oeuvre pour combattre la pauvreté, ce qui veut dire en d'autres termes que nous devons notamment donner les moyens nécessaires aux agences spécialisées des Nations Unies qui ont dans leur mandat l'élimination de la faim, de la malnutrition et de la pauvreté. Mais, que constatons-nous? En même temps que nous reconnaissons que les besoins des pays en développement vont croissant, puisque leurs populations augmentent chaque jour, nous nous arrêtons pour déclarer que les moyens financiers nécessaires pour satisfaire ces besoins exprimés doivent aller dans le sens contraire, c'est-à-dire dans le sens de la diminution. C'est cela que j'appelle vouloir une chose en même temps que son contraire.

Monsieur le Président, ma délégation pense que chaque fois qu'elle doit élaborer un Plan à moyen ou à long terme, la FAO devrait avoir présent à l'esprit qu'elle est l'Organisation chef de file du Système des Nations Unies pour toutes les questions touchant à l'alimentation et à l'agriculture à l'échelle mondiale. On a suggéré la création d'un groupe de travail *ad hoc* pour l'élaboration d'une stratégie de planification à long terme. Sans nous opposer à cette idée d'un groupe de travail *ad hoc*, nous pensons qu'un tel groupe, s'il était créé, devrait constituer une occasion pour confirmer une fois de plus le rôle de chef de file que la FAO doit jouer dans tous les domaines qui cadrent avec son mandat. Ce serait aussi, pourquoi pas, l'occasion d'obtenir que désormais les niveaux du budget de la FAO soient fixés en fonction des besoins des Etats Membres en développement qui attendent l'assistance de la FAO et que, pour atteindre les niveaux du budget de la FAO, l'on puisse recourir à toutes les sources de financement, à savoir notamment les contributions obligatoires de tous les Etats Membres, d'autres contributions que l'on peut qualifier de volontaires que les Etats Membres peuvent annoncer à l'occasion de conférences d'annonce de contributions au budget ordinaire de la FAO sans oublier bien sûr le fonds fiduciaire que les donateurs peuvent mettre à la disposition de la FAO pour aider les pays en développement.

Je termine mon intervention en rappelant qu'en ce qui concerne la coordination des activités du système des Nations Unies dans un pays donné, ma délégation estime qu'il faut rappeler à ce propos le principe qui veut qu'au niveau de chaque pays la coordination des activités relève de la souveraineté du pays et que, si ce pays-là le désire, il peut toujours recourir au conseil de l'Agence spécialisée des Nations Unies dont le mandat correspond bien aux activités à coordonner.

Hirotsugu AMAMIYA (Japan)

I would like to express our appreciation of the Secretariat's efforts to prepare the documents C 97/9 and JM/97/1 and also to thank Mr Wade for his detailed explanation of the new planning process to facilitate our understanding of the Secretariat's ideas.

The World Food Summit, held last November, affirmed the political will to achieve world food security and eradicate hunger. I would like to stress that the results of the World Food Summit should be a major basis for considering the Medium-Term Plan of FAO's work. On the other hand, FAO is faced with budgetary constraints as are other UN Organizations. I expect the reform process of FAO, initiated by the Director-General, should be continued. Under these circumstances, although I can accept the proposed Medium-Term Plan C 97/9, I would like to express the view that the FAO should pursue its activities in a more effective and efficient manner, focusing on the achievement of world food security.

With respect to the newly-proposed planning process, I would like to mention that the ideas would be very useful as a basis for considering the improved planning process. At the moment, I will make the following comments. First, I can support the examination of FAO's mandate to begin with. Secondly, I think that identification of Stakeholders' needs would be important for FAO's effective activities; however, FAO's decision-making process should continue to be pursued by Governing Bodies composed of all Member Nations. Thirdly, the results of the World Summit should be fully reflected in the framework. Fourthly, due attention should be paid to the balance between normative and operational activities and FAO's comparative advantage. Lastly, the framework should have flexibility so that it could be adjusted to the changing situation around food and agriculture diversity and fisheries.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much for including those very concrete suggestions in relation to the new Strategic Framework.

Atul SINHA (India)

First of all, Mr Chairman, I would like to take the floor to congratulate you on your unanimous election as the Chairman of Commission II, and I particularly commend you and congratulate you for very ably conducting the proceedings of this Commission so far.

I would also like to congratulate Mr Wade for having run us through the basic scheme of this document C 97/9 and, in particular, I do appreciate the clarity with which you explained the Stakeholders who are involved in this entire exercise because I think that helps us to understand the fundamental planning process that is before us for consideration and comments. I also appreciate the way he has explained the basic structure of this document and the way this exercise has been conducted by the Secretariat in the light of the guidance received from the various Specialized Agencies and from the Council in the past.

Having said that, I would now confine my comments to two components. One is the planning exercise by itself, some comments on the way it has been conducted and the comments which have been made on it by various distinguished speakers so far. The second part would be on the contents of the documents specifically in terms of the programme contents and in terms of the items which are inside this document. I am sure I would then be able to present my ideas a little more clearly.

First of all, we are concerned about the fact that any planning exercise, even though it is very necessary, is also quite costly and today, with the present budgetary constraints, we have to think about the cost-benefit of this exercise if it is conducted on a very long-term basis or if it is conducted at a great cost. It is in that context that we have heard the comments of some Members who feel that a long-term plan with a substantially high cost needs to be conducted in order to give a strategic framework. Nobody could object to that kind of an exercise but let us try and see whether what we have is sufficient for our purpose.

My delegation feels that what we have within the covers of this document, the main purpose for the next six years, is more than sufficient and I would feel that FAO would have done an excellent job if it is able to execute all that it plans to do in the next six years, given the increasingly difficult resource situations that it is facing. In fact, I would very strongly support what has been said by my distinguished colleague from South Africa. I do not wish to repeat his arguments, but the fact of the matter is that we have the World Summit Plan of Action which very clearly spells out what needs to be done. We have the experience of a long history of FAO which has been going into the problems of hunger, malnutrition and so on. So today there is no shortage of knowing what needs to be done. The question is, how do you do it?

There again you have to prioritize, we have been saying that. I think this particular document has done an excellent job. In fact, in my opinion, it has given a list of priorities, a list of areas where it wants to go into in the next six years, far too clearly. The point is that if it is able to do even ninety percent, I think, a major problem in the world of hunger and malnutrition would be solved, indeed. So the question is first of all we must see that if a detailed exercise coming in the wake of a whole lot of exercises which has already gone into the World Food Summit needs to be done at this stage. That is question number one, and I think we would be far more comfortable having the engine of the FAO do what it has already been told to do with the resources rather than engage into another exercise which will probably result in a lot more meetings and so on. Indeed I would like to commend the Director-General once again for what he said on the World Food Day and what he said also in this document, in the beginning, where he said that the time for big conferences, or even small conferences, discussions, speeches and so on is long past and we need to get to the ground and start messing up with our hands about what needs to be done. That, I think, is the central theme of all such planning exercises, desirable as they are. That is number one.

Number two is another issue and that is we have been talking of the need for medium-term planning, for what needs to be done, programmes and so on and so forth. Have we searched our hearts and seen whether we are ready with a Medium-Term Plan of contributions? We have talked of plans but we do not even have a Two-Year Term Plan of Contributions. There is so much of uncertainty which has hung over this Organization over the last four years, five years or even six years. We have not been able to tell the Organization right till the Conferences about the kind of resources which will be made available to it. We, as Member Nations, I am afraid do not have the moral right to demand that the Organization present us with ten-year or a twenty-year plan when we do not tell it will be fed for the next two years. I think that requires some introspection.

The point is, we all know the resource constraints that are facing all our organizations, not only the major donors but even the minor donors and that is by the fact that a large number of countries, much as they would like to give their contributions, do find it at times difficult. It is not a lack of commitment, it is just sheer, hard economic reality which, if it is being faced by the richer countries, it is certainly being faced by the smaller and poorer countries. So the question is, if we are not able to tell this Organization what we will be able to deliver it in the six years, I am afraid we do not have the moral right to ask it to prepare a plan for the next ten or twenty years.

Let us be content with this Plan, which I think is an excellent exercise which has been completed by the Secretariat, and I must commend this important Stakeholder which is the Secretariat in this entire exercise. They have had to produce a huge document in the form of the Programme of Work and Budget where it deals with three scenarios. Now the question is, if we go into this so-called "drip" system of irrigation, efficient as it is, it is also very strainful for the plant because it gets everything drop-by-drop. Now the point is a plan cannot plan for six-year growth if it gets items drop-by-drop, if it gets nutrients drop-by-drop. That is a hint which I wish to give here.

About the exercise which was suggested by some delegates it is very well intentioned but at the same time perhaps it forces us to think. Whether we need an exercise like the one which was conducted at the Summit. I do feel that Summits of the type which was held last year happen once

in a decade or probably two decades or even five decades. You cannot have the luxury of holding those kinds of exercises every now and then. You have a chart, try and do what you can given the resources. Therefore, in my opinion, for the moment we may find it difficult to support a large exercise of the type that was convened last year, even though some countries may be willing to give resources for it. I would go back to the very able comment made by the distinguished delegate from Senegal who said that, if some countries are willing to provide funds for that exercise, I think they will be doing a far greater service to the hungry and poor of the world if the same money could be diverted into field programmes, into programmes which have already been mentioned as priorities in the World Food Summit Plan of Action. So let us try and start spending that money on the ground, rather than on meetings and on conferences and discussions.

Coming then to the specifics of this document, to the second part of my intervention, I would first of all like to praise what the distinguished Ambassador from Italy said. I think fundamental to this entire exercise is the importance of expressing greater synergies and rapport between the Rome-based Organizations.

We recognize that these are the days when FAO by itself cannot achieve whatever it wants to achieve alone. That is a recognized fact of life. The days are gone when FAO had a massive budget and could do lots of things. Today unless everybody moves in tandem things cannot improve and the most desirable thing to do would be a System-wide response to problems on the ground. That is easier said than done. We know the large size of the UN System, we know the fact that there is going to be a lot of restructuring, a lot of improvements in the administrative system of the UN but those reforms are obviously taking time. The question is, charity begins at home.

Let us begin by the Rome-based Organizations and we know that a lot of synergies can be built up between WFP, IFAD which are really in with the same clientele, the same people. I see that if we set an excellent example of greater collaboration between FAO, WFP and IFAD, I am sure the foundation, the ground work for a System-wide response to the problems of hunger and malnutrition all over the world would have been very successfully laid. So I would commend the distinguished Ambassador of Italy for having drawn our attention to that fundamental requirement and that, I think, somewhere must find a mention in our document.

Secondly, I fully agree with the Chapter here on the challenges for the medium-term and I think the most important part of that is putting agriculture back on the map. I think that was the central theme of all that was said in the Summit document. I think somehow, somewhere, we have taken food production and food distribution for granted and the world is very happy with the industrial advances, industrial development. Let us not forget hunger and malnutrition are key to the whole thing and all human efforts, whether agricultural or industrial, are geared towards that purpose. Nobody gears by industrial development *per se*, it is only as a means to an end, and the end is to feed the people of the world and put agriculture back on the map. I cannot help but recall what I saw on cars in the United States some time back which said "we cannot eat houses" and that was a hint to people who were busy all the time with real estate development and forgetting the agricultural margin and agricultural lands. Therefore, putting agriculture back on the map I think is a very timely reminder in the portion relating to challenges for the medium-term.

The role of women, I am happy to see, has been well put up and I, at the same time, would like to underscore what the very distinguished Ambassador from Burkina Faso mentioned: it is not a question of just giving a passing reference to the women who are involved in this, indeed they are the linchpin to the entire structure. Therefore I fully support what she said that it is not including women that is the question: women have to be put in the centre stage, you do not have to mention them as incidentals, they are the keystone to the whole arch of agriculture development.

Reducing variability, I think, once again is the key to this entire exercise and the experience of my own country I think bears witness to the importance of reducing variability, although it may not come out very clearly what my country has been able to achieve. I am very grateful indeed to

the Director-General, personally as well as on behalf of my country, when during "Telefood" he said that India had shown that a country that was really an importer could turn into an exporter over these years, based on the advice it received from FAO and other countries and also based on controlling the variability of agriculture. What is happening is that even now we have failures with the monsoon and yet -- touch wood -- nobody dies of hunger and drought in India any more, whereas we had millions dying in the famous Bengal famine in the early part of the century. Therefore, I think that reducing variability is a very important long-term goal.

Reference has been made by many delegations to the importance of the key role of water. I would only like to underscore what has been said in paragraph 25 and I think that could, by itself, be a very good pointer. It says "less expensive methods of water control accessible both financially and technically to all producers have to be disseminated in seeking to improve traditional systems of irrigation". We have seen the dangerous effects of large-scale irrigation and I think it is time, and my own country has seen that by pushing small-scale irrigation relying on the local knowledge and cheap methods, I think we solved a lot of problems of salinity and so on which we see with large projects.

I would try to be brief, I think one more important point which FAO seems to have missed in this Chapter, which I would have loved to have seen was the advocacy of the poor small farmers, Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, Least Developed Countries and Small Island States. I think that advocacy role is very important in a world that is now increasingly governed by trade considerations, increasingly governed by harsh realities of the market place. It is there that we need an Organization like the FAO to perform its task in favour of these disadvantaged areas and disadvantaged people.

I fully agree with the programme priorities mentioned here. Very brief reference needs to be made to the Technical Cooperation Programme which has proved its merits and which needs to be supported. The Special Programme on Food Security, which has been the initiative of the Director-General, has made excellent progress. I am very happy to indicate that India is about to enter into an agreement with Eritrea for the Special Programme on Food Security, which I think will go a long way and I do understand that other countries are also joining in this exercise.

Technical Cooperation amongst Developing Countries is another very cost-effective method of ensuring that experiences of developing countries are transplanted on to other developing countries. I am sure this plant will take root very strongly and will prosper. I think today we ought to be looking not only at strategies, but cost-effective strategies and I think TCDC strategies are very cost-effective.

In respect of SPFS all I would like to say is that I do hope that geographical distribution is kept in mind while giving out benefits under SPFS in order that this programme be much more successful in future.

Investments I think are another area which would require attention. I am happy that a portion is devoted in this document to investments, which I think are the best way to enable countries to get the benefit of international funds which are available. I am sure that the Investment Centre can help developing countries capture more and more resources because only there can you develop strategies.

Watershed management and poverty, in my opinion, are two major omissions in this particular document as pointed out by the distinguished delegate from Nepal. Indeed India has had a lot of experience in watershed management. All our strategies for agricultural development are centred on watershed management and poverty administration. Poverty, as you know, is the root cause of hunger and malnutrition, and to that extent, I think greater attention could have been paid here.

Very briefly, savings have been mentioned. I would only say the maximum contribution to savings can be made by making use of the services of retired staff of the Organization because they are really seeing how savings could be effected, they have seen the way the Organization worked several years back and the way it is working now. It is a tighter, slimmer Organization. It

is working efficiently, but I am sure we as outsiders cannot probably provide as much as the insiders. Therefore I would seek the help of that important Stakeholder. Probably an Incentive Scheme could be built up to ensure that suggestions come which are more and more valuable. We would also know that many developing countries and developed countries have had a lot of Commissions which have gone into the question of savings, and I am sure we can benefit from the advice of those without having to go into a large group.

The last point in my intervention is that we are unhappy that we have mentioned the modernization of electronic capabilities in FAO. Indeed I agree with the Director-General in his foreword when he said that obsolescence is a major problem and I do know that this Organization is also facing this problem. However, I am sure we must not try and save money there because I think, if your delivery system is not good, you will never be able to deliver what you have to deliver, and what you have the capabilities of delivering. So I am afraid I would like to press that we must provide more and more attention to ensuring that we are absolutely up-to-date in terms of capabilities on the electronic media front.

Lastly, we appreciate the Chart which has been given at the end of this document because I think it helps us to peg what has been said here to the specific commitments made in the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

I am indeed sorry but I have not been able to keep myself as brief as I would have wished to, but there are certain ideas which I thought must be put on the table so that we are able to do a good job of this particular Medium-Term Plan.

Ms Janet F. BITEGEKO (Tanzania, United Republic of)

May I, on behalf of the Tanzanian delegation, commend the Secretariat for the good documents, especially C 97/9, and Mr Wade for his good and precise presentation.

My delegation believes that strategic planning is vital and supports the move by FAO.

On priorities, my delegation would like to stress that food and water should be accorded the highest priority, especially in Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, as it is in these countries where frequent droughts and floods are experienced. Food availability in these countries is and will continue to be an issue.

Therefore, FAO in the medium term should assist these countries in locust strategies, water conservation, development of resistant and high-yielding seeds, and in the reduction of post-harvest losses. Special Programmes on Food Security, programmes that have been initiated in these areas, should therefore be strengthened and expanded in the medium term.

Emphasis should be on sustainable agricultural production.

On involvement of all Stakeholders, my delegation feels it is a positive move. We believe such a move would maintain the confidence and participation of the Stakeholders both in programme design preparation and the implementation. However, my delegation strongly believes that the governments of the Member Nations should take a lead in providing guidance to FAO.

The Tanzanian delegation is of the opinion that a Strategic Framework will have to involve the use of women in a more elaborate way, since the two groups we feel were not clearly referred to in the documents. Youth is increasingly becoming important in sustainable food security production, especially in developing countries where the technological development is still very low.

On the modalities of implementation, FAO's role in promoting and facilitating appropriate and cost-effective action, through its own programme and operation, should also collaborate with NGOs in foreseeing sustainable rural development in food security. Promotion of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries is also very important.

On Forestry, the Tanzanian delegation feels that emphasis should be directed to supporting land use policies, and articulation to facilitate the implementation of community forestry development, as well as national forestry programmes.

You may wish to note that the Tanzanian National Forest Programme was affected by unharnessed land use and sector policies, and our updating is taking cognizance of this.

On institutional and capacity-building, we feel that, while we applaud the strengthening of national capacities, modalities should be developed in sharing research information in the light of limited resources.

On Fisheries, policies in countries in scientific and economic liberalization process have tended to be obscured by focussing more on short-term economic advancement, along the lines of implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. FAO, in this Medium-Term Plan, should continue to play a facilitatory role in enabling such Member Nations to make strategic plans towards sustainable fisheries development.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

I will be very brief and thereby abide by your recommendation to us.

I am speaking on behalf of the Near East Group. First of all, I would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the excellent documentation we have received on this Agenda Item, especially for document C 97/9 -- Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003. We obviously thank them for the other documents, as well, which we now have before us.

I would like to thank Mr Wade very much for that excellent introduction to this Agenda Item and to the documents. We feel that, thanks to that excellent introduction, it is possible for us to save an awful lot of effort and, consequently, an awful lot of time.

The Group on whose behalf I am speaking would like to voice its support for the Medium-Term Plan now under discussion, which we consider to be a positive step. In this Medium-Term Plan, we feel that the concerns of the Member Nations of this Organization are all well-presented.

Nonetheless, the priorities obviously differ from one country to another, priorities differ from one region of the world to another. Here I feel that FAO, when it prepared this Medium-Term Plan, had to do so in such a way as to seek to respond to the needs of the Member Nations, to the needs of their regions. We all know that FAO is the lead Organization, the pilot Organization in the realms of agriculture in the UN System, the leading edge, as it were, and likewise in the area of rural development.

We feel that greater importance should be allocated to the rationalization, as indicated in the use of water resources, soil utilization, especially in the arid and semi-arid climate countries.

It would also be an appropriate opportunity to give greater importance to technology transfer, or the transfer of technologies, and this with a view to providing much needed assistance to those countries in need thereof.

Lastly, it is the people who live in the house who are in the best position to refurbish or to do necessary maintenance work on the house and to brush it up, as it were. I feel that the Organization is following this pathway -- as it were calling upon its inhabitants --and we would not be willing to accept people coming from the outside to dictate what types of reform should be undertaken in this Organization, what type of work, as it were, should be done on the Organization.

With your forbearance, let me just say that I would like to support what was said by my distinguished colleague from South Africa.

Marcos NIETO LARA (Cuba)

En primer lugar mi delegación desea agradecer a la Secretaría la pertinencia y calidad de estos programas, de los documentos que nos ha preparado para establecer un Plan a Medio Plazo; muy conveniente la organización y, por supuesto, los países. Quisiera felicitar, también, al señor Wade por su excelente presentación en dos tiempos.

Señor Presidente, mi delegación considera que es necesario contar con un marco estratégico que le permita definir o, por lo menos, orientar el futuro de la Organización en los próximos quince años y apoya firmemente esta propuesta. En segundo lugar, quiere respaldar la propuesta de México en cuanto a que se celebren consultas nacionales. Es cierto que durante los años pasados se celebraron consultas también para preparar la Cumbre Mundial, celebrada aquí en Roma en el pasado año, pero eso constituye ya de por sí, un ingrediente muy positivo que pudiera contribuir a disminuir los costos.

También queremos agradecer a algunos países donantes que expresaron su disposición de contribuir con algunos fondos y propusieron que la FAO también tratara de movilizar otras fuentes de financiamiento para apoyar este proceso de consulta.

CHAIRMAN

I should say that Panama has sent a written statement which will appear in the Verbatim Record.

Before I give the floor to Mr Wade to reply on behalf of the Secretariat to the points that have been made, let me tell you how I propose to proceed.

What I envisage is that we will deal this morning with the Secretariat response and will return to this item this afternoon for my summing-up.

J.J. NEETESON (Netherlands)

Before you start your summing-up later on, I would like to indicate that the European Union and its Member States would like to retain the right to come back on this Item, because we intend to submit a Resolution on this very valuable subject of Strategic Framework and New Programming Model.

I am not yet sure whether we could do so later on today, or tomorrow.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá)

A nombre de la Delegación de Panamá y en el mio propio, deseo expresarle nuestra sincera complacencia por verle presidir los debates de esta importante Comisión. Permítame, así mismo, por su digno conducto, hacer extensivas nuestras felicitaciones al resto de la mesa.

Señor Presidente, como miembros del Comité de Finanzas no teníamos la intención de participar en el debate de este Tema, ya que consideramos que en los comentarios y las recomendaciones contenidas en el Informe de la Reunión de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas, se recoge todo cuanto tendríamos que decir al respecto y consideramos por lo tanto de poca utilidad alargar el debate, aún considerando el argumento de importancia prioritaria. Sin embargo, durante la última sesión de esta Comisión, escuchamos la propuesta que nuestro amigo y colega, el Consejero José Robles, hiciera en representación de su país, México, en relación a la elaboración de documentos sobre las estrategias nacionales, tal como se están efectuando en el ámbito de la aplicación de los objetivos de la Cumbre.

Estimo que esta propuesta es de gran utilidad y deseo por lo tanto expresar el más decidido apoyo de nuestra delegación a la misma. Muchas gracias.¹

CHAIRMAN

¹ Texto incluido en las actas a petición expresa.

I suggest that the best way to proceed would be as follows. I will ask Mr Wade now to reply on behalf of the Secretariat, and we will then adjourn the debate on this Item. Whether we adjourn it to this afternoon or whether we adjourn it till tomorrow, is something that needs some discussion.

I now turn to Mr Wade to reply on behalf of the Secretariat to the points that have been made.

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

I do not think I will take too much of your time because the specific questions were not that large a number. There were, of course, a lot of suggestions being made and I think that this debate is one of the major inputs to the process of improving these plans. We of course do take note of those particular proposals or comments.

There has been a lot of discussion about the proposals for the new programme budget process. In a way, I feel a need to apologize that we did not, somehow, in some way, make it easier for you to handle that Item. As you know, what we did was produce a document for the Programme and Finance Committees. They considered it and made recommendations to the Council, who made recommendations to you.

What we were discussing there was simply the process; we are not yet at the stage of having completed the analysis and being able to give you a document, so we did not put the same weight on it. I am very pleased to see that you have and I thank you for your interest in the area.

The first draft of the Strategic Framework is planned for May 1998. That first draft will take into account your concerns as the major Stakeholders of this institution. We will be relying on sources such as your comments today, such as your comments through the Council, the strategic issues raised in each of the technical committees -- in COAG, COFO, COFI and the CFS -- and of course your deliberations in other Bodies such as the World Food Summit itself. Be assured that the document is not going to come out as a Secretariat Think-Tank result, but as a result of things you yourselves have been saying over recent months and, I may say, years, in certain cases.

On the specific questions, I would like to refer to very specific ones which I feel need to be addressed.

The distinguished delegate of Poland was very concerned that the document did not refer to soil erosion and it is true, we do not use this terminology, but I would like to assure you that work on soil erosion and desertification is, in fact, part of the second and the third projects, projects two and three, under Programme 2.1.1, in the Programme of Work and Budget, for which we are planning a six-year effort to address those problems.

You also raised, Madam, concern about plant breeding, and here I would like to confirm that this is included as the first priority item under paragraphs 94 and 95 of the Medium-Term Plan, through the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources. This, of course, is also in part response to the distinguished delegate of Nepal's concern about the lack of attention to biodiversity. FAO's contribution is very much in the area of conservation and management of the genetic resources involved, and you will find references to that throughout the document; in the case of animals in paragraph 105 of the Medium-Term Plan to which I am referring now, in the case of plants in paragraph 94, and, to a lesser extent, because of the priorities that have been set so far, in the case of forestry in paragraph 145.

Returning again to the distinguished delegate of Poland and the concern about marginal grazing lands, I would say that the Medium-Term Plan does not address it too directly, you are quite correct to raise that. If it is any comfort or assistance to you, work on marginal grazing lands will centre on the policy issues of their management, including the environmental aspects. I would refer you to paragraph 351 of the Programme of Work and Budget, which throws some more light on this.

On research and technology development, we agree with Poland entirely that this is a very important task and that we have a role in supporting and guiding agricultural research. Included, as an example of this, is paragraph 96 of the Medium-Term Plan, where we see this is the first priority.

With regard to our relationship with IAEA and the agricultural application of isotopes and biotechnology, yes, the Medium-Term Plan is a bit thin on the subject matter. We do go into this in much more detail under Programme 2.5.1 in the Programme of Work and Budget, where, I have to say, we do emphasize and recognize the role of IAEA in this process. I am sorry if the Medium-Term Plan does not spell out all the linkages, but it was one of the decisions we made, not to make it too heavy in that regard. It is a given for us, they are the major contributor to that process and we are from the resource viewpoint, if you like, the junior partner.

I think there is a particular question, I cannot remember who it was from, with regard to grazing systems. I will give you the reference, anyway. In paragraph 104 of the document C 97/9, you will find some emphasis for pastoral and extensive grazing systems and, in fact, the methods to increase livestock productivity from grazing in high potential areas will concern areas mainly in South America. Our Animal Production and Health Division will continue its efforts to pursue, as much as possible, the objectives of integration for all farming systems and thus avoiding or preventing natural resource degradation.

I do not have other specific questions but I hope I have not missed anything. It was a very long debate and I have only answered those where I thought there were questions to the Secretariat, rather than comments about what should be made a priority in future plans.

CHAIRMAN

Does anyone wish to take up points made by Mr Wade in his reply? In that case, let us move on.

Given that the Netherlands has asked for the right to come back on this Agenda Item, what I propose to do, is to adjourn the discussion of it for the moment. I still have to sum-up. We have to hear from the Netherlands. I, therefore, propose to adjourn, not to close the debate on this Item. Whether we come back to it this afternoon or whether we come back to it tomorrow, I am afraid that I can not yet tell you. But, I will tell you at the beginning of this afternoon's Session.

Having mentioned this afternoon's Session, I should say that there is a degree of uncertainty about how we are going to handle it. You will see from the Order of the Day that the Programme of Work and Budget has been slated for consideration during the course of today, but as those of you who were here on Saturday will know, this Commission has been reassigned from Commission III, the Review of Statutory Bodies. It may be convenient to take that Item this afternoon. I would, therefore, be grateful if delegations who wish to speak on that subject were prepared to do so this afternoon.

While on the subject of which Commission is doing what, I need to clarify a point about the Resolution -- which we had before as in this Commission -- relating to the amendment of the General Rules of the Organization, to simplify the planning and programming system.

I said this morning, when introducing the Item, that among the papers we had to consider was a Draft Resolution to give affect to a change in the General Rules. If the proposal for a new Strategic Framework, and systems flowing there-from, met with our approval. The formal position is that that Resolution will be endorsed by Commission III and those of you who are eagle-eyed scrutineers of the Agenda will know that it appears on the Agenda for Commission III, as Item 16.2.

As I understand the position, it is the job of this Commission to endorse the concept and it is the job of Commission III to endorse the Resolution as such. I hope that is clear. It does among other things, illustrate the procedural pitfalls which surround this subject. Our job is to endorse the concept. The job of Commission III is to endorse the Resolution as such.

Two further points. One from myself and I will then give the floor to my Secretariat. I repeat the point I made at the outset of this morning's Session, which is, that I intend to set-up a Group of Friends of the Chair, and if any delegation would like to nominate themselves to be involved in that process -- I describe it as a process at this stage -- I would be grateful if they would let my Secretariat know. A number of delegations have already indicated their interest.

The meeting rose at 12.35 hours.

La séance est levée à 12 h 35.

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.35 horas.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)

14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (continued) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (suite) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003 (continuación) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10; C 97/LIM/20)

CHAIRMAN

At the end of this morning's session, I adjourned the debate on our discussion of the Medium-Term Plan, Item 14, The Netherlands having told us that there was the possibility of a Resolution. The Netherlands has asked for the floor again this afternoon.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

I can confirm to this Commission that the Netherlands will, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, submit a Resolution on the new medium-term planning system and especially, looking for strengthening the FAO 2000 project, will submit a Resolution to the Resolutions Committee this afternoon to be discussed, hopefully, in the Resolutions Committee of tomorrow or of Wednesday.

CHAIRMAN

Netherlands, thank you very much. We note that point. It will, of course, take a little time for a Resolution to go through the Resolutions Committee. I think our expectation should be that we will not resume discussion of this Agenda Item until tomorrow afternoon, at the earliest, and it may indeed move into Wednesday.

Can I, before we begin the afternoon's substantive debate, reiterate a point I made this morning, which is, that I have it in mind to set up a group of Friends of the Chair, to help forward the process of arriving at a consensus on the Programme of Work and Budget. It would be very helpful to me to know, at the earliest opportunity, who would wish to take part in such a group. How that group will operate, I have yet to decide, but it is becoming a matter of some urgency that those who wish to participate in it should let me know.

We have an extremely tight timetable for dealing with the Programme of Work and Budget since the Budget Resolution has to go to the Plenary on Friday. The earlier we can begin the process of talking as part of the Friends of the Chair the better.

Having adjourned the discussion of Agenda Item 14, on the Medium-Term Plan, we have a choice this afternoon about what we are going to do. The order paper says the next item on the agenda is the Programme of Work and Budget. As you all know, from my introduction on Saturday morning and from what I said when we began this morning, this Commission has had reassigned to it, from Commission III, Agenda Item 22.1 which is the Review of Statutory Bodies. It would seem to me convenient to move on to the discussion of that Agenda Item, the Review of Statutory Bodies, this afternoon. However, there may well be delegations who would wish to speak on that issue, who are not ready to do so. Can I propose that we should move now to the Review of Statutory Bodies and would anyone who has problems with that please indicate.

The Commission is content to move to that Agenda Item. I envisage that it would be possible, later this afternoon, to open the debate on the Programme of Work and Budget. So, as things stand at the moment, I hope that we will be able to deal, this afternoon, with the Review of Statutory bodies and to make some inroads into the debate on the Programme of Work and Budget.

I now propose to give the chairmanship of this Agenda Item to my Vice-Chair, Mr Paul Paredes Portella.

Paul Paredes Portella, Vice-Chairman of Commission II, took the chair
Paul Paredes Portella, Vice-Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence
Ocupa la presidencia Paul Paredes Portella, Vicepresidente de la Comisión II

III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
III. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES
III. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y ADMINISTRATIVOS

22. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters
22. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques
22. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos

22.1 Review of FAO Statutory Bodies (C 97/LIM/24)
22.1 Examen des organes statutaires de la FAO (C 97/LIM/24)
22.1 Examen de los Organos Estatutarios de la FAO (C 97/LIM/24)

EL PRESIDENTE

Tenemos un tiempo limitado y asumo que tienen delante de ustedes el documento C 97/LIM/24, para maximizar nuestro tiempo. El señor Hjort, Director General Adjunto, presentará este documento.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

The Review of Statutory Bodies is a matter that was initiated in earnest by the Conference two years ago. The matter was considered at, I believe, every Session of the Programme and Finance Committees since then with increasing diligence.

They appointed an *Ad Hoc* Contact Group which, gave its Final Report to the Programme and Finance Committees on 25 September 1997. That Report was considered by the Programme and Finance Committees and they moved forward their recommendations to the Council.

Last week, the Council considered the matter that you have in front of you in C 97/LIM/24, which has already been referenced, the extract from the Report of the Council. I would highlight from the cover page paragraph 2, where it states in the last sentence: "In this connection, the Council amended the Draft Conference Resolution and recommended that the wording of the Draft Resolution should be carefully examined by the Conference before its approval, in order to avoid any possible misunderstandings."

I must say there was considerable misunderstanding at Council and so, perhaps, it would be well for me to refer to the basic fact that the authority to establish Statutory Bodies rests with the Conference or the Council or the Director-General, with the concurrence of the Council or the Conference.

The Statutory Bodies, themselves, have the authority to establish Subsidiary Bodies. So, you will note in the Draft Resolution that is before you, in the operative paragraph 1, it refers to Bodies that are proposed to be abolished. These are Bodies that were established either by the Conference or the Council. They are listed in Appendix A to the Resolution.

In the second paragraph, the operative paragraph states that "the Conference recommends to the Parent Bodies concerned, that their Subsidiary Bodies, listed in Appendix B, be abolished and calls on those Parent Bodies to take the necessary action unless they consider ..." and so forth.

In other words, there is a big difference between those Bodies listed in Appendix A and those in Appendix B or C or D, in that the Conference has the authority to abolish those Bodies listed in Appendix A. What you are doing in the other cases is recommending to the Parent Bodies, or

requesting the Director-General, or recommending to the Codex Alimentarius Commission. These bodies, in turn, the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the other Parent Bodies, will take these recommendations into account in deciding what action to take but they have the authority to decide to abolish, merge or establish, Subsidiary Bodies to the Statutory Bodies.

In paragraph 3, just to highlight again. Here the Conference is requesting the Director-General to consult with the Organizations listed in Appendix C, with a view to securing alternative arrangements for the abolition of the Joint Bodies. In other words, here again the Conference is not, in this instance, abolishing those Bodies. There is another step in the process.

I hope I have not taken too long but, in view of the confusion over the authority to establish and precisely what was being asked, I thought it might be necessary to give this background.

Again, just to summarize, if you approve this Resolution in this Commission and it goes forward and is approved by the Conference, you will be abolishing the Bodies listed in Appendix A. You will be making recommendations to the Parent Bodies, including Codex Alimentarius, with respect to their Subsidiary Bodies. You will be requesting the Director-General to consult with the Organizations. The specific Bodies in each instance, about which recommendations are made, or the request to the Director-General, are listed in the Appendices to this brief document. They are in Appendices B, C and D.

EL PRESIDENTE

Muchísimas gracias por su explicación que visiblemente esclarece el contenido, el alcance de este documento y, como usted mismo señala, concretamente es el Apéndice A, solamente a él que se hace referencia en cuanto a su abolición.

Señores representantes, si ustedes lo tienen a bien, en este momento del trabajo de la Comisión podríamos tratar de optimizar nuestro tiempo y si así les parece revisar este Proyecto de Resolución. Si así lo creen podemos comenzar por el primer párrafo introductorio.

Ms Astrid BERGQUIST (Sweden)

I have, in particular, a comment on Appendix C. I do not know whether you would like me to take it up now or whether you want to go through the draft text of the Resolution before.

As a general comment, I would like to say that, of course, we are in favour of a number of obsolete Statutory Bodies being abolished. On the other hand, we have some views as to some of the suggestions, in particular in Appendix C, which we feel it is contrary to decisions taken in other bodies. In particular, decisions taken in the recent UNGA Session. So that is what my comments would lead to.

EL PRESIDENTE

Considero que para maximizar nuestro tiempo, sería conveniente que trabajáramos párrafo por párrafo. Llegará un momento en que ustedes me dirán sus atenciones en el punto que corresponda. De allí que, señores delegados, insisto, en ver en este momento el primer párrafo. Si no hay oposición seguimos adelante.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

Before considering the document, I would like to have the Secretariat answer some additional questions related to this project. If I understand well, we have two basic goals which we pursue with this exercise. One is to get some savings and the second goal is to achieve greater efficiencies.

We have different appendices. Appendix A is for definite action by the Conference. The other appendices are not definite action because there will be other consultations. There is a kind of an invitation to pursue the matter, if I understand well. Therefore, obviously these are decisions which are of a different nature.

In general, I would like to underline that my country supports the general direction of this exercise. However, I would like to ask the Secretariat to tell us what are the savings which can be expected from the abolition of the Bodies listed in Appendix A. What, in particular, are the savings which can be expected from what is proposed, under paragraph 7, of the proposed Resolution, where it is suggested that Statutory Bodies should work rather as *ad hoc* groups. If I understand correctly, this has some consequences on the languages, for translation of documents, and so on. Therefore, there is probably a potential for quite some savings.

I think it would be interesting to see what is the benefit of the whole exercise which we can yield, and I would be grateful to the Secretariat if it could give us some additional information on that.

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

On the first question, I should point out that in effect most of these Bodies are not meeting in 1998-99 and, therefore, are not in the budget. However, we tried to do a rough estimate of what the savings would have been against 1996-97's budget. I have to say that we made a number of assumptions to come up with these estimates, in that we are abolishing things which were or were not meeting, so it is a bit difficult.

On your Appendix A, Commissions and Committees, we estimated that the biennial savings were in the region of US\$189 000. For the other two groups, US\$ 222 000.

Now, as to your second question. I do not have a proper answer for you, I am afraid, because it really depends so much on how the *ad hoc* Statutory Body is set up. Generally, many of these bodies were not meeting with all five languages and, therefore, they already reflected the language needs of the particular committee. I assume the *ad hoc* committees would do the same. I think the major reasons for changing to *ad hoc* committees is not so much to do with cost, so I cannot give you a nice clean answer on that, I am afraid, Mr Marinček.

EL PRESIDENTE

Teniendo en consideración estas respuestas, podríamos por favor, señores delegados, proceder a revisar este texto. El párrafo introductorio 1 *conscious*, comentar el párrafo 2 *recognizing*, luego pasaríamos, señores delegados, a los párrafos operativos, al final veremos los Anexos, si hay algún tipo de comentario específico por parte de ustedes. El operativo 1, *decides*, el 2 *recommends*.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénégal)

Monsieur le Président, dans ce dispositif, on suggère la suppression des organes figurant à l'Annexe A. Je voudrais rappeler ici que, lors du Conseil, le Représentant du Sénégal avait posé des questions au Secrétariat sur la suppression d'organes que sont la Commission de la trypanosomiase animale africaine et les Comités et Groupes d'experts concernant justement la lutte contre la trypanosomiase animale africaine. Et le délégué du Sénégal demandait si, en fait, cette proposition de suppression avait fait l'objet de consultations au niveau de la Conférence africaine. Il lui avait été répondu que la Conférence africaine, tenue à Ouagadougou au Burkina Faso, avait souscrit à cette proposition de suppression de ces Commissions et Comités. Mais, à la vérification, on s'est rendu compte que ce n'était pas tellement cela. Nous, nous voudrions avoir une réponse très précise sur cela, à savoir si effectivement la Conférence régionale africaine a été informée, a été saisie, et si tel n'était pas le cas, comment est-ce qu'on pourrait suggérer la suppression de ces Comités, de ces organes, sans auparavant recueillir l'avis de la Conférence régionale africaine. Et, on aimerait également avoir des informations peut-être sur les incidences financières de la tenue de ces Commissions et autres. Merci.

EL PRESIDENTE

Como había dicho, los temas específicos y las comisiones específicas de cada Apéndice las veremos en su momento. Si me permite, sigamos la revisión del texto y al final cuando lleguemos a los Apéndices retomaremos su pregunta.

Estamos en el párrafo operativo 2; el párrafo operativo 3 *requests*; el operativo 4 *recommends*.

Ms Astrid BERGQUIST (Sweden)

I must say it was with some concern and surprise, that I noticed that the list of Regional Bodies in Appendix C includes two Committees that are joined with the European ECE Timber Committee which is based in Geneva. The Committees I refer to are first the joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology Management and Training of the European Forestry Commission and second the joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Forest Economics and Statistics of the European Forestry Commission, ECE. As Members might know, the ECE, which is a regional commission and subsidiary body of ECOSOC, has been under very careful scrutiny and revision as to its work programme and that has also involved the joint Committees. The Timber Committee was retained as a Committee while a joint Agricultural Committee was abolished.

The Timber Committee had a meeting in October where a joint programme with the European Forestry Commission was agreed upon. An FAO representative was present also at that meeting and no information was given on proposals to abolish these two Committees. The Committees are of great importance and vital to much of the work both of the ECE and of FAO and, in particular, the Statistics Committee which coordinates much of the statistical work of the boreal and temperate forests that concern perhaps half of the world's forest resources. As you might also recall, the forests have been discussed in a Panel set up by the United Nations, the CSD Committee, and the recommendations from the forest panel were discussed and the recommendations were adopted at the UNGA. In particular in the field of statistics, strong encouragement was given to coordinate and increase work in the statistical field between FAO, national governments and concerned international organizations.

Thus, my delegation has great difficulty in going along with the proposal to ask the Director-General to consult on the abolition of these two Committees, and I would like to suggest that they are deleted from the list of the Regional Bodies in Appendix C.

EL PRESIDENTE

Si me permite, dejé que usted concluyera su intervención a efectos de que la Secretaría sepa exactamente a que atenerse cuando tratemos los Apéndices en su conjunto, Apéndice por Apéndice.

Y ahora volviendo al texto, si usted me permite, le ruego veamos el párrafo 4, *recommends*, después veremos los Apéndices.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

When we refer to the Statutory Bodies and we look at them in detail, I think that Mr Hjort has already said very clearly and in detail, in fact, he has explained the various stages that were gone through bringing us up to the present point in our consideration of this Item. This *ad hoc* Contact Group, set up by the Programme and Finance Committees, regarding the status of the FAO Statutory Bodies, was established at our behest and after our specific request that the Group be set up. Subsequent to that, the study was carried out by the *ad hoc* Contact Group and the Report was submitted to the Regional Groups within the Organization, and each of the Regional Groups responded in a clear fashion giving its opinion regarding the report on the Statutory Bodies.

Once again, that report was then submitted to the Programme and Finance Committees and after that the Report was brought before the FAO Council. This brings us to our present reading at

which we are considering the Draft Resolution which has been referred by the Council to the Conference.

I think the situation is crystal clear right now and, therefore, I see no reason to prolong discussion on this matter since we agree on this Resolution which has already been studied in depth through the previous stages.

Mme Béatrice DAMIBA (Burkina Faso)

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Justement, je voulais vous faire une proposition peut-être de méthode de travail pour l'examen du Projet de résolution, parce que les délégués ont du mal à approuver des paragraphes se rapportant à des annexes qui n'ont pas encore été elles-mêmes examinées.

Est-ce qu'on ne pourrait pas inverser et examiner d'abord les annexes et nous mettre d'accord sur les organes listés avant de revenir à l'adoption de la Résolution? Parce que c'est cela la difficulté qui fait que les différents intervenants ont tendance à corriger d'abord, à amender d'abord les annexes avant d'adopter le Projet de résolution. On décide d'abolir les organes, etc. figurant, alors qu'on n'a pas encore arrêté définitivement le contenu de ces annexes.

L'autre proposition, si ce n'est pas trop tard, c'est que justement il y a eu un long processus pour en arriver à ce Projet de résolution, mais nous sommes au niveau de la Conférence; la Conférence ne se tient que tous les deux ans et peut-être qu'ici, il y a des gens qui n'ont pas pu suivre de près justement le processus d'examen de ces organes à supprimer.

Je me demande dans quelle mesure il ne serait pas possible au Secrétariat de présenter également la liste des organes statutaires de la FAO qui sont maintenus, pour permettre en fait de comparer par rapport à ce qui est proposé à la suppression, et on se rendra peut-être compte à quel point il y a un grand nombre d'organes statutaires dont beaucoup sont justement obsolètes ou devenus inutiles.

EL PRESIDENTE

Para ser franco, quizás en la cuestión de la metodología, *grosso modo* sabemos a que se refiere el Apéndice A, el B, el C y el D. Si terminamos con la fraseología operativa, podríamos pasar a ver lo que es cada Apéndice, porque de lo que yo he entendido y lo que quedó claro para mí, por lo menos, es que hay delegados que quieren que algún tipo de Grupo de Trabajo o de Panel se mantenga o se elimine. Eso lo podremos ver con mucha atención cuando toquemos cada Apéndice.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

We also have some problem in the procedure we are following because right from paragraph 1, we almost took a decision, like taking a decision on this Appendix. Then to go on listing some of these conditions that are given seems to be contradictory. I tend to agree with the delegate of Senegal who cited the question of the African Animal Trypanosomiasis.

We know we discussed that in the past and of necessity it is an African problem and instead of abolishing it, we said that there must be funding of this rather than abolishing it. That is our understanding in the past. Because of necessity this is an African problem, there is no other region that has the same problem. If we look at the methodology we are following -- I am going back and then come to discuss those categories and appendices -- I think we need to go back to the Secretariat. In the introduction, we are told that there are some decisions that could be taken by the Director-General himself, others are to be referred to the Bodies, maybe outside FAO, to make a recommendation, somehow of a regional nature, so I do not see how we can actually arrive at a consensus if we adopt this method.

EL PRESIDENTE

Está claro de una parte que existe la percepción de los señores delegados de que algún listado de órganos serían abolidos. En el momento en que nos encontremos con este Apéndice, ahí definiremos. Está claro lo que dice el delegado de Senegal, que no está de acuerdo con la abolición de dos órganos referidos a Africa. En la eventualidad de que la Secretaría tuviera que insistir en esa percepción de los Apéndices, le doy la palabra al señor Hjort.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

It is of course a matter for the Commission to decide. I would point out, however, that what you are doing in going through the draft Resolution is dealing with the principles. When you come to the Appendix, you will see if you want to make any change in the Appendices. The only way it would have an influence on what you have already approved is if you decide to delete everything in an Appendix, then you would not need that operative paragraph. You may wish to do that, but I doubt it.

Since I have the floor, I would like to make one other statement. There are references here to the Secretariat. The establishment, the abolition, the merging of Statutory Bodies is a matter for the Member Nations, it is not a matter for the Secretariat. These Bodies that we are talking about have been established by the Conference and the Council, they have not been established by the Director-General and the Secretariat has tried from the beginning of your decision to review the Statutory Bodies, to provide all the information that we can but we do not make recommendations, we do not argue for or against. We are providing a service to you. It is for you to decide. I was wondering if it might be useful if one of the Members of the *ad hoc* Contact Group who reviewed this detailed material that we have could respond to any specific questions that you have.

I will go on however for a little bit on the PAAT Programme, the Programme against African Animal Trypanosomiasis. Commission I tomorrow, unless they get to it today, will be considering a modified programme to deal with that problem. You will note in that document there is the recommendation that the Commission and these two Panels of Experts be abolished. That therefore is coming not only through the substantive side, but the recommendation is the same that has come through the Contact Group. That does not mean that we are going to give lower priority to that problem. It is one of the highest priority problems, but what Dr Sawadogo has done in proposing this together with the other three organizations, including the OAU, is to come forward with a more cost-effective, efficient way of dealing with the problems of the Secretariat and the coordination of this Programme.

Please be assured that by taking this action to abolish this Commission and these two Panels of Experts you will be doing yourselves a favour, not a disfavour, because you will be replacing them with something that is more efficient, more effective and better for the countries that are involved in the problem. On the matter raised by Sweden, we can come back to that.

EL PRESIDENTE

A la luz de lo que ha tenido a bien indicar la Secretaría, les encarezco realmente que prosigamos el trabajo. Llegará el momento que al leer los apéndices podamos decir que comentario corresponde respecto a cada órgano. Estamos en el Punto 4, *free comment*; en el 5 *encourages*; el 6 *calls on*; en el 7 *decides*; el 8 *further decides*. Este párrafo es un poco largo y les doy tiempo para que lo lean. El párrafo 9 operativo: *requests*; el párrafo 10 operativo: *further requests*; el párrafo 12 operativo: *decides*. Señores delegados, el texto de esta Resolución aparece aceptable. Nos concentraremos ahora en los Apéndices. Apéndice A: vamos a comenzar por ver lo que tuvo a bien señalar el señor delegado de Senegal. Luego de la Secretaría les digo de que manera afrontamos la consulta de Senegal.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

I must say I do not have first-hand information on this matter but I am informed that the Body that dealt with this was technically not the Regional Conference itself, but it was the Commission, meeting during the time when the Regional Conference was in session. It was the Commission itself, at the Regional Conference for Africa in Botswana, that recommended that the whole matter be brought closer to the Regional Conference. This is essentially now the proposal under Item 12, that is under consideration in the other Commission.

I hope that clarifies the matter. If the impression was left at the Council that it was an action of the Regional Conference itself, that in fact is not so. It was the Commission itself that spoke of the matter.

EL PRESIDENTE

Señor delegado de Senegal, a la luz de esta información, le pregunto si usted insistiría con su atingencia o la retiraría, de forma tal que podamos o no respetar o mantener estas dos Comisiones y Panel.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénégal)

Monsieur le Président j'ai pris bonne note des explications de Monsieur Hjort et je pense qu'il parle plutôt de la Conférence régionale du Burkina Faso et non pas du Botswana, si je ne m'abuse. Cela étant, je voudrais savoir quelles seraient les incidences financières pour le maintien, en tous cas tout au moins en veilleuse, de ces Commissions. Ne serait-il pas possible de maintenir en veilleuse ces Commissions et de ne pas tout simplement les supprimer comme cela? Est-ce qu'il serait possible de recueillir, malgré tout, l'avis de la Conférence régionale sur cette question? Je vous remercie.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

As I mentioned, the document that is before Commission I has the same set of recommendations as are before you here, that is, the Commission itself be abolished and the two Panels of Experts would be abolished. In replacing them, the proposal in the document that is considered in the other body is that PAAT would have four major components. There would be a Committee that would consist of elected representatives of donor organizations and countries who have a specific interest in aspects of livestock development. They would be supported by policy-level technical advisers. The Committee's Terms of Reference proposed are to define and regularly review the purposes and strategies of the Programme and to guide and to review its activities and progress. In other words, you have an elected Committee replacing the Commission.

A Secretariat that would be joint FAO, WHO, OAU and IAEA would support the Committee and facilitate implementation of its decisions. You then would have a research and development module, and you would have a policy planning and implementation module which would bring together the relevant people.

Now, the problem we are having is we are discussing a substantive matter that is pending business in another Commission. Could I therefore suggest that you agree that this document will contain, with respect to this problem, whatever is decided in Commission I. Since a substantive matter is being decided there, can you say, all right, if the substantive Body, considering the alternative proposals that are put forward, agrees to them then, you would leave in this document the abolition of these three Bodies. If that Body decides not to, then you modify this accordingly.

EL PRESIDENTE

Para mí está claro, pero quisiera, señor delegado de Senegal su impresión sobre esto. El señor Hjort señala que este tema de los Apéndices, toda vez que leemos el texto del Proyecto y es aceptable, me refiero a que los Apéndices están siendo vistos por otra comisión y que si a luz de eso podríamos decir sí o no.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénegal)

Oui Monsieur le Président, je peux souscrire à cette proposition de Monsieur Hjort.

Herijanto SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia)

I understand Appendix A as belonging to operative paragraph 1 of the Resolution. This Body in Appendix A will be abolished due to the operative paragraph 1.

Also, as we can see in this document in paragraph 2, the Council emphasizes that the authority to abolish rested with the Statutory Body. In this respect, Mr Chairman, I will ask the Secretariat through you, whether this Statutory Body already consulted or not on the abolition because the interests of the Statutory Body depend on the Statutory Body itself.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

The Statutory Body has authority with respect to its Subsidiary Bodies. The Statutory Body itself, which you see on Appendix A, has the authority to establish Subsidiary Bodies and the authority to abolish the Statutory Body or abolish them rests with the Conference or the Council.

Others have raised a question about consultation with Members. You should recall that the Conference has all of the Members of the Organization as Members. It was the Conference that asked that the Statutory Bodies be reviewed. Your Bodies, the Programme and Finance Committees, your Council and now your Conference are considering the results of a two-year Review by those Bodies. The Contact Group certainly must have carefully considered the Bodies, I know that they had before them the facts. Many of these Bodies have not met, some of them have not met for a decade. We had indications of their efficiency and effectiveness, and you can be assured that none of these rank high on any kind of efficiency or effectiveness scale.

We have provided factual information, the number of participants, the number of countries that were members, the ratio of attendees and so forth. This kind of information was provided. This *Ad Hoc* Group spent a lot of hot days this summer trying to go through all of the details.

As I say, it is not a Secretariat exercise, but watching the process unfold, I would believe that you should put faith in your own Subsidiary Bodies of the Conference and believe that they did a rather thorough job in reviewing the Bodies. I want to remind the Ambassador from Burkina Faso that the document giving the entire list of Statutory Bodies is available to every Member Nation. It was updated specifically for the purpose of the Review of the Statutory Bodies, and contains all of the basic information. The Members of the Programme and Finance Committees were given copies of this first. It has been widely distributed, there has been no way we have been trying to hide any information. We have simply been trying to facilitate your process.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

I had wanted to speak immediately after the questions directed to Senegal. However, if I can request the Chairman, perhaps we can get all the questions raised, and then the Secretariat to answer them at the same time rather than on a piecemeal basis. Then we will make better progress because I am still not clear about the decision taken at the Commission.

Is the decision of the Commission transmitted directly to the Conference or to the other Bodies such as the Committee on Agriculture, or the Council before coming to the Conference? The Secretariat also explained that this matter will also be discussed in Commission I. So, if it is a

question of whether we can really take a decision now or defer this issue until we are able to get the clear picture in this very important matter pertinent to Africa, I think we can defer any decision at this moment.

Of course we know also it is going to be very difficult to establish another arrangement that will have financial implications to the Organization if we delete it. Getting donor countries to be interested will be another because FAO will know that there are other areas of intervention, which are not needed in the main Statutory Bodies established, but to get extra-budgetary resources could be very difficult. I will suggest that if this matter will be discussed in Commission I, a definite decision should be deferred concerning these two Bodies.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Again I would encourage you, since we are in this situation where the cart is before the horse, in that the substantive matter is yet to come up in Commission I. I have noted that the recommendation in the paper there is identical to what is here. It would seem to me that you can proceed with your business here, with respect to Statutory Bodies, with the understanding that the Chairman gave a few moments ago that if the substantive body agrees to the abolition of these three Bodies, then this document goes forward to the Conference in your final Report, as it is. If Commission I decides to amend, then this gets amended, but you do not have to come back and meet just to have that discussion again. I would however point out, because there was some question about the money, in the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99 there is US\$ 1 240 000 for this Programme. That US\$ 1 240 000 will buy you a little bit more programme if you do not have this Commission and two Expert Groups, than if you do.

EL PRESIDENTE

Señor delegado de Nigeria, creo que vale la pena retener la última parte de la reflexión del señor Hjort, no obstante quiero dejarle claro que con mucho gusto vamos a transmitir a la Comisión I las atenciones hechas por usted y por Senegal en relación a la Comisión y al Panel sobre la Tripanosomiasis. Si hubiera algún punto de discusión, volveríamos a usted para que simplemente este papel pueda pasar.

J.J. NEETESON (Netherlands)

I would like to make a general remark pertaining to all the annexes, A, B, C and D.

The European Community and its Member States have commented, extensively, on the Review of the FAO Statutory Bodies at the Session of the Council in June and some EU Member States have commented on it individually, at the Council Session, last week. These comments are still valid and I would not repeat them at this stage. They are accurately recorded in the Verbatim Records of the Council Session last week.

However, individual Member States of the European Union may wish to comment on specific bodies, as was already done by Sweden earlier in the Debate.

Atul SINHA (India)

I am indeed sorry for seeking the floor now but I was held up in the other Commission, when we had to speak on the World Food Summit follow-up. Therefore I am coming a little late. Please excuse me for this.

However, I have some points of importance to make and I am sure you will bear with me.

I have seen this Report about the Statutory Bodies. I do feel that the Contact Group has done an excellent job and, therefore, they need to be complimented on this. We generally would go along with the recommendation here. However, having agreed with the remaining part of the Report, I have one major concern in respect of one component of that Report, and that relates to the proposal for the abolition of the Commission on Fertilizers.

I have taken the floor, very briefly, in respect of this matter in the Council, but I think some little elaboration in this Body, which is going to take the final decision, is absolutely in order.

The proposed abolition of the FAO Commission on Fertilizers is, I think, of great concern to my country, particularly when it was widely acknowledged that efficient and balanced plant nutrition is indeed a key component to crop production intensification and food security.

FAO has been doing this work since the very inception and the activities have had, indeed, a marked impact on agriculture production, in many countries, including mine. The benefits of appropriate fertilizer inputs is well known to everybody to need elaboration.

The work of the Commission over the years fostered support from donors and beneficiaries, and the witness for the success of FAO's work in this field, including its attention to environmental concerns. At a time when advocates of low inputs penalize developing countries, on account of problems encountered with inefficient application of plant nutrients in some industrialized countries, the abolition of the Commission would be interpreted as an abdication by FAO of its affirmative action, which it has conducted up to now. This move, in my opinion, would be very detrimental to the promotion of integrated plant nutrition systems in the developing world, particularly in Africa and Asia, where the needs for assistance are the most.

We have, indeed, seen with some concern the various actions in the past. We had a Special Action Programme on Plant Nutrition Management, that has disappeared; the staff which will be removed if the Zero Nominal Growth budget scenario comes in. Now this abolition of the Commission on Fertilizers and the Fertilizer Industrial Advisory Committee, I think, gives a very wrong signal. It shows that FAO is moving away, significantly, from a very key area of its activity, and I think that will give out wrong signals.

India fully supports FAO's IPNS initiative. In this area, in my opinion, more rather than less needs to be done, particularly in the area of safe recycling of ministerial and agro-industrial wastes, as nutrient sources, promoting biological sources, harvesting nutrient mining, increasing fertilizer-use efficiency. In fact, I have had occasions of speaking about these issues, particularly organic fertilizers and so on, in my previous interventions in the various technical fora of this Organization.

India indeed considers it essential that the Conference is informed by its Commission on recent developments in these areas, in addition to fertilizer prices, production, distribution and new strategies. We, therefore, consider that there is an urgent need for a Commission. In fact, I would like to sound a note of caution; we should never throw away the baby with the bath water.

A point was made that this Commission has not met since 1990. We should not just state this evidence for what it is. We should also see the reasons why it has not met; we should see that the last meeting of this Commission had 60 countries and probably about 80 or 90 delegates. The question is that shows that it was important; all that happened was funds dried up; there was a new programme called IPNS, but the fact of the matter is that there is greater scope for this Commission to be enlarged in its mandate rather than be disbanded totally.

I would, in fact, suggest that the Commission of Fertilizers be replaced with the Commission on Plant Nutrients, and that will indeed be an activity which will cover all components, not only fertilizers but with fertilizers as its focus.

I think, in the days when we are wanting an increase in food production, fertilizers can be overlooked at their peril.

Therefore, in my opinion, instead of abolishing the Commission on Fertilizers, we should have an expanded Commission on Plant Nutrients, which should include the erstwhile functions of the Commission on Fertilizers.

Barring that particular item, I could go along with the recommendations made by the Council.

EL PRESIDENTE

La Presidencia ha acogido completamente su punto de vista, con gusto la transmitirá a la Comisión I y tenemos ahora, señores delegados, a nivel del Apéndice A, estas tres comisiones que vamos a revisar a la luz de lo que ha sido dicho por los señores delegados de Senegal y de Nigeria. ¿Alguna otra atingencia sobre el Apéndice A?

Kiala Kia MATEVA (Angola)

Merci Monsieur le Président. Puisque j'interviens pour la première fois je voudrais présenter les félicitations de ma délégation et les ajouter aux délégations qui nous ont précédé.

Ma délégation a lu avec attention ce document: Examen des Organes statutaires. Les interventions du Sénégal et du Burkina Faso ont couvert dans son entièreté mon intervention, c'est pourquoi je me limiterai à les appuyer fermement.

Quant à la préoccupation soulevée par la délégation du Nigeria qui consiste à retarder la décision de la Commission I, ma délégation se réjouit de constater que Monsieur le Président a compris l'importance de ces Organes statutaires, c'est pourquoi elle appuie la proposition que vous avez faite de les transmettre à la Commission I.

J.J. NEETESON (Netherlands)

I would just like to react to the comments made by the distinguished delegate from India, on his remarks with regard to the Commission on Fertilizers.

I fully agree with the delegate of India, on the importance of fertilizers for agriculture and certainly, also the IPNS, which he mentions. It is a very important subject and the work that FAO is carrying out in this field we regard also as important.

I myself have been involved in this work and attended a number of sessions of the Commission on Fertilizers.

However, we do not agree with his proposal that the Commission on Fertilizers be retained in the form of a new Commission on Plant Nutrients.

The European Union and its Member States have indicated this point also in my intervention before the Council, in June. We are of the opinion that this Commission on Fertilizers be retained in Appendix A and be proposed for abolition.

In our opinion, plant nutrients is typically a subject which falls within the mandate of the Committee on Agriculture. That Committee meets every two years, as you know, and it can very well be discussed on that Committee. It will further substantiate the work of the Committee on Agriculture and, as we all know, the Committee on Fertilizers has not met since 1990; this Committee on Agriculture is a very good opportunity for discussing this kind of matter.

Gebrehiwot REDAI (Ethiopia)

Mr Hjort has tried his best to explain the basic issue as it relates to the Review of Statutory Bodies. He has clearly indicated that the Statutory Bodies will be established, and will only be abolished by the Body that has established them.

In the FAO category, there are about four of them under A, B, C and D, and Ethiopia, being a Member of the Programme Committee, had the privilege of participating in the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group.

The Council, if my memory serves me right, has empowered the Programme and Finance Committees in the Hundred and Twelfth Session of the Council. The relevant document, if I remember correctly, is CL 112/20.

Once the Council has empowered to review Statutory Bodies under C and D, which are Committees, Councils and Experts of Panels that are established by the Council, and passed on its power to the Programme and Finance Committees, the Programme and Finance Committees,

for clarity and expediency, has formed the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group. The *Ad Hoc* Contact Group, for your information, had met five times, between May and September 1997.

The Contact Group had sufficient material from the Secretariat to work on. On the various status of the Statutory Bodies that strictly fall under C and D. The *Ad Hoc* Contact Group was also privileged to have a working criteria which we endorsed, to work with. We had also the Legal Counsel with us. The staff dealing with the relevant Bodies were there and had sufficiently indicated, with the help of the document, why the Statutory Bodies had to be abolished or why they had to be in operation.

In this respect, the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group, taking the relevance of the criteria, took a decision on all the Bodies listed in Appendices C and D.

The preoccupation of many Member Nations is, their understanding that, once the Committees or the Commissions are abolished, their related activities automatically stop. That is not the case, because the Council was looking for efficiency and effectiveness and, in order to get this, many of the Commissions and Committees which were not operational had to be replaced by relevant bodies which they called *ad hoc* and, in that case, they were also forwarded to the Parent Bodies.

Therefore, the bottom line is that the activities are not going to be discontinued and the necessary precautions were taken. I would like to draw your attention to paragraphs, such as, paragraph 5, on page 2, which deals with those Bodies established under Article VI. Since, there was a need for these Bodies to be transformed into extra-budgetary, we, the representatives of the Member Nations, have indicated that all Members are not on equal footing. Those regions that do not have the capacity to finance such regional Bodies have to be financed from the Regular Programme.

In short, the bottom line lies in that, the activities are not going to be terminated immediately, and the results of the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group have been forwarded for consultations, for comments, to each region.

If I, for instance, pick up the case of African Animal Trypanosomiasis, which was extensively discussed at the Session, we learn that there are other Bodies picking up the activities in a more efficient and coordinated manner. It is not only FAO, there are other stakeholders that will come into the picture.

EL PRESIDENTE

En primer lugar le agradezco sus amables palabras y en segundo lugar, también a nombre de los delegados aquí presentes, le agradezco por la información esclarecida que usted tiene sobre la evolución de las negociaciones para haber llegado a este papel, muy amable de su parte.

Señores delegados, seguimos en el Apéndice A; agradecería me dijeran si alguno de ustedes tiene algo más que añadir. Antes de pasar al Apéndice B, doy la palabra a la Secretaría para un esclarecimiento acerca de la Comisión de Fertilizantes.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

I am not sure that much can, or need be, added. The facts have been presented, with respect to the Commission on Fertilizers. Perhaps what was not sufficiently stressed is, in large part, the reason it has not met since 1990 is because that was about the time that the Organization embraced and started to move forward very aggressively with the Integrated Plant Nutrient Programme. That, of course, is one of the highest priority Programmes. Within Integrated Plant Nutrients, fertilizer is of extreme importance, as has been stated by Netherlands.

I was not quite sure I understood the specific proposition that came at the end of the Indian statement. I gather you are not opposed to the abolition of the Commission on Fertilizers, as such. What you are in favour of is a body on Integrated Plant Nutrients. This Commission has just passed the guidelines and criteria for the establishment of new Bodies. That procedure will continue. A suggestion has been made that the matter could best be discussed at COAG. I do not think this Commission can simultaneously establish or create a Body to replace this one. I believe, technically, what you need to do is to agree to leave the Commission on Fertilizers on the list, with the understanding that the need for a Statutory Body for Integrated Plant Nutrients be considered by COAG at its session next year. That would be a way out, a way forward, at least. What it would mean, you would leave it here as being abolished as a Commission on Fertilizers but you would give guidance on considering, at COAG, the question of the appropriate governmental Statutory Body for Integrated Plant Nutrients.

Atul SINHA (India)

I heard, very carefully, the remarks given by Mr Hjort. I do appreciate what he has said indeed. However, the fact of the matter is that the process of establishing a new Commission is indeed a long and tortuous one. I know the kind of problems which are likely to come up once we abolish the Commission on Fertilizers, and I am not able to establish a Commission on Integrated Plant Nutrient System in the short run, or even in the medium term.

However, I am the last one to stand against a consensus. If there are people who do not feel strongly about this, I would not like to be the lone voice. I would like to have the concern of ours recorded because we would wish to use that as and when the matter is considered by the Committee on Agriculture. I am not really sure what will happen there but, nevertheless, let the note of caution sounded by me, at this stage be recorded in some way because I do want to come back to it at a later stage. For now I would not stand against a consensus on the subject.

EL PRESIDENTE

Le agradezco por su flexibilidad, de todas maneras tomaremos debida cuenta de su reflexión.

Señores delegados, pasemos al Apéndice B. Me parece que la delegada de Suecia tenía algunas reflexiones que hacer, las hizo y quizás valdría la pena que en este momento la Secretaría las absuelva.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

My comments will be on page 5, the last items on Pesticides Registration and also the Expert Group on Specifications, PIC. I know that this Item is also going to be discussed in Commission I.

You will agree with me that this Group is doing an excellent job at least advising the developing countries on their own findings and they are assisting us. I do not know whether there is another alternative arrangement that FAO is making to deal with this problem under PIC and the Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of pesticides.

EL PRESIDENTE

Como dice el Artículo 2, Operación de este Proyecto de Resolución, este listado será elevado a la consideración del órgano matriz quien definirá en consecuencia si se elimina o no.

Harald HILDEBRAND (Germany)

Before I come to some comments regarding Appendix B that we are now dealing with, let me first say that my delegation is in agreement with what the Netherlands -- on behalf of the European Community and its Member States -- has said and is in general agreement with the Draft Resolution as it was passed by the Council last week. I think, as other speakers, that the Contact Group, chaired by Mrs Leclerc from Belgium, deserves our thanks for the thorough review undertaken, and the approach chosen to recommend the abolition, merger or reduction of a large number of Bodies was undoubtedly correct as it has caused, and goes on to cause, Member Nations to consider their usefulness or uselessness under the pressure of decision.

I come now to two Bodies or groups of Bodies mentioned in Appendix B which need our comment. These are regional Bodies. The first reference would be to the European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (EIFAC), whose subsidiary bodies regarding their ultimate fate, in our view, deserve careful consideration. Of course, we do agree that cost-savings can be attained by selectively placing some of the working parties of EIFAC on an *ad hoc* basis. However -- and this reflects the view of our experts -- we should take into account that EIFAC, the European body, fulfils a kind of pilot technical function *vis-à-vis* other regional Bodies on inland fisheries.

Secondly, inland fisheries, including aquaculture, are increasingly important for raising fish supplies in view of over-fished or even exhausted marine resources. Following the adhesion by several Central and East European countries, this regional Body now has 30 Member Nations strongly engaged in these activities.

Finally, a large part of the cost for EIFAC events and publications are already borne by Member Nations.

In view of all this, the long list of EIFAC's Subsidiary Bodies, in the view of my delegation, should not be screened indiscriminately. My delegation would like to submit to the Secretariat a list with priority ranking for the various EIFAC Working Parties to help EIFAC as a Parent Body and, maybe the Secretariat, to arrive at pertinent conclusions.

The second remark, on Appendix B, relates to the Working Party on Women and Agricultural Family in Rural Development, which is under the European Commission of Agriculture (ECA). In the view of my delegation, it would be fully warranted if this Body be continued, in view of the valuable and generally-recognized activities for rural areas, particularly with regard also to the Central and East European Sub-region.

This working party has already adopted changes in its work procedure that will result in considerable cost-reductions, including the use in future of one working language in meetings.

This position, in favour of that Working Party, was endorsed by Member Nations of the European Commission on Agriculture during the recent meeting of ECA, held early in October in Slovakia.

This, for the time being, would be all. I would come back on Appendix C later.

EL PRESIDENTE

Le agradezco sus reflexiones, sobre todo en lo que se refiere a la priorización de las Subcomisiones EIFAC y a su última reflexión sobre el tema del grupo de trabajo sobre la mujer.

Ms Aulikki KAUPPILLA (Finland)

In addition to what was said by the Netherlands on behalf of the EU, I have some detailed comments to make on these Appendices.

Concerning Appendix B, my comments concern the ECA Working Party on Women and Agricultural Family in Rural Development which was just mentioned by Germany.

Having heard the criteria mentioned by Mr Hjort on making these lists, we find that this Working Party is totally in the wrong list. It has been very active and it has had several types of activities that Finland has found very useful. We would like to support, as also said by Germany, that we would like to see this Body deleted from Appendix B.

Franco GINOCCHIO (Italy)

Italy agrees with Germany and Finland on the need to maintain the Working Party on Women and Agricultural Family in Rural Development.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

On the PIC matter, as the Members of the Council will recall, the negotiating sessions for PIC are underway. We did not complete them by this Conference, which we were supposed to, but there is very good reason to believe that the final negotiating session will be held in March 1998 and the signing, the Conference itself, the Diplomatic Conference, will take place in April or May. Somewhere along in that period. We then will have a new framework, a new structure for the PIC Bodies of one kind or another.

In responding to the comments that have been made about EIFAC and the ECA Working Party on Women and Agricultural Family in Rural Development, obviously we are in favour of Women in Rural Development and EIFAC but I am fearful that a basic point is being missed. Maybe you went through paragraph 7, which you have already adopted, a little too fast. It decides that, in future, Statutory Bodies should be established only where strictly necessary and where the work to be undertaken cannot be carried out by *ad hoc* groups, and that the Terms of Reference of all new Bodies created should provide for a periodic review of their usefulness.

You will notice here, and also in the more detailed documents, that some of the Statutory Bodies have established Subsidiary Bodies and then Subsidiary-Subsidiary bodies, Working Parties being a case in point.

You are very familiar, much more so than I, with the work of EIFAC but it is my understanding that they do not need to be a Statutory Body to carry out their work. In fact, the way they are actually working is not quite in accord with the rigid terms of reference of Statutory Bodies. This proposal, as a general proposition for many of these, is to release the shackles of a Statutory Body and free them to be able to have the flexibility to do their work. There is no proposal here that suggests the work undertaken by these groups stops. What is suggested is that the Subsidiary Body be established on an *ad hoc* basis -- however many Working Parties they need and as long as they are doing useful work -- they continue to do it. It is up to the Statutory Body.

This is why all of these Working Parties appear on the list and it is really why the ECA Working party on Women and Agricultural Family in Rural Development appears also. It was the Contact Group, in looking at it, that said it does not really seem to be necessary and maybe it is to the disadvantage of formally establishing these Subsidiary Bodies, these Working Parties, as Statutory Bodies. The recommendation here is that, do not tie your hands too much, let the Statutory Body decide when it needs to set up *Ad Hoc* Working Parties for this or that, or the other. Give them the additional flexibility.

Finally, I once more remind, that the Conference is not deciding, the Conference is not deciding to abolish these Bodies. The Conference is making a recommendation to the Parent Bodies and asking them to consider. If there are concerns, it is when the Parent Body takes the matter up that you need to be working your will.

Ronald ROSE (Canada)

Canada was privileged to have been asked by the Council and by the Programme and Finance Committees to serve on the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group which generated this Report and this particular Resolution. As a member of that Contact Group, I want to reinforce the comments just made by the Deputy Director-General.

In developing the proposals for Appendix B and Appendix C, we were not suggesting that the work being done by these important groups be discontinued. We made specific recommendations that, where the Parent Bodies considered this work to be important, *ad hoc* groups with specific terms of reference and specific time limitations be established, but that they cease to operate as Statutory Bodies with all of the procedural paraphernalia, I will say, that is attached to a Statutory Body within the FAO.

There are two levels of protection for this work involved in this Resolution. The first level of protection for this work is that, in fact, it is the Parent Body that will have to make the decision and, the second level of protection is that the Parent Body, if it feels for some overriding reason that these should not cease to exist as Statutory Bodies, they have the ability, as pointed out in paragraph 2 of the recommendation, of coming back to the Council through the Programme and Finance Committees and giving those reasons. The Bodies that are listed in Appendices B and C, the work of these Bodies is not singled out for elimination, the work was recognized as being important, and the recommendation simply says it should cease to be carried out by a Statutory Body which has specific rigidities built into it by the nature of the FAO system and continue to be carried out, where necessary, by more flexible *ad hoc* Bodies. So, again I would just like to support the comments made by the Deputy Director-General.

EL PRESIDENTE

Gracias por su comentario esclarecedor que muestra el trabajo hacia la flexibilidad que tiene justamente este ejercicio. Si alguna otra delegación tuviera algún comentario que hacer sobre el Apéndice B, sea bienvenida. De no ser así pasaríamos al Apéndice C, y ahí retomariamos lo que la señora delegada de Suecia dijo y lo que la Secretaría absolvería.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

I think, as we discuss the various Appendices, it is becoming clear that for B and C we are not making/taking a decision here but we are making a recommendation to the Parent Body. If so, I think our work is very simple, we choose those that we feel we should not make any recommendation on and then take them out.

I have in mind the one under the Panel of Experts on Integrated Pest Control. You know pest control has been practised with PIC, I think it is to assist the developing countries more especially on how best to control pests, not necessarily using chemicals, if there is any other way that you can control pests through integrated means. I think this is the work of the group that would be most welcome, at least to my delegation. I cannot see the rationale behind making a recommendation on this very important subject matter. It has both environmental and also health aspects -- we have to find a very efficient way of controlling pests in the most modern and economical way. So, I believe the work of this group could be of great assistance to the Member Nations, particularly those in the developing countries.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

On the comments of Sweden I would just point out that this was one of those to which I just referred. The actual recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Contact Group was to replace them by *Ad Hoc* Working Groups. It was not a matter to do away with or abolish the work, it was just to replace with *ad hoc* arrangements.

As far as the comment of Nigeria on the FAO/UNEP Panel of Experts on Integrated Pest Control, I understand that that work is being taken up under the IPM Facility.

Ms Aulikki KAUPPILLA (Finland)

Having heard what was said by Mr Hjort to Sweden, I would still like to support the Swedish statement on these two committees on forestry, the joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee and joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Forest Economics and Statistics.

We have studied the document and we did notice that an *ad hoc* basis was proposed for these Committees, but as Finland has the chairmanship of the European Forestry Commission, we still find that it is not the cultural use. The nature of the work of these two groups is not an *ad hoc* one. We feel that in order to ensure a smooth functioning of the European Forestry Commission, we need these two committees as Statutory Bodies, not on an *ad hoc* basis.

EL PRESIDENTE

Señores delegados, refiriéndome al Apéndice C simplemente pregunto si algún delegado quisiera que alguno de estos Paneles o Comisiones sea eliminado.

Harald HILDEBRAND (Germany)

To be short, I would like, on behalf of Germany, to endorse what was expressed by Sweden and just recently by Finland regarding the two Joint Bodies of FAO/ECE/ILO on Forest Technology Management and Training and also the body of FAO and ECE on Forest Economics and Statistics.

As far as we know, the ECE Timber Committee last month recommended that this Body be maintained, and Germany is in favour of this.

EL PRESIDENTE

Señor delegado de Nigeria, le ruego me precise si usted pide que se elimine este Panel de Expertos sobre Control de Pestes.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

I think the clarification given by the Secretariat, if IPM is to replace this one, we welcome that idea.

EL PRESIDENTE

¿Usted quiere que se mantenga?

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

It could be eliminated, but then the work of this Panel of Experts is to be integrated with IPM.

EL PRESIDENTE

Pasamos al Apéndice B, si tienen algún comentario que hacer.

A la luz de lo que hemos compartido esta tarde, se puede decir que el Proyecto de Resolución es aceptable para ustedes, tal y como se presentó. Ahora bien, en relación al Apéndice A, la Comisión y el Panel de Expertos en Tripanosomiasis para Africa las coordinaremos con la Comisión I. A la luz de eso llegaremos a un resultado. En cuanto al Apéndice B, esperamos por favor la priorización que hará la delegación de Alemania sobre las subcomisiones EIFAC. En el Apéndice B se elimina el Grupo de Trabajo sobre la Mujer y la Familia Campesina en el Desarrollo Rural. Tal como lo señaló Suecia, se elimina de esa lista. Del Apéndice C, se eliminan dos Grupos de Trabajo conjuntos: El *Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training*, etc. Y se elimina el *Joint FAO/ECE Working Party on*

Forest Economics and Statistics of the European Forestry Commission, etc. se elimina.
Apéndice D queda como está.

J. LADAN (Nigeria)

When we discussed PIC we thought that the Secretariat said that anyway that decision will wait until there is another meeting in March next year. I mean, what is the conclusion on that one, on PIC?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

There are two parts, two streams affecting the PIC matter. One is that it is an Expert Body and there is the general recommendation that these not be Statutory Bodies but that they have the flexibility to be what they need to be. The other point I made is that the undertaking has been under negotiation and good progress has been made. The Fourth Negotiating Session was just recently held, and the final one is expected to be held in March. The anticipation is that it will then move to the Diplomatic Conference in April or May. This then will establish a new framework for Prior Informed Consent matters, and so that will be another time to review what kind of *ad hoc* Bodies will need to be there. Leaving it on this list simply says that it is judged to be better, it gives more flexibility to have Bodies established as need be rather than as formal Statutory Bodies. You can be assured that with the negotiation, with all of the rest, this matter will continue to deserve the attention that it needs.

EL PRESIDENTE

Con esa explicación creo que el señor delegado de Nigeria está satisfecho. El texto en consecuencia queda aprobado como lo hemos revisado con las atingencias que hemos hecho a lo largo de esta tarde.

CHAIRMAN

El Reino Unido ha pedido que su discurso sobre este Tema sea incluido en las Actas.

Ronald FOX (United Kingdom)

The United Kingdom has some concerns on the proposed abolition of the following Statutory Bodies:

Appendix B: 1. Working Group of FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGFRA).

Further CGFRA meetings may be helpful in securing the revision of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. 2. Regional Fisheries Commissions. The United Kingdom likes to support the participation of members of each of these Parent Bodies in taking a decision on the Conference recommendations for abolition of each Working Party/Sub-Committee. We believe that most of these might be abolished, but there are important areas of regional significance in some of these Groups which should not be lost without full agreement of Commission members.

Appendix C: 3. Joint ECE (UN) Codex Alimentarius Group of Experts on Standardization of Fruit Juices.

This Group has not met since its 19th Session in 1990 when it adjourned indefinitely. On the advice of the Committee, Secretariat issues relating to the Group are being handled by the Codex and UN/ECE Secretariats. It is our understanding that the standard for fruit juices should be brought in line with the latest format for Codex standards (i.e. simplified), and that this may result in new work for the Group. The European Community (EC) Directive on fruit juices is also currently under review and may also impact on the Codes Standard. The United Kingdom therefore suggests that we await the outcome of the two reviews before taking a decision on the future of the Group.

Experts Committee and Panels: 4. Marine Environment protection (GESAMP) - Working Group on impacts of Coastal Aquaculture (GESAMP) - Task Force on Integrated Coastal Area Development (GESAMP)

The United Kingdom has noted that GESAMP is to be de-listed and not abolished. One assumes that this applies equally to the two GESAMP Working Groups. We would be content for FAO to review its own role in GESAMP but not to take a lead in considering GESAMP's future. This should be undertaken by the appropriate Organization.

Appendix D: 5. Codex Committee on Cocoa Products and Chocolate - Codex Committee on Sugars - Codex Committee on processed Fruit and Vegetables - Codex Committee on Soups and Broths.

All these Committees are presently involved in reviewing their existing standards. It would be inappropriate to consider the abolition of these Committees at this time.²

Anthony Beattie, Chairman of Commission II, took the chair
Anthony Beattie, Président de la Commission II, assume la présidence
Ocupa la Presidencia Anthony Beattie, Presidente de la Comisión II

CHAIRMAN

Thanks to my Vice-Chair colleague for dealing with that Item on the Agenda. I hope everyone is now feeling strong since we will attack the main Item of this Commission, the Programme of Work and Budget, Agenda Item 15.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (C 97/3)

15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (C 97/3)

15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (C 97/3)

CHAIRMAN

This is a subject which is intrinsically difficult and complicated. It is so in this Organization, it is so in organizations across the world, be they in the public or the private sector. Our consideration of this Item has to lead to two outputs, one is a Report which we are scheduled to adopt on Thursday, and the other is a Draft Resolution on the Budget which will be voted on in the Plenary on Friday. We have been allocated two days for discussion of this Item, that is to say Tuesday and Wednesday, leaving Thursday for the Report. We are running a little ahead of schedule which means that we have a very useful opportunity to open up the debate this evening. That being said, this Item appears the most difficult time management challenge of this Conference. I therefore reiterate my injunctions of earlier today and Saturday about the importance of being brief and about the importance of starting on time.

This Commission started work this morning at 10.00 hours which is frankly much too late. Can we please try to start on time tomorrow and on succeeding days? Will you please bear in mind the written statement procedure to which I have already drawn attention, which enables you to have statements recorded, in whatever length you deem to be appropriate, in the Verbatim Records.

I hope that people will be able to make the points they want to make in less than five minutes. I do not want to have to resort to the Chairman's prerogative of time-limiting speakers but I will do so if it becomes necessary. That is necessarily unfair to people who speak late because it means

² Statement inserted in the Verbatim Records on request

the people who speak early have taken an unreasonable proportion of time and it means there is a penalty on those who speak later. It would help, as I already said, to give copies of written statements in advance to the interpreters. This is very much in your interest as speakers, it is helpful to the interpreters and, of course, it is extremely helpful to people who have to listen to what you are saying in another language.

I am now going to turn to the Secretariat in the shape of Mr Wade to introduce this subject. I have asked him to spend a little time explaining to us the various documents which have been tabled under this Agenda Item and how they relate to one another, because I believe it is vital at the outset of this debate, that we have a clear understanding what are the relevant documents and how they interrelate.

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

First and foremost, the primary document that you are dealing with today is C 97/3 which is the Programme of Work and Budget from the Director-General.

What I would like to do is go through the document, as you have requested, so as to explain the quite substantial changes that have been made in relation to previous presentations. These changes arise from two aspects: one, some changes in our budget preparation technique, and the other from the fact that this document tries to present two scenarios in a single document.

For those of you who have studied the document already, you will see that the first few paragraphs, that is from paragraph 1 to paragraph 35, deal with Explanatory Notes which describe the changes that have been made. There are basically two significant changes. The first is that we have integrated "Other Income" into the Budget. I will come back to that in more detail when we get to the table that shows exactly what that means in practice. The second is as you may recall, that as a result of the major budget reductions in 1996-97, when we reduced the budget from US\$ 706.9 million to US\$ 650 million, we also restructured the production process for publications. In doing that, we had to change the costing structure, and therefore the allocations by Chapter varied. So the Explanatory Notes make the effort of trying to describe what those changes meant and they refer you to Annex v(b), which takes us from the adjusted budget that was approved by the Programme and Finance Committees, as delegated by the Conference, through to the base that we use in this document. Of course, if you have any questions on those changes, we will be happy to respond to them.

Immediately following paragraph 35, you have the Draft Appropriation Resolution and this, of course, is finally what must go into your Report in some form or other as being the recommendation of this Commission to the Plenary, and the Plenary will then vote on that budget. There are a couple of points to note on the Resolution. The first is rather obviously, the figures may change because of your own deliberations. You may decide to propose a different budget level. The document, I should make clear, is proposing a budget of US\$ 675.3 million, that means Zero Real Growth, and that is the Director-General's proposal. It also includes, internally, information about the impact of a lower budget of US\$ 650 million, which is also titled the Zero Nominal Growth budget, but that is not the Director-General's proposal.

The Resolution is also likely to change because of one other factor. The budget in this document has been developed at an exchange rate of lire 1 690 to the US dollar. As so much of our expenditure is in lire, you can see that a strengthening dollar reduces the total cost in dollar terms or a weakening dollar increases the total cost in dollar terms.

The Conference has approved a practice where it adjusts the budget on the day of the Resolution -- that will be next Friday -- to the current rate of that day. For your information, I checked the rate this morning, it was Lire 1 677/US\$ 1 when I looked. If you look at the figures in the document, and I will show you later on where it is in paragraph 139, you will see that under Zero Real Growth a budget at Lire 1 677/US\$ 1 would cost us US\$ 2.3 million more than we have said because Lire 1 677/US\$ 1 means that we will have a more expensive budget in terms of

US dollars to pay for the same lire expenditures that are planned in this document. That means that the US\$ 675.3 million would be increased by US\$ 2.3 million to arrive at a revised total of US\$ 677.6 million.

If, for example, you were working on the Zero Nominal Growth budget, the adjustment would be US\$ 2.2 million instead of US\$ 2.3 million and therefore a Zero Nominal Growth budget, which supported the same programme as is presented in this document, would be US\$ 652.5 million.

Now I have to say we are still guessing on rates, of course, because I looked this afternoon, just before I came here, and it was Lire 1 684/US\$ 1 which is getting very close to the Lire 1 690/US\$ 1, so it is just possible that the Gods will bless us, and we will have it at Lire 1 690 on the morning, and not have to adjust anything.

The document then goes through the section on the programme framework. Here I am dealing with paragraphs 36 and following. Here we see the rules for the application of the Council's criteria in determining priorities and in setting priorities. In fact, we went through every programme element that is listed in this document and had the technical staff concerned score the priorities against each of the criteria established by the Council. We weighted the scores by the value of each programme element, and developed a result for each Sub-programme. The consequences of that process, that is, the thinking about the criteria and application of them to the budget, have resulted, we believe, in a good reflection of the Council's view of the priorities of the Organization, and I hope you can see that in the outcome. We also took into account the recommendations of the Technical Committees which had been received before this document was prepared, and both the Programme Committee and the Council acknowledge that this document does take into account those recommendations.

The remainder of this particular Chapter describes the thrust of the proposals, but I would like to draw your attention to paragraphs 60 and 61 which then concentrate on telling you what the impact would be of Zero Nominal versus Zero Real. I mention this partly because the technique we have used in the document is to shade the text that is describing Zero Nominal Growth. So if you see shaded text, it is about the Zero Nominal Growth aspects.

Finally, on this section you will find in paragraphs 62 through to 73 that you have the two special analyses that were requested by the Council at its Hundred and Twelfth Session, and by the Programme and Finance Committees before that. The first one is on Women in Development and the second one is on the Special Programme for Food Security. In both cases, the analyses try to take a cross-organizational look at these particular Programmes and show you, not just the resources that are within the substantive technical division looking after the Programmes, but also the resources that are being applied elsewhere.

We now move to the budgetary framework. The budgetary framework commences, in the English version, on page 23. Because of the complexity of this, I will mention that in Arabic it is page 31, in Spanish and French it is page 27, and in Chinese it is also page 23, the same as the English. This table is critical to the new technique, so I would like to draw your attention to it. For those of you who have missed the page number, it is the Table immediately preceding paragraph 74, and it is entitled 'Overview of Total Resources'.

The importance of this Table is it that responded to the requests of the Programme and Finance Committees, in particular the Finance Committee, and to the Council, that the documents somehow reflect the total resources that were available to the Organization rather than concentrating just on the Regular Programme of Work. In particular, certain Members had expressed concern that there were resources coming in that were being co-mingled and spent with the Regular Programme contributions, but which were not being made clear in the document. For example, the World Bank pays approximately 75 per cent of the costs of investment project preparation by the Investment Centre and we pay 25 per cent. Previously, our Budget had shown the 25 per cent, and the 75 per cent was shown as being extra-budgetary. However, in reality we are working with the full 100 per cent and, in fact, we are working with

people who are on posts which have to be in the Budget. It is just that we do not pay the full cost of those posts, we share it with someone else. So, the idea was to bring these sorts of programmes actually into the Programme of Work. If I can just take you through this table, as quickly as possible, I think you will see what is happening.

If you look at the 1996-97 column -- again I am still on page 23 of the English version, preceding paragraph 74 -- you will see that it starts off with Members' Assessed Contributions at US\$ 639 million. That was the figure for 1996-97. You will see that we add on US\$ 11 million for Miscellaneous Income, arriving at the total of US\$ 650 million with which you will be very familiar.

The remainder of this Table deals with funds which we receive under Financial Regulation 6.7, that is, voluntary contributions. We have split those funds into two sections: Section a), which is "Other Income", and Section b), which we have called "Trust Fund Income".

Section a) is the part that we are bringing into the budgetary preparation process because it is so closely related to the Regular Programme, and you will see the first item is, in fact, the resources we receive from the World Bank. The second item shows US\$ 8 342 000 coming from other financial institutions. This includes the Asian Development Bank, IFAD, the African Development Bank, etc. You see the World Health Organization, where we have a cost-sharing arrangement for Codex. You see TAC, etc. Also being brought in here you will see Support Costs in the form of income on technical support services, from UNDP, from Trust Fund donors, wherever those services are reimbursed, and you will also see income in the form of the charges we make for service costs on projects that we execute. That list of items totals US\$ 101 796 000, and if you add that to the US\$ 650 million, you see that the Total Resources Available for the Programme of Work -- this is the shaded line with that title -- is US\$ 751 796 000. That is what this document is explaining. All the tables elsewhere in this document explain the US\$ 751.8 million, not the US\$ 650, because that is what your Committees wanted us to do. Of course, for information we also show the conventional field projects in the section below, under b), so this is where you see normal Trust Fund and UNDP projects, and there you get another US\$ 514 million in 1996-97, arriving at a grand total US\$ 1 266 million.

You then have the comparative column for 1998-99. If you have any questions on the variations, we would be, of course, happy to answer them.

That Table is important and so I have spent a lot of time on it, but I will try and move a little more quickly now.

The budgetary framework which follows the table -- that is the rest of the document leading from paragraph 74 right the way through to paragraph 197 -- covers a number of aspects which I will not go into in any detail, but there are technical support services, there are the changes in posts, and then there are the details of cost increases, including the methodology that has been applied and the calculations that have been made. Those calculations have been looked at in detail by the Finance Committee and they have found them satisfactory, as you will see in their Report to the Council.

Immediately following that section, you find six landscape Tables. I mean they are horizontally placed in the book. They follow page 53 in the English version, page 53 also in the Chinese version, but in the Arabic version it is page 71, in the Spanish version it is page 61 and in the French version it is page 59. Sorry about the complexity of this, but the different language versions do change the location of items quite considerably.

I would like to take you to Table 3 because Table 3 summarises the Zero Real Growth budget. Then I would like you to make the connection between Table 3 and the Overview of Total Resources that I just went through in some detail. Table 3, which you have before you, has in the first column the 1996-97 Programme of Work, and if you go down to the bottom of the column, you will see a figure of US\$ 751 596 000.

That is exactly the same amount that appears in the Table of Total Resources that we went through a few moments ago. So in other words the Total Resources' picture is showing you the income, this is showing you the expenditure, the proposed Programme of Work.

Incidentally, if on Table 3, you go to the ninth column, it is the 1998-99 ZRG proposal, the column entitled "Programme of Work", has a total, again on the bottom line, of US\$ 743 906 000. That US\$ 743 906 000 is exactly the same level of resources that you will see in the Table on page 23 preceding paragraph 74 for 1998-99. I am sorry to be so laborious, but I think it is important that you see that you have before you a Budget which consists of total resources coming from Member Nations in the form of Assessed Contributions, coming from Miscellaneous Income and coming from other income, that balances.

From now, the document deals with this Programme of Work figure, the US\$ 743 million and how we get there. In each case you will find that it goes from the base through to the proposal, and then is reduced for the ZNG proposal. I will go through one example of that, so everybody is clear. If we could turn first of all to paragraph 340 which has before it a table on Sub-programme 2.1.2.4 which is Crop Protection, you will see the resource proposals for Crop Protection in 1998-99. The first column shows what is in the 1996-97 Programme of Work and Budget - there is a total of US\$ 11 504 000. The second column shows the programme change arising from the ZRG, or the Zero Real Growth budget proposal - in this case it arrives at US\$ 11 553 000. Then you see that below we add on the cost increases of US\$ 354 000, and then finally you see we give you the impact of the ZNG proposal, which is to take away US\$ 741 000, that is on the second last line of that Table.

If you just turn over the page, you will see the main outputs for Programme Elements 01 and 02. Programme Element 01 deals with the implementation of IPPC, and Programme Element 02 deals with Pesticide Management. What I want to point out to you is that in each of the Tables for outputs, there is a column on the right-hand side which says "ZNG impact". So what happens under IPPC, which is Programme Element 01, is that the four FAO/IPGRI guidelines on Safe Germplasm Transfer will be eliminated. This was the area of least priority which the Division could recognize to be able to accommodate the budget reduction. Similarly, if you look at the Table under Pesticide Management, this is the Main Outputs under paragraph 344, you will see on the right-hand side that we have cancelled one expert panel and one technical government consultation, and we have also reduced the number of pesticides that will be dealt with under the PIC arrangement.

There are a number of Annexes in the document, on which you can ask any questions. I would just refer you now to the additional documents, if I may. Very briefly, you have the corrigendum in the various languages for which I apologize. The document is produced under some pressure, but there are one or two changes to be made. Secondly, you have C 97/3-Sup. 1, which lists the individual Scheduled Sessions and Selected Publications, that is, all the Major Publications. Then you have C 97/3-Sup. 2, which is a Third Scenario. May I say that Council did not discuss this scenario at all. There is no mention of it in its Report, but it is there because it was requested by the Council. This is the Scenario that suggests what would happen if we had less than Zero Nominal Growth, and it is worked out on the basis that all of those things that we added in to ZNG when we changed the exchange rate are taken back out. It is a "Doomsday Scenario", if I can call it that.

Finally, there is one piece of information which I gave the Council which is not in the document but which you should be aware of. We have a very difficult situation in this Budget. In both cases, in both the ZRG and ZNG proposal, we are reducing the number of posts of a certain kind. For example, you will see that even under ZRG, where the total number of reductions is not that enormous, the number of General Service abolitions is quite high. Then under ZNG there are even more reductions.

The practical problem for us is that some of those posts have people on them, and therefore there will be some costs in resolving each situation. From 1 January 1998, you will not give us a

budget for the posts that are abolished, but the people will still be here because there will not be time between the Conference decision and 1 January 1998 to resolve each case. The cases are complex and require certain delicacy. In some cases, people will be transferred to other posts. Certainly the first priority of the Director-General is to try and redeploy staff who lose their jobs and who have satisfactory performance - to redeploy them onto other vacancies as quickly as possible. The second option is to offer Agreed Terminations, that is, to separate people within the Rules and Regulations of the Organization but of course, as you are aware, at a cost. It is very, very difficult to estimate exactly what these costs will be. The technique that we use is to set up a Task Force involving both management and staff to examine each case, and try to find a solution. Until the Task Force has met, we cannot say exactly what the costs will be. On the other hand, we have done an exercise on a statistical basis to go through and look at the age and length of service of all the people that are on posts that will be abolished. We have then applied some factors, and estimated firstly what it will cost pending redeployment, in other words, how long will we be paying salaries until we resolve the cases, and secondly, how many of those will be resolved through Agreed Terminations which have high Separation Costs.

The net effect of all of that is that we consider that this document is under-budgeted and, looking at these costs, we feel we have underestimated how much it will be. In the case of ZRG, the underestimation is around about US\$ 4 million but with a margin of error that could be as much as 25 per cent. In the case of ZNG, the margin of error is another US\$ 8 million on top, that is as much as US\$ 12 million in total, again with a rather high margin of error. The point I am making is that the budget is under-funded, and under ZRG it is not probably a desperate situation. It is probably a function of keeping some posts vacant a little longer than we would otherwise wish to do, and we will be able to resolve it. Under ZNG, it is a fairly serious situation. It will mean that we will have to reduce the allotments to Divisions to try and make sure that we do not exceed a budget authorization that was based on ZNG.

I think that is all I have to say at this stage. If there are any questions I should be happy to assist.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much Mr Wade. I am sure that those explanations represented time well spent. Logically, we ought to ask ourselves whether we are happy with our understanding of the methodology and presentation before we debate the substance.

My experience is that if you ask people to divide their responses between methodology and presentation and substance, in fact they start talking about both. I am nevertheless going to take a risk because I do believe that it is very important that we should try, so far as possible, to start off with a common understanding of what is set out here.

Mr Wade has made an heroic effort to explain what is a very difficult set of issues in an extremely long document, and I am sure that would have helped considerably. But I would like, if possible, to dispose of doubts and misconceptions that anyone may have about this presentation before we start to discuss its substance.

I propose to adjourn this Session at 17.45 hrs. I would now like to invite reactions from the floor on the issues of methodology and presentation. I am asking for people to pose questions that will elucidate and inform, to give us a better understanding, of what is before us.

Who would like to take the floor?

I am vastly encouraged. I deduce from this that you have a perfect understanding of the methodology and the presentation. In that case we will now turn to matters of substance. Who would like to open?

Herijanto SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia)

First of all, I would like to express our appreciation to Mr Wade for his eloquent introductory remarks on the Item now under discussion. I would also like to express our appreciation to the

FAO Secretariat for preparing the Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 before us, which presents in one document the two scenarios for a Zero Real Growth and a Zero Nominal Growth.

FAO's Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 which integrates Regular and extra-budgetary resources is an important and useful innovation that should be continued. The Indonesian delegation welcomes the initiatives taken by the Director-General of FAO to streamline the structure of Headquarters and to slim its Secretariat staff in Headquarters, Regional and Sub-Regional Offices, as well as to vastly improve and strengthen FAO's professional teams. I believe that by decentralizing offices to the field, FAO's representatives ameliorate its services to Member Nations and strengthen the field activities.

Despite those heartening developments, the Indonesian delegation is increasingly concerned with the continuing financial cut back of the Programme of Work and Budget of FAO, which we believe, would adversely affect FAO's capabilities to fully implement the mandated programmes, especially the mandate given by the World Food Summit to reduce by half the number of hungry and malnourished people by the year 2015. In this regard, the continued budget reduction would, eventually, force FAO to creatively explore its fund-raising activities and seek other additional resources to strengthen its activities.

The Indonesian delegation is fully aware that the subject matter of the Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 of FAO tabled before this Conference has been seriously discussed during FAO Council and Programme and Finance Committee meetings, to which my delegation attaches considerable importance and whose developments it follows very closely.

This Programme of Work and Budget, in our opinion, fully reflects priorities set out by the Council and the Conference, and provides a balance between the operational and normative type of activities. In this context, my delegation would like to reiterate the importance of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS), the Forestry and Fisheries Programmes and Codex Alimentarius, as well as Women in Development and "Telefood" Programmes which need resources to be available in view of high priorities accorded to them. The SPFS is one of the pillars of the activities of FAO in the field level. It will play a significant role in achieving food security objectives set out in the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

Furthermore, after having looked in some depth, at the Programme of Work, we found that FAO has a significant comparative advantage in assisting Member Nations in the field of water management, including water harvesting for the agricultural sector. In this respect, we would like to see that this important matter be duly reflected, as one of the priority areas in the Programme of Work and Budget of FAO.

The Indonesian delegation, therefore, sincerely expresses its appreciation to the hard work of the Programme and Finance Committees, in examining the Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99, and believes that the recommendations submitted by the Council in its Hundred and Thirteenth Session, would provide valuable inputs for the Conference to take a decision.

It is my sincere hope that this Conference, in deciding its Programme of Work and Budget, should be based on the Constitution and General Rules of FAO.

Therefore, should the Programme of Work and Budget be applied effectively and efficiently, the decision taken by the Conference should accommodate the interest of Member Nations and avoid any action which could hamper the mandate of FAO.

In conclusion, the Indonesian delegation would like to reiterate its support to the Zero Real Growth scenario for the Programme of Work and Budget of FAO for the 1998-99 biennium. By this scenario, the Organization would be able to fulfil its mandates and implement a programme to the satisfaction of its Members in their efforts to deal with hunger, and malnutrition and would serve to alleviate poverty and moreover maintain its capacity to deal with the programmes in priority areas.

In this respect, while we support the statement made by the Director-General to Plenary last Saturday on his view with regard to Zero Real Growth, we would like at the same time to underline the need to make available the resources at the level which has been determined by the Programme of Work and not by the policies or problems of certain Member Nations. Political commitment is necessary to achieve an acceptable decision on this matter.

Horacio MALTEZ (Panamá)

En esta oportunidad hablaré en representación del Grupo Latinoamericano y del Caribe. Con su venia, me reservo pues el derecho de poder intervenir más adelante, si fuese necesario, a nombre de la delegación de Panamá.

Considero oportuno iniciar esta intervención expresando que el GRULAC acoge con satisfacción el nuevo formato del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto, ya que en nuestra opinión el mismo suministra amplios detalles, expone de manera más clara la presentación de datos sobre los recursos totales disponibles y su distribución regional indica las estimaciones relativas a otros ingresos que consideramos una buena base para la elaboración del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto. Sobretudo, porque se ajusta a las recomendaciones efectuadas por los Comités de Finanzas, del Programa y por el Consejo de la FAO.

En este orden de ideas es nuestra opinión además que el nuevo formato para el Programa 2.1.1 representa un serio intento para mostrar los vínculos más importantes con otras organizaciones, aunque consideramos que deben continuar realizándose esfuerzos para mejorar esta información, pero sin ampliar necesariamente el documento.

Es opinión del GRULAC que el documento C 97/3 presentado por el señor Director General responde cabalmente a la solicitud del Consejo relacionada con las diferentes opciones del nivel presupuestario.

Con respecto a la aplicación del tipo de cambio, *mutatis mutandi*, de 1690 liras por dólar ee. uu., nuestro Grupo considera que la misma, cuando se hizo, fue una estimación prudente que se basó en pronósticos independientes de amplia base y realizada por consenso sobre probables tipos de cambio durante tal período.

En nuestra opinión, es oportuno reconocer que la eventualidad de un dólar más fuerte implicaría una reducción ulterior de los aumentos de costos, lo cual permitiría reintegrar recursos que han sido eliminados de programas de alta prioridad. En este contexto, estamos convencidos de que cualquier nuevo aumento del tipo de cambio serviría para reducir la cuantía global del presupuesto, lo mismo que las cuotas asignadas a los Estados Miembros. Asimismo, es opinión del GRULAC que la estimación, que naturalmente cambiaría de modificarse el tipo de cambio de 25.2 millones de dólares ee. uu., correspondientes al aumento neto de los costos, es un cálculo basado en las suposiciones antes mencionadas, por lo que expresa su respaldo al volumen de los aumentos de los costos estimados.

El GRULAC desea expresar su reconocimiento por los enormes esfuerzos que ha realizado la Organización durante los últimos cuatro años en las economías por eficiencia. Este es un hecho innegable, hecho que nadie puede poner en duda. Son muchos los ejemplos, no consideramos necesario alargar esta declaración enumerándolos, ellos son más que conocidos por todos nosotros.

Nuestro Grupo ha siempre manifestado de manera enérgica sobre la utilidad de este tipo de acciones y no piensa que sea el momento de cambiar de opinión, pero toda acción tiene un límite, por lo que expresamos con la misma firmeza, nuestra oposición a tratar de conseguir economías a toda costa y a cualquier costo. Estamos convencidos que no deben tratar de imponerse reducciones que excedan la capacidad de la Organización para absorberlas - ya fuera a causa del tiempo necesario para introducir ajustes o por los posibles riesgos de que se atenúen los controles internos. Todo intento de persistir en esto representa un peligroso atentado contra la

Organización y por ende para los intentos de aliviar el hambre y la malnutrición y está en contra de los objetivos de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación.

En este contexto, el GRULAC desea expresar su seria preocupación por las consignaciones presupuestarias correspondientes a los Capítulos 5, que se refiere a los Servicios de apoyo, y 6, que trata de los Servicios comunes, aplicadas hasta ahora y de las propuestas de Crecimiento Nominal Cero para 1998-99 sobre la eficacia de estos programas administrativos. Al respecto, nuestro Grupo Regional expresa particular determinación por las consecuencias que podrían ser, sólo por citar algunas, el posible riesgo de que se atenúe el control financiero interno y sus consecuencias sobre la calidad financiera, la reducción de la capacidad para responder al aumento de las peticiones de elaboración de políticas, examen de organización, y otras muchas más.

Al referirnos a las políticas y prácticas de descentralización, señalamos la necesidad de adoptar procedimientos incluidos o relacionados con la preparación del presupuesto y la participación de las Oficinas Regionales y Subregionales en la determinación de las prioridades. En este orden de ideas, el GRULAC expresa su preocupación por el hecho de que la eficacia de esta delegación de funciones pueda estar gravemente limitada por los escasos recursos que se han asignado a las Oficinas Regionales y Subregionales. Nuestro Grupo expresa asimismo su inquietud ante el carácter y la magnitud de las economías propuestas en el Programa de Labores y Presupuesto a las Representaciones de la FAO, las cuales nuestro Grupo desea que sean fortalecidas y aumentadas durante el próximo bienio.

Como último argumento, señor Presidente, deseamos hacer referencia a los aspectos relacionados con el nivel de presupuesto. Al respecto, queremos recordar que desde el principio nuestro Grupo se manifestó por la opción de Crecimiento Real, propuesta durante la fase de esbozo y de resumen del PLP para 1998-99.

Estimamos importante evidenciar, sin embargo, que consideramos esta alternativa como insuficiente, ya que ella significaba en realidad una opción negativa, si recordamos que el presupuesto para el bienio 1994-95 fue de 673 millones de dólares ee. uu., que se redujo a 650 millones de dólares ee. uu. en el ejercicio presupuestario vigente para el bienio 1996-97. Como vemos, se trataba ya de un presupuesto decreciente, es decir, para utilizar la eufemística nomenclatura propuesta, de un Crecimiento Nominal.

A pesar de estas consideraciones y con el propósito de lograr un consenso, el GRULAC, con muchas dificultades aceptó ratificar la propuesta de Crecimiento Real Cero propuesta por el Director General pero indicando que es el mínimo, el mínimo aceptable. La Secretaría de la FAO nos asegura que la hipótesis de Crecimiento Real Cero permitiría mantener la capacidad de la Organización en las esferas prioritarias, y estamos dispuestos a aceptar tal hipótesis. El propio Director General, en su Declaración Inaugural, nos expresa de que se trata de un sector normativo en el que se aseguran aspectos a los que concedemos gran importancia tales como la Convención Internacional de Protección Fitosanitaria, el Código de Conducta para la Distribución y Utilización de Plaguicidas, el Codex Alimentarius, la Conservación y Ordenación de Recursos Genéticos, la Pesca Responsable, y la Evaluación de los Recursos Forestales. Se contemplan también las actividades de asistencia técnica proporcionadas a los Estados Miembros que las soliciten, tales como la aplicación de los Acuerdos de Marrakesh, del fomento a la apicultura, etc., así como a programas que consideramos de gran prioridad y que respaldamos, como lo son el PCT y el PESA.

Para terminar, señor Presidente, queremos manifestar nuestro apoyo, naturalmente *mutatis mutandi*, a la Resolución contenida en el documento en examen.

The meeting rose at 17.50 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 50.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.50 horas.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (Arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

CHAIRMAN

I wish to bring up one or two procedural points before we resume our discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget.

The first one is that the Drafting Committee will meet for the first time tonight, and I will announce its composition as soon as I can -- I hope by the end of this morning.

The second point is that I still await nominations from delegations who would like to take part in the Friends of the Chair process. Can I urge you to think, urgently, about that. That process needs to begin as soon as possible. I have, so far, a lightweight representation from Asia and a non-existent representation from Latin America. It would be very helpful to have, before the end of this morning, nominations from delegations who would like to take part in that process.

The third point is that, as you will have seen from the Order of the Day, the work of this, and indeed other, Commissions will be suspended at 10:40 hours, to enable us to hear the McDougall Lecture in the Plenary Hall. I intend to resume the work of this Commission after the Lecture, so we will come back here after the Lecture and continue with our discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget.

Reviewing our discussion of that item, which we began last night, I draw your attention to a new paper which is available this morning, C 97/LIM/3, which is the extract from the Report of the Council last week, in its discussion of this Item -- C 97/LIM/3, Programme of Work and Budget, 1998-99. This is the Report of the Council's consideration of this issue last week.

Mrs Hannelore A.H. BENJAMIN (Dominica)

On behalf of the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean, may I congratulate you and the Vice-Chairman for chairing this very important Committee on Programme of Work and Budget. We are convinced that, through your guidance, we will be able to find a solution for the right budget that will be best for all Member Nations.

We have studied the documents before us very carefully and would like to congratulate the Secretariat for preparing them. A task that must not have been easy for them to do so. We have also listened very carefully when the Director-General made his statement at the opening of the Conference, and have paid close attention to that which he had to tell us, like how over-expenditure on staff has been reduced, and how FAO has tried hard to find ways and means to economize and cut costs.

Over the next few days, we, the developing countries, will be asked to consider a budget proposal that calls for a budget from US\$ 676.3 million to US\$ 650 million. This represents no nominal growth budget, and a real cut of 3.7 percent.

Before we evaluate this proposal, let us set it in the context of FAO's financial condition in recent biennia. The Statement of Assets, Liabilities, Reserves and Fund Balances, as of 31 December 1995, states it very clearly. As you will know, FAO had assets of US\$ 409 million and a net fund position of negative US\$ 38 million, at the end of the 1992-93 biennium. At that time, contributions receivable were US\$ 151 million.

By the end of the 1994-95 biennium, however, FAO's assets had decreased by 8 percent, to US\$ 375 million. Assessment on members also fell by 3 percent. Meanwhile, contributions receivable - and here we are talking about arrears on pledged contributions - had shot up by 41 percent, yes, Mr Chairman, 41 percent, from US\$ 151 million to US\$ 213 million.

Something clearly had to give. What is it? Well, first of all, FAO's net fund position became increasingly negative, rising to over US\$ 70 million. Second, the Regular Programme increased by only 0.3 percent over two years, or far less than the rate of inflation, meaning that there was a substantial real cut.

But third, and most importantly, expenditures on projects fell significantly, from US\$ 700 million in 1992-93 to US\$ 544 million in 1994-95. With a 22 percent nominal cut in project expenditures, it was the poor and the disadvantaged in rural areas who bore the brunt of the cuts, and in 1996-97, this went down even further to US\$ 514 million.

Let us now turn to the 1996-97 biennium. Available data suggest that, far from improving, FAO's financial position has worsened. At the beginning of the biennium, FAO had an accumulated deficit of US\$ 113.6 million, entirely attributed to the non-payment of assessed contributions. Member Nations must have their serious reasons, and by stating it, we are only stating a fact here, it is not a criticism, but a fact. But we must remember that this shortfall is a serious constraint on FAO's operations and calls into question our true commitment to the objectives of FAO. Our aim is, through "Telefood" and "Food for All", to eradicate hunger and to reduce by half the number of hungry people, hopefully, by the year 2010.

This is the financial context in which we are being asked to consider a 3.7 percent real cut in FAO's budget for the next biennium. Can we really do that, Mr Chairman?

But before we evaluate the proposal, let us also consider the broader issue of priorities. What are our priorities, both as policy makers and as representatives of the sisterhood of nations? We firmly believe that our first priority must be the eradication of hunger, malnutrition and poverty in every nation, not just in our backyards, but wherever it is. With modern technology, we cannot help seeing it wherever it is. "Telefood" has vividly brought forward the sad phenomenon of hunger and malnutrition before the eyes and conscience of our peoples.

It is never easy to ask our taxpayers for more funding. With one of the higher FAO assessments in *per capita* terms, the GRULAC countries are fully aware of this. However, "Telefood" and other programmes have brought home the continuing truths of one billion people living in abject poverty, these same taxpayers will ask us what we are doing about it. Will we tell them that we cut the budget of the Food and Agriculture Organization by 3.7 percent in real terms? Will we tell them that we thought FAO merited a lower budget increase than other UN Agencies? Will we tell them that agriculture, the mainstay of the rural economy and, thus, the lifeline of the rural poor in all countries, did not merit fuller support?

These are the questions on global priorities that we, as policy makers, must address.

Now that we have this broader context before us, we can proceed to evaluate the merits of a cut in FAO's budget, and ask ourselves whether we can truly go for anything less than a Zero Real Growth budget, because if we would, the technical programme would have a further cut of US\$ 12.9 million and it would be the smallest farmers who would have to bear the cost. But if we want to achieve world food security, we need to establish food production, and this cannot be achieved at the national level alone, but at the regional and global level.

Mr Chairman, also Small Island Developing States would be even further vulnerable to external shocks brought on by changes in the world economy and natural disasters, like hurricanes and droughts, as well as long-term climatic changes such as the rise in sea levels. When we prepared for the World Food Summit, FAO and GRULAC realized this and it is documented in the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action. We know that even in the best of times, the Small Island Developing States face a trade-off between high costs due to the small scale of local production and high cost of transportation. But if the budget is cut, all these Small Island Developing States face an even bigger problem than they already face, and that, Mr Chairman, we have to try to avoid.

In concluding this, in view of their specially vulnerable situation, Small Island Developing States suggest that FAO organize, in 1999, a meeting to examine their specific problems with respect to agricultural development and food security in the context of globalization and agricultural trade. This is in an effort to strengthen and accelerate their programmes on food security in the face of an increasingly liberalized world trade market.

Mr Chairman, I would like to continue on behalf of Dominica.

Distinguished colleagues, on behalf of Dominica, I would like just to add what I have said as Chairman of GRULAC. Please bear in mind that Dominica is a small agricultural economy. A little project system has considerable impact on our economy. FAO's TCP projects have played, and continue to play, an important role in our agricultural development. We are in need of those projects.

As many of you are aware, Dominica faces the prospect of significant economic upheaval, as a direct consequence of potential changes in the trade regime. In this context, Dominica will require further support to assist with agricultural diversification, product activity increases and development of non-farm rule enterprises.

In the early 1980s, we saw a major political crisis in the Eastern Caribbean, with important implications for our island. Dominica had to implement painful, structural adjustments, to strengthen her economy and foreign aid for Dominica in particular, in the GRULAC region in general, plummeted as donor nations looked increasingly inward or eastward. Dominica survived by pursuing sensible development, and showed an appreciation for the importance of following sound macro-economic policies to ensure the well-being of her people.

We have also devoted our scarce public resources to investing in our physical infrastructure and endeavoured to conserve our pristine environment, maintained sound democratic tradition and established an outstanding human rights record. Dominica is, therefore, gravely concerned at the prospect of sharp cuts in FAO's budget for the forthcoming biennium.

FAO is an important partner in Dominica's development and in that of our sister nations and the developing world. FAO also holds and supports knowledgeable exchanges and other activities, including, for example, the Codex Alimentarius, that are of considerable importance to farmers, and not only to those in the developing world but in the donor countries as well.

I believe that a persuasive case can be made for a Zero Real Growth in FAO's budget, in combination with the sound statement made by the Director-General showing economy on overheads. In addition he intends to redirect resources to frontline activities that directly benefit all Members, while focusing on initiatives for effective rationalization.

This will ensure that FAO's programme can be maintained and its mandate fulfilled. The point is to achieve the maximum bang for the buck.

However, we must bear in mind that, whenever an Organization envisages a process of restructuring and change, there is the danger that staff morale may be adversely affected. It is important for the success of the Organization that the staff do have a positive outlook, rather than a fearful approach, in their work. In order to ensure that staff morale remains high, it is

incumbent upon FAO's Management and its Members that changes be very clearly defined. This will earn the trust and support of FAO's staff.

I regret to say that, in this sort of outlook, it looks very bleak for Dominica's economy. Sources of export earnings have dropped, and the Government is taking every preemptive measure to mitigate the potential adverse declines. However, my delegation would like to underscore that these measures will require the support of FAO and of the international community.

Let us, therefore, avoid major shocks, hunger, malnutrition among all people, by agreeing to a Zero Real Growth budget.

Leiv LUNDE (Norway)

Let me first of all commend the Secretariat for the improved format of document C 97/3, Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1998-99.

My delegation welcomes the inclusion of support costs in the Budget, as well as the presentation of the expected extra-budgetary resources, which gives the Member Nations a better picture of the total resources available to the Organization in the next biennium.

We would, however, also have appreciated a clearer explanation of the interrelationship between the regular budget and the extra-budgetary-funded activities. High priority programmes should, as a rule, be financed from the regular budget, even though the Secretariat has obtained assurances of extra-budgetary funding.

My delegation welcomes the trend towards concentration on a fewer number of programmes, and increased weight on FAO's normative functions. Normative and operational activities should be planned to be mutually supportive. Operational activities should strengthen the normative work, by giving precision and content to the normative activities.

Under Agenda Item 13, my delegation has already commended the Programme Evaluation Report. There is a clear need to include lessons learned from programme evaluation in the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget. Thus we would better understand reorientations and priorities in the document. We also believe that, when indicating priorities, it would be helpful to have access to the current expenditure on the different activities.

The Secretariat has, during the past biennium, managed to make some savings, which we highly value and welcome. We do, however, believe that there is room for further savings through increased efficiency and cost-effectiveness. In this regard, the recommendations of the External Auditor could be used as guidance for further savings.

We have agreed to the process of decentralization, but it should be borne in mind that decentralization also has its costs. There is a danger of creating units below the critical size necessary to maintain the sufficient level of expertise to carry out the normative and operational tasks. Moreover, there is a risk that the Organization can no longer fulfil its role as a global Centre of Excellence, within its mandated areas. Decentralization to the regions, with emphasis on multidisciplinary teams, has reduced the need for expensive units at country level.

In our view, FAO's system of field representation needs to be revised in light of the on-going reforms within the UN System. FAO's activities should be coordinated with other UN activities and, as a rule, FAO's Country Representations should be integrated in the UN Resident Coordinator System. Headquarters' ability to execute better control with activities at the field level needs to be strengthened. We, therefore, welcome the enhanced utilization of modern telecommunications. We will encourage the Director-General to continue to make full use of its advantages in order to improve effectiveness. The savings which would result from such rationalization efforts should be used to strengthen the Forestry Programme activities.

Norway appreciates the efforts made, during recent years, to increase the number of women professional staff and to ensure equitable Member Nation representation among the staff. In absolute terms, and also in comparison to other UN Specialized Agencies, FAO still has a fairly

top-heavy structure. We, therefore, urge the Director-General to continue his efforts in broadening the grades pyramid.

Norway, supports the overall thrust of the Programme of Work and Budget, which will maintain activities under Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 at the present level under the Zero Real Growth scenario. We were, however, somewhat surprised when studying the proposals under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario. The most severe cuts in the ZNG budget are in Chapter 2, Technical and Economic Programmes and in highly-prioritized areas. Such cuts would harm the follow-up of agreements reached by the international community through Conventions, Conferences and Summits from UNCED to the WFS, which we consider should be the main criteria for setting the priorities.

Let me now turn briefly to our comments on the priorities within Chapter 2, which is the core of FAO's substantive output.

Under Major Programme 2.1, we agree with the Director-General's proposal of giving the highest priority to the follow-up of the Leipzig Global Plan of Action and to the revision of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources. The Global Plan of Action may become an extremely important instrument in maintaining the diversity of plant genetic resources. FAO should, therefore, actively promote the implementation of the Global Plan of Action. Conservation and sustainable utilization of genetic resources is an important part of the international work on assuring global food security for future generations. Sufficient resources should be allocated to the negotiations on the International Undertaking in order to reach an early and successful outcome.

We appreciate the new approach to Programme 2.1.1., Natural Resources. The new format makes it easier to identify output and evaluate results. This approach should be further refined and extended to other parts of the Programme.

We also support giving high priority to the implementation of the revised International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and completing negotiations on making the Prior Informed Consent procedure a legally-binding instrument.

The largest increase in Chapter 2 is under MP 2.2 Food and Agriculture Policy Development. We welcome the net increase to Codex Alimentarius, but we would have liked to see that the resources allocated to nutrition remained at least at the same level as for the current biennium. We do not find that a decreased support to nutrition is in line with the Plan of Action from the World Food Summit.

As regards the new Sub-Programme on Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems (FIVIMS), the Plan of Action stresses UN-wide coordination and a comprehensive approach to reach goals. The Plan of Action further states that FAO should play a catalytical role in this effort, within the framework of the *ad hoc* inter-agency task forces on the follow-up of the UN Conferences. It is clear that this system (FIVIMS) should start by building on existing data and work already done, and reflect a broad concept of food insecurity. More information on the cooperative framework established with other Institutions and Agencies would have been appreciated. Such cooperation could also lead to reduced costs to the Organization.

We strongly support the priority given to the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, under Major Programme 2.3. In particular, we endorse the priority given to capacity-building and more advisory support to regional fisheries bodies, which are the cornerstones of the new multilateral system for fisheries management. A report on the follow-up has to be finalized for the first CSD Ocean Session scheduled for 1999. One of FAO's tasks in this connection should be to prepare an adequate standard format to facilitate reporting.

FAO has a central role to play in the on-going and comprehensive follow-up of UNCED's decisions on forestry and the Intergovernmental Panel on Forestry. FAO should be honoured for its active role in the Inter-Agency Task Force. The work plan prepared by the Task Force to

implement the Panel's decisions is an important element in the future work on sustainable forest management. Norway is aware that FAO, due to budgetary constraints, has a limited possibility to implement all the tasks that has been allocated to the Organization during recent years, and we endorse the shift in approach under MP 2.4 on Forestry towards forest resources assessment and the priority given to the follow-up of UNCED. However, we would have appreciated a larger share of the budget allocated to Major Programme 2.4, Forestry.

Further, we agree on the priority given to normative activities related to the Marrakesh Declaration. FAO should continue to monitor effects of the international trade liberalization and, in particular, its consequences on food security in Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries.

In many developing countries, women are the main producers of food and the main providers of meals and nutritional information. Any strategy for improvement in food security will, therefore, have to take women's needs as a point of departure. It is equally important to build up women's knowledge about nutrition in the elaboration of strategies for food security. We commend FAO's efforts to mainstream the gender dimension in all its activities, and the increased attention on the role of women as regards food security. We look forward to a continued focus on this essential issue.

In concluding, my delegation would like to reiterate its support to the main thrust of the programme. FAO has done commendable work in improving the format of the PWB, and we appreciate the savings in administration costs that have been done so far.

To the extent that FAO continues to increase its efficiency, we are ready to support the proposed budget of Zero Real Growth. We are, however, prepared to work with other delegations to reach a consensus on the budget level.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

Australia has undertaken considerable examination of the Programme of Work document, for both the Zero Real Growth and the Zero Nominal Growth scenarios. We consider that the Zero Nominal Growth proposals accurately reflect the priorities of FAO, as identified by technical committees and the Council. They also reflect the results of major recent events, such as the World Food Summit and the Leipzig Conference on Plant Genetic Resources. Shifts of resources have enabled refocusing of programmes and the establishment of a new sub-programme to host FIVIMS (the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information Mapping System).

We also note that priority areas are adequately resourced under Zero Nominal Growth. For example, under crops: plant genetic resources, the IPPC and crop protection; under livestock: transboundary animal diseases, maintenance of activities in small-holder and pastoral systems and domestic animal genetic diversity, agricultural support systems, the focusing of rural finance activities on areas of direct benefit to small-scale rural farmers, Codex, commodity market analysis and food security assessments; FIVIMS, food information and Early Warning Systems, fisheries where COFI priorities such as implementation of the Code of Conduct are well supported; in forestry; in women in agriculture; in the Special Programme on Food Security; in the TCP.

The Programme of Work under the ZNG scenario is not going to lead to this Organization being unable to deliver on key commitments to Members. Rather, and very importantly, the Programme of Work in ZNG represents a constructive set of activities to better focus resources on these priorities. The Secretariat should be congratulated on this.

FAO, as all Members recognized in the World Food Summit Plan of Action, is about continuing to optimize the effectiveness of its support to Governments, all actors of civil society and international institutions. The Zero Nominal Growth scenario does not endanger this, while US\$ 675 million, or thereabouts under Zero Real Growth, would allow additional outputs. Australia has considerable doubt that, by definition, more is better when it comes to optimizing the effectiveness of FAO and ensuring the financial sustainability of the Organization.

Australia is not alone in suggesting a level of funding of no more than US\$ 650 million. It is notable that this group represents more than 60 percent of Regular Programme assessments. This is not to suggest that this group is trying to throw their financial weight around. Rather, this group recognizes the importance of financial responsibility for the Organization, the importance of supporting a Programme of Work that is hardly effective if it does not have sufficient funds to make those activities a reality.

We therefore hope, like many speakers have expressed, and will no doubt continue to express, that we have consensus on a Budget Level. We feel, however, that this consensus should be at Zero Nominal Growth, that this is a level which gives us an established Programme of Work, which we all understand, have examined and can recognize, does not lead to either starvation and malnutrition simply by being Zero Nominal Growth rather than Zero Real Growth. Rather, it puts this Organization on a sound footing, programme and budget-wise, to in fact continue to overcome the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

Kim YONG (Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

Mr Chairman, allow me, first of all, to congratulate you on your election to the Chair for Commission II. On behalf of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's delegation, I take this opportunity to thank the Director-General for his efforts in preparing the 1998-99 Programme of Work and Budget to be submitted to the Conference.

My delegation appreciates that the 1998-1999 Programme of Work and Budget, which he submitted to the Conference, is a constructive and well-analysed document and reflects the internal financial problems the FAO faces, as well as the desire of the Member Nations for strengthened international cooperation in agriculture and food sectors.

We consider the biennium 1998-99 FAO budget reasonable since it takes into account the current financial status of FAO and the attitude of the Member Nations towards it, and anticipates Zero Real Growth in a balanced way.

Before anything else, this Zero Real Growth budget mirrors the Organization's willpower to implement the important Resolutions adopted at recent international meetings, including the World Food Summit Plan of Action and the Resolution of the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources.

The current Budget emphasizes obtaining and utilizing financial resources in such a way that FAO concentrates on priority sectors, with the emphasis on world food security and economic and technical programmes. The Budget also takes into consideration the fact that the Economic and Technical Cooperation Programme for Developing Countries has an increased budget compared with the 1996-97 budget, and it will either further increase or maintain the present level depending on a possible fluctuation in exchange of currency. This will also solve the financial problem with regard to securing funds to implement the FAO Food Security Special Programme, the main objective of which is to help those countries with low incomes and food shortages, as well as, the countries with limited investment funds for food imports and ever-decreasing food aid, to rapidly and sustainably increase food production and productivity.

I, therefore, support the 1998-99 Programme of Work and Budget proposed by the Director-General of FAO, and recommend that these documents be adopted unanimously. In conclusion, I call upon all the Member Nations so that there will be full strength and solidarity and cooperation for the welfare of mankind, particularly for the hundreds of millions of people suffering from hunger and poverty. I assure you that Democratic People's Republic of Korea will actively participate in the Organization's activities for this.

Nahi SHEIBANI (Syria) (Original language Arabic)

My delegation has examined document C 97/3 very carefully. We have examined the contents of this document, and we are going to make some brief comments on it.

The FAO Secretariat has done its best to put before the Conference and Council an account of the activities carried out in the biennium, and it has also shown the necessary financial resources needed for the coming biennium. We thank the Secretariat for all the details contained in this document. The objectives of FAO's activities are clear, and the personnel table also. The accounts have been based on two options in accordance with the recommendations of the Council. So, we wish to reiterate our thanks to the Secretariat for the efforts made.

My delegation would have preferred the document C 97/3 to be less detailed, and hopes that in the future, it can be.

Secondly, the budget proposed for the period 1998-99, in a framework of Zero Real Growth, will make possible the execution of the programmes planned for this two-year period. However, the budget will not allow the Organization to implement the programme and commitments assigned to it by the World Food Summit. We would have wished to have a concise document, making a comparison between the commitment of FAO to reduce the number of malnourished persons in the world by half, and the possibility of carrying out the programmes to achieve that goal because we realized that the Programme of Work and Budget falls short of what is expected of our Organization.

Thirdly, we would like to support a prioritization of programmes. We are concerned about the fall in allocations to certain programmes, including the programme on women and their role in rural development, enduring food security and technical cooperation in programmes.

My delegation would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the good results from the Technical Cooperation Programme and we set particular store by the Special Programme on Food Security. The new procedures in that Special Programme will make it possible to increase food production in developing countries. We consider that that is the best way to collaborate between experts on one hand and farmers on the other.

Fourthly, my delegation would like to reaffirm that water resources are the keystone for an increase in agricultural production in arid and semi-arid regions. Therefore, we wish to express our concern about any attempt to reduce financial resources allocated to water resources developments in arid and semi-arid regions.

Fifthly, my delegation would like to reiterate what was said by the representative of the Group of 77 and the representative of the Near East Region with regard to the level of the Budget for the period 1998-99, and that is the reason why I will not go into further details on that now. We feel that the option of Zero Real Growth, despite everything, will not enable the Organization to meet its obligations in full.

Anton KOHLER (Suisse)

Lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, nous nous sommes fixés l'objectif de réduire au moins de moitié le nombre de personnes sous-alimentées d'ici à 2015 au plus tard. Cet objectif dépasse de loin les possibilités des seuls gouvernements. Le Sommet l'a clairement dit: "Ce défi ne pourra être relevé que si tous les acteurs de la société civile s'attellent à la tâche et si les institutions internationales donnent leur appui".

Le Sommet a réussi à sensibiliser l'opinion publique sur les problèmes de la faim et à placer la sécurité alimentaire en haut de l'agenda politique.

Cela nous permet de prendre un nouveau départ, saisissons cette chance. L'environnement international dans lequel travaille la FAO change et doit changer. Le futur appartient aux réseaux de partenariat et d'alliances, notamment entre les institutions internationales. La FAO est particulièrement bien placée pour tisser de tels réseaux, et pour les élargir vers les différents secteurs sollicités par le Plan d'action du Sommet. Elle peut contribuer ainsi, à travers de tels réseaux, à l'échange d'informations, d'expériences et d'expertises.

Monsieur le Président, partant du Sommet, nous avons établi une base commune, celle d'une FAO jouissant d'une plus grande influence, qui aide les secteurs concernés à mieux affronter les défis, notamment en les aidant à profiter des expériences faites par ceux qui se trouvent déjà sur la route du succès. Cette FAO doit être en fait un catalyseur contribuant à l'association de tous les acteurs au processus du suivi du Sommet. Ma délégation soutient totalement l'avis exprimé au début de nos assises par le Président de notre Conférence, le Ministre Lyle Vanclief, selon lequel les objectifs fixés par le Sommet ne pourront être atteints qu'avec le partenariat et les alliances des gens.

Revenons au présent et à la question épineuse du budget, tout le monde sait que la plupart des Etats luttent avec des problèmes budgétaires, parfois très importants. Mon pays ne fait malheureusement pas exception à la règle. Il a dû et va encore prendre des mesures draconiennes pour réduire le déficit budgétaire, qui passe notamment par une amélioration de l'efficacité de l'administration. Nous sommes de l'avis que la FAO peut et doit faire un effort sur ce Plan, de façon à dégager plus de moyens pour les activités des programmes de développement. C'est une des raisons pour laquelle nous soutenons la solution d'un budget régulier à Croissance Nominale Zéro, c'est-à-dire au niveau de 650 millions de dollars indépendamment du taux de change.

Notre position d'adopter ce niveau budgétaire est motivée par une deuxième raison. Selon le document sur la situation financière, les montants recouverts par la FAO du début de l'année jusqu'à ce jour au titre des contributions courantes et des arriérés de contributions, sont de 50 millions de dollars inférieurs au chiffre correspondant de l'année dernière.

Soixante-quinze pays, non loin de la moitié des Pays Membres, sont en position d'arriérés. Mon pays n'est pas de ceux-là. Si nous adoptons un budget dépassant le cap des 650 millions de dollars, ne risquons-nous alors pas de soutenir indirectement ces Pays Membres qui ne sont pas intéressés à acquitter leurs arriérés? Je tiens à rappeler ici que tous les Pays Membres doivent honorer leurs obligations financières, mais la solution budgétaire, que nous allons adopter, doit aussi permettre à tous de payer. Lorsque nous parlons des 650 millions de dollars environ du budget ordinaire, il s'agit en fait de la moitié environ de la somme dont dispose la FAO: l'autre moitié provient des fonds fiduciaires.

Selon une étude de la FAO sur les investissements dans le secteur agricole, préparée pour le Sommet, environ 140 milliards de dollars sont investis chaque année dans l'agriculture au sens large des pays en développement. Par rapport à ceux-là, les quelque 600 millions de dollars annuels de la FAO sont une goutte d'eau. Ce n'est donc pas ce supplément qui va fortement influencer le développement rural. C'est plutôt sa contribution aux synergies dégagées en vue d'une meilleure utilisation des 140 milliards de dollars par an, investis par tous les acteurs, qui est primordiale.

Il s'agit en fait de mieux utiliser les ressources disponibles, comme le rappelle d'ailleurs l'étude citée. C'est pourquoi la devise de la Suisse dans la négociation sur le budget sera "Faire mieux avec la même somme". Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie de votre attention.

Patrick K. LUKHELE (Swaziland)

Since my delegation is taking the floor for the first time in this Commission, I wish to congratulate you, Mr Chairman, and the other Members of your Bureau, on your election. I wish also to thank Mr Wade for his detailed and very clear presentation of document C 97/3. My delegation also wishes to recognize, with appreciation, the Secretariat's adherence to the directions and guidance given by the Programme and Finance Committees, as well as the Council, in the preparation of this document.

The demands to contain the budget through increased efficiencies and other measures have been quite understandable, particularly because most Governments are facing budgetary difficulties. However, there must be limits to such demands in order to allow the Organization to effectively

and efficiently discharge its mandate. We have to realize and appreciate that in the last three to four years, various radical strategies have been adopted and are still being implemented in order to promote more efficiency. Some of these are outlined from paragraphs 84 to 90.

It would appear to my delegation that it is time we allowed the Secretariat a breathing space to consolidate its gains and implement the programmes, instead of perpetually being preoccupied with pruning an already lean budget. I say this because programmes and projects are implemented by people and not machines. If FAO employees are continually being subjected to uncertainties about their future, the efficiency, excellence and professionalism that this Organization is known for may be seriously compromised.

Recent international events, as outlined in paragraph 46 -- particularly the Summit Plan of Action and UNCED Agenda 21 -- call for more demands on the available resources of the Organization. At the same time, we here are advocating a Budget which is even leaner than that of the 1994-95 biennium. This is not realistic. My delegation appeals for restraint and consensus.

My delegation also wishes to endorse the Director-General's move to decentralize FAO activities by establishing Sub-regional Offices. We in Swaziland have already had positive experiences during the preparation of our Special Programme on Food Security.

Lastly, my delegation, in the spirit of consensus, wishes to settle for a Zero Real Growth budget as an absolute minimum.

CHAIRMAN

We will now adjourn to attend the McDougall Lecture, and will resume our meeting afterwards.

The meeting was suspended from 10.40 to 11.45 hours.

La séance est suspendue de 10 h 40 à 11 h 45.

Se suspende la sesión de las 10.40 horas a las 11.45 horas.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

I am taking the floor on behalf of the Near East Group. Allow me, at the outset, to extend congratulations and commendation to the Secretariat for the fine job that it has performed in the preparation of these documents we have before us for consideration. Mr Chairman, pursuant to your instructions, I shall be extremely brief and hence I will refrain from entering into any detailed discussion of this document. However, I do feel obliged to spend a few minutes in considering the Programme of Work and Budget for the 1998-99 biennium.

I am convinced that the Programme of Work and Budget has been drawn up in accordance with the terms of reference which the World Food Summit established and entrusted to FAO, namely, to work in such a way that the number of undernourished human beings be reduced, I repeat, that the number of ill-nourished people on Earth be cut by half. So, the terms of reference and mandate entrusted by the Summit to the FAO were to reduce the number of undernourished people by half by the year 2015 and this, naturally, necessitates a strengthening of the Programme of Work and Budget and an expansion thereof. This Programme of Work and Budget has also been drawn up consistent with the directives and guidelines set by the technical committees that were, in turn, set up by the Council and the Conference.

Let me say that the growth in hunger and those who suffer from hunger, is not in fact in pace with the efforts to reduce the Programme of Work and Budget. Those who are undernourished, who suffer from hunger, are convinced that the role to be played by FAO is absolutely essential. The Near East Group is concerned due to the fact that the target of the elimination of hunger and malnutrition which was set by the World Food Summit will be nothing but a dead letter if FAO is not provided with the requisite resources in order to carry out the tasks which have been entrusted to it.

The restructuring and reform activities are of course necessary and ongoing. In this connection, the Near East Group wishes to launch an appeal to countries with arrears of contributions - an appeal for them to settle those Assessed Contributions wholly and on a timely basis, and thus enable FAO to fully carry out the Mission entrusted to it.

To conclude, the Near East Group of countries wishes to express its support for the Zero Real Growth Scenario, as found in the Programme of Work and Budget for the 1998-99 biennium and as proposed by the Director-General of the Organization.

Michael SOUTHWICK (United States of America)

We appreciate the opportunity to share our views on a topic of utmost importance to all Conference participants -- FAO's Programme of Work and Budget, 1998-99.

We commend the Secretariat for its diligent efforts in preparing the budget document. We note that the document's voluminous nature is attributable, in part, to the provision of detailed information on both Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth budget options. We also note the supplementary information provided on the implications of a Budget Level of nearly US\$ 640 million, but we do not believe this supplementary information adequately addresses this proposal. We believe it is imperative that the FAO Conference address how to manage its resources at a lower budget level to avoid a repeat of the events of the FAO Conference in 1995.

Turning to the concept of strategic budgeting, as we stated during this Commission's debate on the Medium-Term Plan, we believe that such an approach is promising. Policy and resource management should be based on strategic planning and quantifiable performance indicators to provide focus to FAO's programmes. With political and socio-economic factors playing a key role in FAO's efforts, along with a multi-sectoral approach, strategic budgeting is no easy task. However, FAO can no longer afford to measure its success in terms of a performance report that recounts how much was spent, rather than what goals were achieved.

We have long expressed strong support for FAO's unique role in science-based standard-setting related to food, agriculture, fisheries and forestry. Its numerous information, monitoring and observing systems are of top quality and are useful to Members. They should continue to be among the main orientations of FAO.

For FAO to achieve its World Food Summit objectives, sustained efforts by nations working collaboratively with the Organization to create an enabling environment to alleviate hunger must be supported. We also firmly believe that FAO's strength lies in its critically important work on the conservation and utilization of genetic resources and the promotion of integrated management of pests and diseases.

Regarding trade initiatives, we strongly support adoption of the revised International Plant Protection Convention, by consensus, this week. We also support the completion of negotiations on Prior Informed Consent on trade in pesticides. FAO's work to build effective multilateral relationships to promote sustainable forestry must continue unabated if the goal of achieving a sustainable global environment is to be achieved.

Turning to FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme, as we stated at the Hundred and Twelfth Session of the Council in June, we believe that a full integration of TCP into FAO's budget and planning processes would greatly enhance the transparency of its programmes.

Regarding internal management controls, we strongly support reform measures such as FAO's establishment of an Office of Inspector General that should serve to inculcate a management culture of accountability at FAO. An Independent Office, similar in nature and scope to the UN's Office of Internal Oversight Services, is key to achieving a greater understanding of the importance of internal oversight. We look forward to the synergy that will be created by this Office the use of modern technology enabling FAO to move towards paperless transactions and "real-time" auditing.

Turning to savings, FAO has taken a number of positive steps to deal with a constrained resource environment. Some proposals for savings that we can support include the elimination of both the Budget Outline and the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

The United States remains convinced that FAO can achieve even greater savings by restructuring its overseas presence. A country breakdown of resources devoted to each Office would be a welcome supplement to the budget document. In our view, FAO's expansion of Regional Offices and the establishment of Subregional Offices should provide the impetus for such restructuring. We are not certain that setting up additional offices is the most optimal use of limited resources. We agree with Norway's approach regarding better rationalization of FAO's field structure.

We note that common and support services alone constitute 15 percent of FAO's budget, but little seems to have been accomplished to achieve savings in these components. FAO has taken some innovative steps to lower its costs, such as introducing ORACLE software packages and merging the Fisheries and Forestry Management Support Units. Despite these efforts, workflow processes have not caught up with technological innovations to produce maximum savings. We note, for example, that seven Management Support Units exist while, at the same time, a large central Administrative Department continues to operate. A more rational and less costly approach to realigning FAO's organizational structure to empower line managers should be pursued. We underline the need for greater consolidation of programmes and a more sustained effort to reduce the average grade level at FAO. In this connection, we strongly support the Director-General's efforts to inject new blood in the Organization.

With regard to the Budget Level, we are at a critical stage of our deliberations on the Director-General's 1998-99 budget. We wish to assure FAO and Member Nations that we do not intend to abandon our commitment to achieving food security and improving the quality of life across the globe. Earlier, we have called for an agreement on a budget level of US\$ 610-615 million and immediate adoption of a new UN Scale to reduce the ceiling established for rates of assessments. We intend to address the Scale of Assessments issue in greater detail later this week in Commission III. With regard to the status of our current contributions, we intend to complete payment of our calendar year 1997 contribution to FAO as soon as our fiscal year 1998 appropriations process is completed, which we expect to occur shortly.

The United States of America stands at a critical crossroads in its relationship with FAO and the UN System as a whole. President Clinton has collaborated with Congress on legislation which we expect to be enacted soon. This legislation is designed to put the United States of America on a solid, sustainable, predictable financial footing with regard to the UN System. That is good for FAO and good for its Member Nations. Notably, this legislation, once adopted, would make available virtually all of the arrears we plan to pay to international organizations, including FAO, over a period of three years.

We wish to assure delegates of the Administration's commitment to pay this Organization fully. We want to solve our arrears problem and begin the next millenium with a clean slate. However, I have to emphasize we cannot solve this problem alone, on a business-as-usual basis.

Consolidation and streamlining are commonplace in government and the private sector throughout the world. Governments are under pressure to be more efficient. We believe all publicly-supported institutions must produce meaningful and measurable results. We should expect no less from international organizations. FAO has done a good job, we commend the positive, energetic and imaginative leadership of the Director-General. At the same time, FAO cannot afford to rest on its past accomplishments. It needs to continue the reform process vigorously.

In conclusion we want to work cooperatively with the Secretariat and Member Nations to ensure that a 1998-99 budget is adopted by consensus. That will position FAO to meet the complex challenges that lie ahead.

Gheorghe APOSTOIU (Roumanie)

Comme les autres orateurs, je voudrais féliciter le rapporteur qui nous a offert la présentation du Programme de travail et budget pour 1998-99, le document C 97/3. La délégation de la Roumanie se félicite de l'excellent travail du Directeur général pour l'exercice important de réajustement du Projet de programme qui a abouti à la présentation d'un double scénario. Nous nous souvenons tous du contexte assez contraignant des discussions autour du Budget. Cela signifie que les réajustements budgétaires ont été accommodés avec les options générales des Etats Membres. Comme elle l'a annoncé pendant la session du Conseil, en préférant une variante appropriée du scénario de budget de Croissance Réelle Zéro, la délégation de la Roumanie veut s'assurer que notre Organisation dispose à l'avenir des ressources minimales pour assumer ses responsabilités et retirer tous les avantages possibles de l'effort. Dans notre optique, un tel budget impose à la FAO de continuer la voie de la réforme à la recherche de gains d'efficacité et d'économies, et avec la grande préoccupation pour la rationalisation de l'administration. Ce qui est important est de préserver la capacité de notre Organisation de répondre aux besoins des Etats Membres dans les limites de ses compétences.

Monsieur le Président, sans insister sur les aspects d'évaluation et de rentabilité, la délégation de la Roumanie se limite à souligner, comme aspects positifs du Programme, les choix des priorités, une concordance acceptable des prévisions avec les objectifs de l'Organisation, la clarté de la présentation du cadre budgétaire alternatif Croissance Réelle ou Nominale Zéro avec toutes leurs conséquences, la préoccupation d'assurer à l'avenir une assistance accrue aux Etats Membres, à leur demande spécifique, pour la bonne gestion des ressources dont ils disposent.

En même temps, Monsieur le Président, qu'il me soit permis de présenter quelques options ponctuelles de mon pays. La délégation de la Roumanie se réjouit de la substance du Grand Programme 2 et profite de l'occasion pour souligner brièvement l'importance qu'elle attache au Programme 2.5.1 "Recherche, gestion des ressources naturelles et transfert de technologies". Malgré son potentiel de rentabilité économique élevé, la recherche demeure un domaine difficile, et dans certains pays ayant une économie en transition, décourageant vu le manque de ressources financières. De plus, les faiblesses structurelles et institutionnelles des centres nationaux de recherche constituent un obstacle à l'amélioration de leurs capacités à affronter efficacement les difficultés, notamment la nécessité d'adopter des approches plus ciblées en matière de développement et de technologies.

Nous soulignons l'objectif de la FAO, proposé au Sous-Programme 2.5.1.11, d'aider les Etats Membres à mettre au point des plans et programmes de recherche stratégiques à moyen terme et à formuler des programmes de recherche cohérents et pertinents. Dans ce sens, l'organisation d'un atelier régional sur l'amélioration de l'enseignement et des programmes de recherche universitaires dans les économies agricoles nous semble désirable pour beaucoup de pays d'Europe. Nous prenons note du besoin de recherche pour donner un appui solide au Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation et au Programme spécial pour la sécurité alimentaire, Programme 2.2.4.

Le Grand Programme 3 "Service de développement au profit des Etats Membres" présente pour la Roumanie une importance particulière. Outre la gamme de services en matière de politiques, nous accueillons avec satisfaction les prévisions de la FAO à l'appui de la formation, de la formulation des projets qui peuvent mobiliser les investissements ainsi que les services opérationnels pour l'exécution ou la réalisation de programmes de pays. Nous avons beaucoup apprécié l'initiative de réaliser des stratégies pour le développement agricole national des Etats Membres, initiative intimement liée au suivi du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation.

Pays qui traverse une période de post-transition, la Roumanie considère les investissements dans l'agriculture comme un facteur essentiel pour atteindre et maintenir la sécurité alimentaire au niveau national. Le rôle du Centre d'investissement de la FAO doit se manifester concrètement. Nous avons besoin de la FAO pour initier des études de projets d'investissement et d'assistance

technique viables qui répondent à nos priorités de développement et pour que ces projets soient conformes aux critères de prêt des organismes multilatéraux de financement, principale source d'investissement extérieur dans l'agriculture de notre pays à ce stade. Nous sommes fermement convaincus que la Division du Centre d'investissement de la FAO constitue une source impartiale d'assistance et de conseils techniques.

En terminant, je voudrais mentionner rapidement un autre aspect. Une forme d'assistance qui présente de l'intérêt pour un grand nombre de pays est celle du domaine du régime foncier. La politique foncière et le système de gestion des terres est une préoccupation importante dans l'étape actuelle de la réforme en Roumanie pour assurer le bon fonctionnement du marché des terres rurales et mettre en place le dispositif administratif institutionnel d'appui pour tous les types de transaction foncière. Nous savons qu'un grand nombre d'options en la matière sont communes pour beaucoup de pays ayant des économies en transition et qu'elles ont des incidences sur la teneur et la structure du budget-programme. Nous considérons tout de même qu'elles jouiront de toute l'attention de la part de la Conférence et des Etats Membres.

Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN (Bangladesh)

First of all we would like to thank the Secretariat for its commendable efforts in preparing the document Programme of Work and Budget for the 1998-99 biennium.

We have had extensive discussions on the Programme of Work Budget in the last two Councils, as well as various Committees of the Council. The general tone of the discussions is now quite known to us, however, the present debate, we believe, will be meaningful if we consider it from the historical perspective. FAO is the Organization on which the less developed Member Nations have always relied to solve their problems in food and agriculture. The results of the cooperation is also tangible. Food production has kept pace with the population growth. Achievements in the fisheries sectors are also noteworthy. Institutional and capacity-building measures have helped these countries immensely. The World Food Summit has raised the hopes of millions of wretched people around the world. The hungry and the poor around the world have pinned their hopes on the consensus reached by world leaders to fight hunger with renewed vigour. If we fail to keep and work on our promises, history will not forgive us.

A positive growth of the budget level would have been an appropriate response to confront the challenge ahead of us. However, we have expressed our desire to see a Budget Level of Zero Real Growth as a minimum to protect technical programmes of the Organization from attrition. The total appropriation under this scenario, after taking into account the cost increases of US\$ 25.3 million, would be US\$ 675.3 million.

As requested by the Council, the document under consideration also provides two more scenarios, Zero Nominal Growth (ZNG) and below ZNG for the Programme of Work and Budget. These two options entail a cut in technical programmes of the Organization, though programmes of major interest to a large group of Members like Forestry, Codex, TCP, the Special Programme for Food Security activities have been protected from resource cuts under ZNG. Some of the important technical and economic programmes under Chapters 2 and 3 would have to be suspended. What the situation will be under below ZNG is anybody's guess. Therefore, to protect and maintain FAO's capabilities to support food and agricultural sectors we urge all the Members to try to build a consensus around Zero Real Growth budget level for the coming biennium.

We have a few comments on the programmes included in the Programme of Work and Budget. First of all, we note with satisfaction the priority areas of operation that have been identified on the basis of criteria established by the Council at its Hundred and Tenth Session, and also the recommendations from various technical committees of the Council in recent times. We also commend the Secretariat for keeping in mind the policies and priorities pronounced and made at various international fora, including the World Food Summit, while preparing the Programme of Work and Budget. The creation of a new Sub-programme for the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information Mapping System (FIVIMS) is a move in the right direction. We believe

that this Sub-programme would help in proper identification of the vulnerable groups of population and areas at national, sub-regional and regional levels, as well as in identifying the causes of poverty. However, it is desirable that the process be demand-driven and that it build on works already done in this area.

We welcome the revised approach to Programme 2.1.1 “Natural resources”. This is undeniably a more rational approach, for there are clear indicators of objectives, outputs, beneficiaries, inputs and the timeframe of work. We recommend that this programming technique be gradually applied to some other major Programmes and Sub-programmes under Chapter 2 and Chapter 3.

Under Major Programmes 2.1 and 2.2, we give priority to works on Biodiversity and Plant Genetic Resources. We are happy to note that an extraordinary Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture will be held next month to make further progress in the negotiations of an International Undertaking in this respect. Similarly, EMPRES, Integrated Pest Management and Integrated Plant Nutrient System (INPS) measures are of great value to us. However, we should like to express our concern at the reduction of the appropriation under Sub-programme 2.1.4.3 which is “Post-harvest management”. Adequate support to reduce post-harvest losses and to storage and marketing of production would make a big difference to the present situation.

Concerning “Fisheries”, we strongly support the priority on the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and aquaculture. Increased resource allocations to aquaculture take care of our priority. In the follow-up to UNCED, the increase of resources to “Forestry” has our approval. In conjunction with work on forestry resource assessment, we strongly urge increased appropriations for community forestry programmes and capacity-building measures in less developed countries. We also support the activities aimed at mainstreaming gender and sustainability concerns in the FAO programmes.

We would like to give full support to TCP and SPFS programmes. I will not repeat here the arguments that have been put forward on many occasions in the past in support of these two Programmes. We note with satisfaction here that the level of TCP appropriations under both ZRG and ZNG scenarios have been maintained at its previous level. It is strongly recommended, however, that funds for TCP in the future be increased significantly. This is required, we think, in view of the fact that the Pilot Phase activities of SPFS will have claims on resources from the TCP funds.

Before concluding, I would like to comment on the reforms and efficiency savings that have followed from that. We appreciate that the measures mentioned in paragraphs 86 to 92 to bring about further efficiency savings in the Organization. However, in full agreement with the decision of the Eighty-eighth Session of the Finance Committee, we would like to reiterate that FAO should not seek savings at all costs. Utmost care should be taken to see that such stringent measures do not eat into the vitals of the Organization.

Organizations usually have both short-term and long-term goals to achieve. Long-term goals are generally more noble, while the short-term ones are mundane and more immediate. Every Organization must strive to realize short-term goals to eventually achieve distant long-term objectives. In FAO normative works like policy advocacy, and standard settings are long-term goals. The short-term goals which require immediate action are direct assistance, through operational activities to less developed countries to overcome their problems in the food and agricultural sector. It would be appropriate to say here that the realization of the short-term goals of FAO should pave the way to ultimately achieve the more loftier normative goals. Thus we would like to add here that, if an immediate choice is required to be made between normative and operational activities in view of the growing resource constraints, it should invariably be in favour of the operational activities of the Organization.

Mme Hariba YAHIA-CHERIF (Algérie)

Parce qu'il conditionne et ponctue la vie de notre Organisation tous les deux ans, l'examen du projet de Programme de travail et budget constitue toujours un moment particulièrement important lors des sessions de la Conférence. C'est toujours avec beaucoup d'intérêt que la délégation de mon pays, l'Algérie, suit et participe aux débats de cette question. Mais avant d'entrer dans le vif du sujet, je voudrais tout d'abord vous présenter nos félicitations pour votre élection à la tête de notre Commission et au Secrétariat pour la qualité du document C 97/3 sur le Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 qui a été préparé conformément à la décision du Conseil, ainsi qu'à Monsieur Wade pour l'introduction claire qu'il en a faite.

Les nombreuses délégations qui m'ont précédée sur ce Point de l'Ordre du jour ont couvert des aspects que la délégation de mon pays avait l'intention de soulever. En outre, la délégation des Philippines qui s'exprimera plus tard, donnera la position du Groupe des 77 dont mon pays fait partie. Donc, je me limiterai à évoquer deux ou trois points. En premier lieu, je voudrais exprimer la satisfaction de ma délégation pour les efforts de restructuration et de décentralisation de l'Organisation, entrepris par le Directeur général, et rappeler qu'une telle réforme, engagée depuis 1994, a des limites qu'elle ne peut dépasser si l'on veut préserver l'efficacité de notre Organisation et assurer un certain équilibre entre ses activités normatives et opérationnelles. A ce sujet, ma délégation voudrait insister sur l'importance qu'il convient d'accorder aux bureaux de la FAO sur le terrain, tant au niveau national qu'aux niveaux sous-régional et régional. L'extension de ces bureaux, de manière à couvrir le maximum possible de Pays Membres pour renforcer la présence et les opérations de terrain de la FAO, est pour ma délégation souhaitable. En effet, 78 bureaux sont devenus insuffisants et ne répondent plus aux besoins croissants des Pays Membres qui, en l'espace de quelques années, sont passés à 175.

Deuxièmement, ma délégation souhaiterait inviter la FAO à renforcer son assistance technique aux pays en développement qui en ont besoin; en prévision des négociations commerciales multilatérales, en ce qui concerne l'accord du Cycle d'Uruguay, notamment les négociations sur l'agriculture, les pêches et les forêts.

Enfin, troisièmement, il me paraît important de lancer à l'occasion de cette Conférence un appel à la FAO et aux Etats Membres afin que la coopération entre pays en développement CTPD et CTPT soit renforcée et que les accords de partenariat, impliquant aussi la société civile, puissent renforcer la mise en oeuvre des projets du Programme spécial pour la sécurité alimentaire.

Monsieur le Président, en tout état de cause, ma délégation appuie le scénario pour un Budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro parce qu'il traduit le minimum pour permettre à l'Organisation d'exécuter ses programmes d'activités dits prioritaires.

Vincent MOE (Trinidad and Tobago)

Trinidad and Tobago has been a Member of the Programme Committee for the past two Sessions, and we have had an opportunity to closely examine the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium.

We are fully aware of some of the problems which Member Nations face with respect to public sector expenditure and the need to contain public sector expenditure. However, when one considers what has been achieved by FAO and the commitments taken at the World Food Summit and also, what has happened with respect to the liberalization of world trade, we see FAO playing an extremely important role, with respect, particularly, to Small Island Developing States which are very vulnerable to external shocks. We feel that, because of the predicament and challenges which Small Island Developing States face, it is imperative to lend support to the Zero Real Growth Budget of FAO.

We have had an opportunity to closely analyze the Zero Real Growth proposal, against the Zero Nominal Growth and what we are seeing here, under the Zero Real Growth proposal, is an attempt to reinstate some of those technical programmes amounting to US\$ 11 million which were excluded from the last biennial budget.

Under the Zero Real Growth proposal, we congratulate the Organization for the protection given to certain key priority areas. These priority areas are Forestry, Fisheries, Codex Alimentarius, TCP, the SPFS, EMPRES and Agriculture Production and Support Systems. We feel that these programmes are extremely important to Latin America and the Caribbean and, therefore, should be protected.

However, when we look at the Zero Nominal Growth option, several programmes which should be considered as being essential, as we approach the next millennium and prepare our countries for the challenges of liberalization, are being affected. For instance, technical and economic programmes are being reduced by US\$ 12.9 million, the development services to Member Nations are being reduced by US\$ 6 million, Support Services by US\$ 2.3 million, Common Services by US\$ 2 million, and General Policy and Direction by approximately US\$ 1.45 million.

We think that under the "Support and Common Services", several cuts have already been made and we are, dangerously, reaching to the point where we will affect the internal financial management of this Organization, if further cuts are made.

In addition, these cuts are up to about US\$ 24.6 million, given the fact that we see today the lira gaining strength and we are not sure that our assumptions will hold at Lira 1 690 to US\$ 1. The morale of this Organization is being further threatened by a cut of 83 posts, under the Zero Nominal Growth proposal. We think that staff morale has already deteriorated to the point where we need to do something to uplift and improve the general standards under which the human resource of this Organization works.

Therefore, we are of the view that, given the serious effects with which the Zero Nominal Growth option will have on this Organization we would wish to support what has been stated by the President of GRULAC this morning - that the only option to this Organization is a Zero Real Growth one. We also wish to congratulate FAO, on its decentralization efforts and the establishment of a Sub-regional Office in the Caribbean which has greatly assisted us in our efforts to develop our fisheries and forestry resources and also in the planning process and reforms which are necessary for the trade liberalization challenges that we face.

We think that under the Strategic Framework which this Organization is about to pursue, it will be necessary for it to examine its core competencies, ensure that they are relevant and do those things which, we know, it can do best. FAO can no longer continue to be a doer of all things. We feel that given this thrust by the Organization, it will be well-positioned to assist Member Nations in the pursuit of competitiveness and a better world of food security for all in the next millennium.

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Argentina)

Cuando algunos periodistas de los tantos que asisten a esta Sesión me contactaron y estuvieron conversando conmigo, me decían que con la mayoría de las delegaciones que habían tomado contacto, el Tema más importante de esta Conferencia era el Presupuesto. Creo que nosotros debemos sentir vergüenza de que el Tema más importante de esta Conferencia sea el Presupuesto. Debemos estar lamentando, repito, que el Tema más importante de esta Conferencia sea el Presupuesto cuando realmente tenemos tantos problemas importantes que nos dejó la Cumbre Mundial de Alimentación, y tenemos tanto problemas de sustancia que tratar.

No será novedad para nadie que mi delegación apoye, como las delegaciones del Grupo de los 77, la opción del Crecimiento Real Cero y que esta opción nos parezca a nosotros la más adecuada para continuar con los trabajos de la Organización. El programa de la FAO tiene la parte normativa y tiene la parte operacional, ésta última es extremadamente importante para muchos países en desarrollo. La agricultura sostenible de la cual están en este momento todas las delegaciones ocupándose y es algo además que quienes alguna vez han trabajado en el campo, saben lo que es.

Mi familia, señor Presidente, es productora de alimentos desde hace más de cien años Yo soy el único burócrata de la familia - todos los demás son productores. Ellos saben cuando hay que rotar la tierra, saben cuando hay que elegir el fertilizante adecuado, saben cuando se eligió un mal fertilizante porque luego de pasar la máquina de fertilizantes, durante una hora les duele la cabeza porqué el producto químico les está contaminando y porqué el producto químico le está haciendo mal a la tierra. Todo esto, alguien que haya trabajado en el campo lo sabe, por eso yo creo que es tan importante la parte operacional en este Presupuesto.

Por otra parte nosotros sabemos que siempre es posible mejorar los sistemas administrativos a través de un mejor control de gestión, y es lo que está haciendo la Organización y que nosotros estamos impulsando a que haga. Los ahorros a que se refiere el documento en los párrafos 86 al 90 son importantes. Creemos que el *management* es importante y que la Secretaría tiene que trabajar en este sentido, pero deberíamos darle o presentarle un *challenge* a la Secretaría y decirle que los ahorros que puedan hacerse en la mejora y en el control administrativo podrían aplicarse a los Programas de Cooperación Técnica y en este caso, nosotros estaríamos trabajando junto con la Secretaría para lograr ahorros de la mejor manera posible y poder aplicarlos a las operaciones en el terreno. Ya la delegación de Panamá hizo comentarios detallados sobre el Tema presupuestario que en el Grupo Latinoamericano todos apoyamos, comentarios también los hizo la delegación de Dominica.

Yo quiero, señor Presidente, hacer un par de reflexiones sobre el Tema del nivel y de tipo de cambio. En este tipo de cambio de acuerdo al párrafo 194, el que se ha aplicado para el Presupuesto 1998-99, es de 1.690 liras por dólar ee. uu. y lo que en el párrafo 139 vemos sobre efecto del tipo de cambio la cantidad del Presupuesto queda hoy de acuerdo a los niveles que tenemos, eliminado como posibilidad de juego, puesto que el cambio hoy es exactamente éste el que tenemos aquí en el párrafo 139, de manera que no tenemos más que esa posibilidad de establecer algún tipo de manejo con el tipo de cambio.

Quiero hacer una reflexión, señor Presidente, que sería importante que hicieran todas las delegaciones ¿cuál es el costo financiero que tiene la FAO ante el atraso de los pagos de los países que no han cumplido con sus contribuciones al día? Todos sabemos, que el 5 por ciento es una tasa que es aproximadamente "libor" en este momento. Si nosotros calculamos que 200 millones de dólares ee. uu. al 5 por ciento son 10 millones de dólares ee. uu., prácticamente este tipo de cifra, es la que estamos discutiendo en este momento. Sería bueno que los países que tienen deudas reflexionaran sobre este tipo de cuestiones puesto que si todos contribuyeran en el momento en que deben seguramente estos problemas no se estarían planteando ahora.

Por último, señor Presidente, hay un documento que es el C 97/3-Sup. 2 que la Secretaría nos ha presentado para ver las actividades que se eliminarían en el caso de un Crecimiento Nominal Cero, vemos que son todas actividades como: Codex, Aplicaciones agrícolas de zoobiología, Nutrición, Pesca, Ganadería, etc. Por otra parte en el Plan a Plazo Medio 1998-2003, vemos en el párrafo 99, que la Secretaría quiere realizar una contribución esencial a la seguridad alimentaria y al desarrollo rural sobre el programa de ganadería, cosa que nosotros estamos de acuerdo pero que ahora lo estaríamos eliminando, y en 1999 lo estaríamos creando de nuevo. Es decir que la experiencia de todos esos funcionarios la estaríamos perdiendo ahora para volver a recrearla en el Plazo Medio. Es por eso que creo que tenemos que aplicar la razonabilidad al Tema presupuestario y si bien, como decía antes, siempre los costos administrativos pueden intentar mejorarse, mi delegación piensa que no podemos ir más allá del Crecimiento Real Cero, que es el elemento que nos permitirá cumplir con lo que nos habíamos propuesto.

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénegal)

A l'instar des délégués qui nous ont précédés, nous voudrions remercier Monsieur Wade pour la bonne présentation du document du Programme de travail et budget pour 1998-99, et en même temps, nous saisissons l'occasion pour adresser nos sincères félicitations au Directeur général

pour le travail réalisé avec un document clair et riche en informations, qui, sans aucun doute, permettra aux Gouvernements de prendre des décisions fondées sur des éléments précis.

Après les nombreuses interventions sur le Programme de travail et budget, soulignant la nécessité pour la FAO, de disposer de moyens suffisants pour pouvoir s'acquitter pleinement de sa mission, nous ne serons pas longs, tout juste pour appuyer le niveau du budget correspondant à une Croissance Réelle Zéro. C'est là la position du Groupe africain qui aurait certainement préféré une Croissance Réelle Positive, mais qui, faut-il le rappeler encore, par souci de consensus, peut accepter une Croissance Réelle Zéro. C'est là également la position commune du Groupe des 77, comme cela a été rappelé par son Président lors du Conseil.

Compte tenu des engagements du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation et au sortir de celui-ci, l'on se demande d'ailleurs comment le monde pourra atteindre l'objectif de réduire de moitié le nombre de personnes sous-alimentées en l'an 2015, objectif jugé au reste modeste. C'est bien la première fois qu'un bon élève est sanctionné; en effet, depuis 1994, la FAO a joué un rôle de pionnier dans les réformes de la restructuration qui sort seulement maintenant à l'ordre du jour au Palais de Verre de Manhattan. A ce propos, nous souhaiterions avoir par écrit, de la part de Monsieur Wade, les chiffres fournis au Conseil sur les économies précises réalisées par la FAO depuis 1994. Par ailleurs, au moment où l'on fait appel à la décentralisation et à la régionalisation, autre forme de démocratie, il est étrange de s'opposer aux Bureaux des Pays et Bureaux régionaux et Sous-régionaux qui permettent de vivre les réalités des pays et d'être proches des populations vulnérables et déshéritées. Et là nous voudrions faire nôtres, les propos tenus par la déléguée de l'Algérie sur la nécessité de renforcer la présence de la FAO sur le terrain par un réseau de représentations.

L'on devrait ici traduire, dans la pratique, des discours fort constructifs des Chefs de délégation en plénière, en particulier les ministres français qui mettent en garde comme un excès de rigorisme nuisible au plein accomplissement pour la FAO de son mandat. Nous devrions également avoir à l'esprit le problème du personnel de la FAO, qu'il ne faudrait pas démoraliser, personnel toujours en attente d'un Budget et de la fin d'un processus de restructuration pour servir les populations pauvres du monde, objectif pour lequel il a choisi de travailler à la FAO.

Enfin, Monsieur le Président, nous espérons que l'appel du Président de la Conférence, le Ministre canadien de l'agriculture, sera entendu pour que nous nous serrions les coudes et que nous travaillions ensemble pour le consensus.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours.

La séance est levée à 12 h 45.

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (Arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

Mme Fatma LARBI (Tunisie)

Merci, Monsieur le Président. Ma délégation se joint aux délégations qui l'ont précédée pour féliciter Monsieur Wade de sa brève présentation claire de ce Point important de l'Ordre du jour de notre Commission. De même, je voudrais saisir cette occasion pour remercier le Secrétariat pour les efforts louables déployés pour la qualité du document C 97/3, la richesse d'informations intéressantes et très utiles.

Ma délégation se joint aux délégations qui ont appuyé la proposition du Directeur général du Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 préparé sur la base d'une Croissance Réelle Zéro qui, à notre avis, est le seul minimal acceptable compte tenu des besoins considérables des Etats Membres, notamment des pays en développement et les moins avancés qui demandent une assistance accrue des services de la FAO pour les soutenir dans leurs efforts de mise à niveau de l'appareil productif pour un développement agricole durable et respectueux de l'environnement et ce par la rationalisation de l'exploitation des ressources naturelles et la promotion des ressources humaines. Il est de notre devoir de défendre le montant du budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro qui permet à notre Organisation de s'acquitter de ses fonctions dans la mise en oeuvre du Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, d'assurer un bon suivi des Conférences internationales sur la Nutrition, les Ressources génétiques, les Femmes, l'Environnement, et la Lutte contre la désertification tout en préservant les domaines prioritaires et en maintenant un équilibre entre les activités normatives et opérationnelles.

Je voudrais souligner l'intérêt que porte ma délégation pour que les programmes jugés très prioritaires puissent être réalisés durant le prochain biennium 1998-99. Je citerai à ce titre, à titre indicatif et non limitatif, le renforcement du Programme spécial de la sécurité alimentaire dans les pays à déficit vivrier, notamment dans la Région d'Afrique, l'appui au Programme EMPRES, notamment pour la location de fonds soutenus et durables pour financer les actions préventives de Lutte contre le criquet pèlerin dans les régions d'Afrique et du Proche-Orient, et le renforcement du Programme de lutte biologique intégrée pour la protection des végétaux et l'élaboration des normes phytosanitaires.

Je citerai aussi l'importance d'assister les pays dans leurs Programmes de conservation et de préservation des ressources phyto- et zoogénétiques pour accroître la diversité biologique, végétale et animale, accroître l'assistance aux pays en développement en matière de politiques dans le cadre du commerce des produits agricoles et ceux dans le cadre des accords de l'Uruguay Round et de l'OMC pour que leurs produits répondent aux normes sanitaires et de qualité exigées par le commerce international, le renforcement des programmes visant la conservation et la rationalisation de la gestion des ressources naturelles, d'économie d'eau et de lutte contre la désertification dans les zones arides et semi-arides des régions d'Afrique et du Proche-Orient, et la Consolidation du processus de décentralisation des services de la FAO du siège vers les Bureaux régionaux et sous-régionaux en les dotant d'expertises hautement qualifiées et

compétentes et des moyens financiers adéquats pour qu'ils puissent assurer l'assistance directe sur le terrain au profit des Etats Membres. Au même temps, je note l'importance de l'appui et assistance aux pays en développement pour la promotion et le développement de la pêche et de l'aquaculture tout en rationalisant l'exploitation des ressources halieutiques et en préservant l'environnement, le développement des programmes de reboisement et de gestion rationnelle des ressources forestières et d'amélioration des technologies d'utilisation des sous-produits de la pêche, le renforcement des programmes destinés à l'intégration des femmes dans le développement par l'amélioration des outils statistiques selon le genre et l'élaboration d'indicateurs pertinents sur la participation des femmes dans l'agriculture, les pêches et les forêts, et le renforcement du Programme de coopération technique et dynamisation des accords de CTPD et de CTPT et de coopération sud-sud.

Monsieur le Président, ma délégation voudrait enfin réaffirmer son appui total en faveur du Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 à Croissance Réelle Zéro et approuver le Projet de résolution qui nous est soumis pour adoption. Elle est convaincue que le Directeur général, le Secrétariat et les organes directeurs n'épargneront aucun effort pour améliorer la gestion, l'exécution, le suivi et l'évaluation des programmes approuvés.

Alfred MUTEBWA (Rwanda)

On behalf of the Rwanda delegation, I would like to congratulate you for being elected to head this Commission and to congratulate the FAO Secretariat for the excellent work done in the preparation and presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99.

Without repeating what other delegates have said, allow me to take you back a bit in history to the period of April 1994, when our country suffered one of the worst genocides of the century, that resulted in more than one million people dead, two million exiled and three hundred thousand internally displaced.

Agriculture, which was the backbone of our economy, was completely shattered and every hope of recovery was lost. Thanks to the emergence of the Government of National Unity, the assistance of international organizations and communities, particularly FAO, which came to our rescue, we were able to pick up the pieces.

In November last year, more than one and a half million Rwandese from refugee camps, in Tanzania and former Zaire, suddenly returned to their homeland, after two years in exile. Although the assistance offered by the international communities fell below expectations, FAO, out of its limited resources managed to assist in the rehabilitation and reintegration of the returnees, through its various programmes. They have now resumed their agricultural activities.

Therefore, when I look back at the assistance rendered by FAO to our country during this period, I shudder when I imagine what would have happened to our people had FAO been short of funds.

With this background in mind, I have no option but to support the Zero Real Growth budget as presented, especially as the Programme of Work proposed includes priority areas as far as food security is concerned, especially in developing countries.

The Rwanda delegation does not support any suggestion that attempts to lower the proposed budget, especially from the moral point of view that this budget may be reduced equal to one day's tobacco consumption instead of two.

I would like to conclude by appealing very strongly to all Member Nations to support the Zero Real Growth option, which is the bare minimum for FAO to achieve its noble objectives.

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

En este Punto queremos retomar lo señalado por nuestra delegación en el marco de la reciente Reunión conjunta de los Comités de Programa y Finanzas así como en el 113° período de sesiones del Consejo, en el sentido de que hubiéramos preferido que la discusión se basara en una

opción de Crecimiento Positivo - ello frente a los enormes requerimientos de la Organización y a la luz de los acuerdos de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. Sin embargo, en aras de alcanzar un consenso y a la luz de las posiciones expresadas por otros países, apoyamos la alternativa presentada por la Secretaría, como lo ha señalado ya la delegación de Panamá y la delegación de Dominica a nombre del GRULAC.

Permítame abordar a continuación algunas áreas de interés para mi país. Celebramos que la propuesta de programa otorgue prioridad a los resultados de la Conferencia del Leipzig. De particular relevancia en este sentido es la creación de capacidades nacionales así como el entrenamiento sobre la conservación y utilización de recursos fitogenéticos.

Para México cobra gran relevancia el hecho de que la FAO esté fortaleciendo el Subprograma de Diversidad Genética de Animales Domésticos en virtud de que en la actualidad están en proceso una serie de acciones tendientes al establecimiento del "Programa Nacional de Recursos Genéticos Pecuarios" con la actividad y bajo la coordinación de la Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería y Desarrollo Rural. Este Programa de Recursos Genéticos será presentado ante la comunidad internacional durante el IV Congreso Iberoamericano de Razas Autóctonas y Criollas, que se celebrará en noviembre de 1998 en Tampico, Tamaulipas. Esperemos que la FAO contribuya en las acciones que emanen de este Programa Nacional.

Apoyamos de igual manera el Subprograma 2.1.2.3 sobre el fortalecimiento de semillas y materiales de plantación, ello en conexión con un programa que tiene el Gobierno de México denominado "Kilo por kilo" que busca promover el uso de semillas mejoradas. En el Subprograma relativo a ordenación y diversificación de cultivos, el concepto de "cultivos industriales para el desarrollo sostenible" tiene relevancia para México. Por otra parte, nos gustaría que el Programa sobre ganadería tome en cuenta las necesidades de los países en desarrollo en el contexto de los resultados de la Ronda Uruguay. El Subprograma de mercadeo es compatible con uno de los principales propósitos de la "Alianza para el Campo", un programa a través del cual mi gobierno busca, entre otros objetivos, el de crear un entorno propicio para el establecimiento de servicios de mercadeo.

No podemos concluir nuestra participación sin mencionar la importancia que para mi gobierno tienen los Programas de Pesca y Montes. En este sentido queremos llamar la atención de los otros participantes sobre el documento C 97/3-Sup. 2 en relación a las actividades que la FAO eliminaría en caso de que se aprobase un nivel de presupuesto por debajo de la opción de Crecimiento Nominal Cero. En el área de pesca se afectaría la aplicación del Programa del Código de Conducta para la Pesca Responsable en tanto que en el área de bosques se eliminarían varias publicaciones, mientras que en el campo de la nutrición se afectarían las actividades del Codex Alimentarius.

Gebrehiwot REDAI (Ethiopia)

Allow me to take this opportunity to thank Mr Wade and his colleagues for his excellent introduction and preparing a Programme of Work and Budget for the coming biennium.

As a Member of the Programme Committee, we have witnessed how the Programme of Work and Budget was under repeated scrutiny of the Programme and Finance Committees, both at their separate and joint meetings.

In this connection, we would like to note that, despite our aspiration for efficiency savings, the Secretariat was requested to develop a Programme of Work and Budget under different scenarios. Definitely, such an exercise was not without claiming many resources.

Consequently, with a view to facing the challenge ahead, we have observed that the Secretariat has started doing more with little.

While the demand for the services of the Organization is increasing, particularly after the Summit, my delegation finds a budget level below the Zero Real Growth contrary to the political

and financial commitments indicated in the Rome Declaration and Plan of Action. The objective of reducing the number of malnourished by half by the year 2015 cannot simply be achieved by wishes. We also recognize that the primary responsibility in implementing the Action Plan lies with national governments. However, let us not lose sight that the international community and all stakeholders have an important role and they have to live up to their political and financial obligations. Certainly, after every Plan, there must be an accompanying resource to effectively implement it.

We have closely followed the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget under the two scenarios. Although a special effort is made to protect the economic and technical programmes, TCP and also the Special Programme for Food Security, under the Zero Real Growth option, we cannot but admit that there were activities that are to be sacrificed, even at this level. Already, the computation for the scarce resources among beneficiaries is felt. The continuous consultations we had on the use of the TCP resources for SPFS is nothing but a manifestation of the general awareness of the fact that the Organization's resources are declining and there is little room for flexibility.

Under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario, the situation is more grave and, in the considered opinion of my delegation, the budget at this level is not sufficient to keep a balance between the normative and operational activities. FAO cannot carry out its priority activities at this level of budget. For a budget of Zero Nominal Growth or below, cuts in important programmes in the projects were inevitable and such measures will, directly or indirectly, affect poor farmers in developing countries.

Rainfed agriculture in Ethiopia proved to be precarious. The need for small-scale irrigation cannot be overemphasized in the face of the country's growing population. Therefore, in order to meet the full needs of the country, supplementing the traditional rainfed agriculture with irrigation is absolutely essential.

In this context, my delegation attaches special importance to the Special Programme for Food Security in Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, of which water control and management is a critical element. Ethiopia is one of the countries participating in the Pilot Phase. The Pilot Phase was a success and production has more than doubled.

In the same spirit, adequate budget support to the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and EMPRES are also vital.

In closing, we would like to point out that few proponents of Zero Nominal Growth budget level suggest areas where cuts can be made and, in this respect, mention has been made with reference to FAORs. We would like to indicate that FAORs are links between the Organization and Member Nations, therefore, their presence in countries where FAOR assistance is essential are definitely needed. In this respect, it is important to make a careful review of their presence before we suggest their reduction. In closing, my delegation would like to reiterate that we are fully convinced that it is a Zero Real Growth budget that enables FAO to meet its broad mandate. Therefore, in this regard, we strongly support the Zero Real Growth budget.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

On behalf of the European Union, which countries -- as you know of course -- together contribute 38 percent of the FAO budget, I would like to give our views on the Programme of Work and Budget.

We welcome the presentation in one document of the two scenarios for Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth. Based on the Zero Real Growth scenario, it indicates at the Sub-programme level, in a quantitative way, the activities proposed for Heads of Member Nations under Zero Nominal Growth. We would have preferred a more balanced presentation of the two scenarios.

The orientation for the Programme of Work and Budget must be based on the Medium-Term Plan for which a revised programming model, with more strategic elements, will be applied as agreed on the previous Agenda Item. All the elements of our orientation for assessing the Programme of Work and Budget are, as we pointed out during the June Session of the Council: budgetary discipline as has been exercised throughout the UN, firmly, maximum possible improvement in efficiency, clearer prioritisation of activities, and clearer distinction between high and low priorities.

At the June Session of the Council, the European Union, welcomed the savings that had been reached and called for -- further exploration of the scope for savings arising from internal efficiency. As an example, we had identified two possible areas.

The first area is the possibility of reducing the number and costs of Country Offices. In June, we recommended that the Secretariat propose objective criteria, in order to decide which Offices have to be maintained, or not. The aim should be integration of these offices into UN Country Representations within the United Nations Resident Coordinator System. This is, of course, in line with the on-going reform of the UN System at the field level. In addition, it should be mentioned that the functioning of the new Regional and Sub-regional Offices should be subject to a careful cost-efficiency evaluation.

The second area is organizational changes at FAO Headquarters, targetted into increasing linkages between and within Divisions. One possible way would be to work towards a smaller number of Divisions. Each of them consisting of more offices than at present. This would cut back, of course, on the burden of coordination and the number of posts at the Director level and higher.

Turning now to the Programme of Work and Budget presented to us. We note that the Secretariat has made a distinction between high and low priorities by indicating which activities are to be eliminated under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario and under a scenario with Negative Nominal Growth.

We do appreciate that some of the Sub-programmes, like the ones on plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture, have escaped the pruning knife. However, we feel that more efficiency gains through lower priorities could have been achieved in areas, such as, administrative costs and services. We are keen to see more work done to achieve such gains, while looking at areas which we referred to earlier and that were expected to receive more attention following our statement in June.

A further reduction in administrative costs is essential to limit cutbacks in technical and economic programmes, as of course all Member Nations of FAO wish. The substantive activities in technical and economic programmes, have already suffered too many cutbacks. In contrast, no substantive administration and financial services have seen their budget increased, or have seen only minor decreases.

Critical efficiency gains, as I mentioned earlier, are not yet realized. This trend must be reversed as earlier noted by the Finance Committee.

The European Union proposes to look also critically at costs increases. For example, we can barely accept an increase of total travel costs when, at the same time, decentralization is being pursued with more people outside Rome and observe also decreasing airfares.

The Minister of Agriculture of the Netherlands stressed the importance of agro-biodiversity as a crucial element of sustainable agriculture. On behalf of the European Union and its Member States, the Netherlands submits, here by, a Resolution on this subject. Furthermore, the Netherlands will submit, on behalf of the European Union, a Resolution on training in agriculture and commodity issues.

At the Council last week, we the European Community and its Member States, indicated that we aim at the Budget Level which may allow for some flexibility on the Budget for technical and

economic programmes, but only on the condition that we see real evidence of efficiency and other savings in relations to non-substantive programmes, such as administrative costs and areas mentioned earlier. Translating this indication into practical terms, we would like to propose a few changes in the Draft Appropriations Resolution in the Programme of Work and Budget document. The Draft Resolution presents a breakdown of the total appropriation into eight chapters. We wish to see significant shifts of resources from administration and financial services, which are mainly in Chapter 5, to technical and economic programmes in Chapter 2.

During this week, we hope to discuss a Budget Level in an open and constructive spirit, aiming at reaching a consensus. We hope that all delegations here in this room take the same position.

Xu NANSHAN (China) (Original language Chinese)

First, I wish to express our thanks to the Secretariat for the preparation of the detailed document C 97/3, and to thank Mr Wade for the introduction given yesterday, which helped us quite a lot for today's discussion.

Regarding the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99, the Chinese delegation, in principle, supports the seven criteria put forward in the document for priority-setting.

Now I wish to stress, especially, the following few points.

1. Strengthening policy analysis and advisory service. Along with the development of world economy, the development and evolution of the food and agricultural sector accelerate. Hence, the strengthening of policy analysis, especially the analysis of the trend of agriculture policies following the Uruguay Round and to provide the necessary policy advice for Member Nations, would have great significance.
2. Further strengthening information and publication support. Information becomes increasingly important for scientific policy-making. As the trend of global economic integration is deepening, economic relations are becoming ever-closer. FAO should continue strengthening its information and publication support. All kinds of annals, the State of Food and Agriculture, Review and Prospect of Commodities, Food Outlooks and other publications should be well-edited and distributed. There should also be emphasis on continuously improving the quality of these publications.
3. Human resources development. Strengthening all kinds of training activities and means to exchange scientific research, is of great significance to the Member Nations, in understanding the development of the ways to downsize, in defining the orientation to future technological developments, in promoting the spread and application of science and technology, and in developing food and agriculture.
4. Technical Cooperation Programme and Field Operations. It has been proved, in practice, that the Technical Cooperation Programme and Field Operations for FAO not only provide Member Nations with necessary technical assistance to facilitate the resolution of some crucial problems encountered in agricultural protection and development, but also effectively promote the routine activities of FAO. FAO should maintain the means for promoting relationships between its Field operations and routine activities, and strive to maintain and even to increase its level of Field Operations.
5. This Organization should strive to improve its efficiency, especially in its administrative work and carry out the necessary structural adjustments. It should be reducing the unnecessary administrative units, compressing meeting periods, and streamlining documentation to further realize savings and to ensure that its limited resources could be used on more important aspects.
6. The level of Budget. It is our belief that the Budget should facilitate the effective implementation of FAO's Programme of Work. It should also facilitate the improvement of its work efficiency. Meanwhile, it should also take into account the present financial burdens of the Member Nations. We, therefore, could not set a Budget which is too low and at the same time, we

should strive to avoid, as far as possible, any further increase of the financial burdens of Member Nations. We hope through the joint efforts of all the Member Nations, we can reach a consensus on the Level of the Budget for the next biennium.

Harald HILDEBRAND (Germany)

The following comments on specific aspects of the Programme of Work for 1997-98 are intended to complement the earlier statement by the European Community and its Member States, which is fully supported by the German delegation. They are aimed at providing the Secretariat with some additional advice on now certain programmes, sub-programmes or programme elements might be changed and resources be reallocated. But this is also done with a view to finding out where technical aspects, following the view of our experts, require more scrutiny.

On the whole, for the unbiased reader, this Programme of Work is still too heavy to digest in view of its great diversity. It lacks the necessary selection of, and concentration on, those issues that are really indispensable, given FAO's mandate and taking into account current and perspective development needs.

Let me now come to concrete remarks related to Chapter 2, Technical and Economic Programmes.

Programme 2.1.1: Natural Resources. In the general approach, we miss a stronger relationship between the technical work and the political, economic and socio-cultural frame conditions existing in the respect project areas.

The Programme does not yet have a clearly defined holistic approach.

The reference in paragraph 260 -- Technical Project 1 -- to similar projects developed by other national and international agencies, including IARC, raises the question to what extent this FAO project has been or will be coordinated with activities of those other bodies.

The target group defined in paragraph 261 for Technical Project 1 is primarily at the level of development planners and managers, extensionists, etc. However, the outreach to the farm or producer level does not become quite clear. Is it through this national staff that information and knowledge on soil, water and plant nutrition management at the farm level will be disseminated? Would it not be better to include farmers and farmers' organizations from the start?

The assertion in paragraph 274 on "reallocation of water away from agriculture", which is said to lead to "reduced agricultural production and rural income", lacks a reference to the need for an inter-sectoral water management concept. Here again, FAO should seek the advice of other international agencies engaged in water management.

Training on "Inland valley and swamp development", also to be covered by Technical Project 3, must take into account ecological aspects as well.

If possible, a reduction in the coverage of the "Report on Global Overview of Problem Soils" (from eight to six countries) should be avoided, because its merit would lie in a wider scope.

Technical Project 4 -- National Policies and Strategies for Land, Water and Plant Nutrition -- described in paragraph 274, should not omit, under the agronomic aspects, the cropping system part, which goes beyond plant nutrition.

In Project Component 4.2 -- Land and Nutrition Policy -- the actual output in terms of improved plant nutrition is not clear. Perhaps this activity could be better incorporated in Technical Project 1 or 2.

On the whole, Programme 2.1.1. needs a certain reshaping. Much more attention should be given to the work done by other Agencies and through bilateral development cooperation in the field of natural resource management, and to concrete cooperation with them. The Programme should also attribute more initiative and responsibility to the target countries concerned.

Programme 2.1.1: Crops. On the whole, this Programme is professionally presented, reveals the required degree of detail and makes good reference to the work of other agencies, e.g. the IARCs.

However, the share of funds to be devoted to Sub-Programme 2.1.2.1. -- Conservation and Management of PGR -- with just 5 percent, is quite small in comparison to the Sub-programme for crop protection, although the PGR Sub-programme has been reinforced over 1996-97.

In addition, the reduced allocations for the Commission on Genetic Resources must be seen with some concern, as the negotiations for the revision of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources have not yet been completed and the CGRFA has an enlarged scope now.

The total amount for SP 2.1.2.1 (last line in the Table on page 99) would have to be US\$ 4 078 00 instead of US\$ 4 090 000, because the programme decrease under ZNG must be deducted.

All major elements necessary for the improvement of cropping systems have been considered in Sub-Programme 2.1.2.2: Crop Management and Diversification, with the exception of plant breeding, which is not adequately covered.

Although single elements of plant breeding are found in several Sub-programmes (2.1.2.1, 2.1.2.2, 2.1.2.3 and 2.1.2.5), Sub-programme 2.1.2.3 does not cover breeding work proper. With a view to correcting this, plant breeding should be incorporated into Sub-Programme 2.1.2.3. and renamed "Plant Breeding and Seed and Planting Material Development". This would then imply a reinforcement of that Sub-Programme at the expense of the Crop Protection Sub-Programme, for which a proportionally high share is foreseen.

Under Sub-Programme 2.1.2.2, a relatively significant share is to be devoted to the promotion of under-utilized crops. This is deemed correct. However, the outputs expected from the Programme Element (listed on pages 106 and 107) are rather vague.

If possible, for the output -- Support to meetings conducted with NARS and IARCs to assess impacts of new technologies, e.g. apomixis, hybrid rice, durable resistance breeding, and plant, soil and water management (see paragraph 320, page 102) -- a reduction under ZNG should be avoided, in view of the importance of these activities.

Programme 2.1.3: Livestock. Element 01: Management of Grazing Resources in Sub-Programme 2.1.2.5 (see paragraph 352, page 114), and Element 05: Resource Management in Pastoral in Low Rainfall Areas, in Sub-Programme 2.1.3.4 (see paragraph 383, page 124) offer scope for synergy and savings, in view of the similarity of problems -- grazing in arid and semi-arid areas.

Element 01: Support to Global Management Efforts and Inter-governmental Mechanism, in Sub-Programme 2.1.3.5: Domestic Animal Genetic Diversity, provides for the review of the Global Strategy by the Inter-governmental Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources. Therefore, an additional Panel of Experts for that review, as foreseen in paragraph 390, is not considered necessary.

Programme 2.1.4: Agricultural Support Systems. General: the amount of methodologies, guidelines and training material to be produced under this Programme could be reduced as other national and international bodies are engaged in editing numerous materials of that type. FAO should restrict this activity to the dissemination of recommendations that are of genuine international relevance.

For some of the Sub-Programmes, the question arises whether there is duplication with activities of other international organizations, e.g. in Sub-Programme 2.1.4.4, Food and Agricultural Industries, duplication with UNIDO?

Sub-Programme 2.1.4.3: Post-Harvest Management should be protected from any reduction, in view of added-value and employment potential of measures aiming at improved post-harvest and, in particular, processing and handling techniques.

Sub-Programme 2.1.4.4: Food and Agricultural Industries, concretely Element 02, leaves some scope for reductions, as the commercial sector has already developed extensive activities in this field of textiles and natural fibres. Does FAO have the required advantage, as well as technical and economic competence in this field, in comparison with other Bodies? FAO should primarily promote the support to the small-scale farming sector producing the raw material.

In Sub-Programme 2.1.4.5: Marketing, the number of publications on improving urban food marketing systems could be reduced to two to three without sensibly affecting the output. In addition, two activities of support to Member Nations could easily be combined to make one: "Advice on national policies ... " and "Scenario planning for urban ... ".

Programme 2.1.5: Agricultural Applications of Isotopes and Biotechnology. General: the Programme, on the whole, gives a less innovative impression, as it is strongly oriented towards the Seibersdorf Laboratory. Research activities directly aiming at production should be left to the countries. FAO should assume those tasks that are required to enable the national research and development units to perform their basic technical work.

In Element 01: Water and Nutrient Use Efficiency in Sub-Programme 2.1.5.1, the output "Methods for measuring the dynamics of soil organic matter at the ecosystem level" should not be eliminated under ZNG. Reason: importance of such studies for marginal soils of low nutrient retention capacity and high water deficit.

Whilst breeding work on varieties and crop species adapted to local conditions is highly important, Element 02: Crop Improvement, is very closely linked with work on induced mutagenesis. This technique has not produced the desired results in food crops and does not reflect the current trend in breeding (see "Mutation Breeding Letter", which recently reported that only 6 percent of breeding products used in practice are based on artificially induced mutants). Therefore, the "Manual on mutation techniques for crop improvement" would be tantamount to inventing the wheel again.

Element 02: Support for National Legislation and International Agreements on Food Quality and Pesticide Control, in Sub-Programme 2.1.5.2, should make use of cooperation through coordinated exchange programmes with national institutions and the chemical industry in developed countries.

Programme 2.2.1: Nutrition. The merger of Elements 02 (Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and Contamination Surveillance and Control) and 03 (Food Contamination Surveillance and Control) into Element 05 (Food Quality and Safety Evaluation and Analysis) would affect JECFA, whose further work is considered indispensable for the elaboration of scientifically-founded proposals on maximum amounts of additives, veterinary drugs and contaminants in food, this being a precondition for discussing and fixing such standards in Codex Alimentarius.

Programme 2.5.1: Research, Natural Resources Management and Technology Transfer. In Sub-Programme 2.5.1.3: Extension, Education and Communication, the various programme elements present a number of duplications which could be avoided by merging the respective activities.

Element 02: Agricultural Education: the "Workshop on improving university teaching and research programmes in agricultural economics" should be dropped, as no comparative advantage can be seen for FAO in this particular field.

Likewise, the need for producing a "training guide on alternative funding for agricultural extension" is not recognized.

Under Element 04: Communication for Development, the activity "One feasibility study on a sustainable rural radio programme (Zambia)" could be dropped (what is a sustainable rural radio programme?). In addition, we do not see the need for "Community Management of Watersheds (Morocco)" under this programme. The need for updating the publication "Communication, a key

to human development” is not seen either, because the basic factors underlying this Statement will not have changed.

On the other hand, the various measures in support to Member Nations could be maintained, if possible, as originally planned under ZRG.

Programme 2.5.3: Rural Development. In Sub-Programme 2.5.3.1: Land Tenure, Element 02, the last two items under “Methodologies and Guidelines” should be maintained also under ZNG, because of the increasing importance of land problems in relation to the urbanization process and rising population pressure.

In Sub-Programme 2.5.3.2: Rural Institutions and Participation, Element 06, activity numbers 2 and 5 under “Methodologies and Guidelines” could be conveniently combined.

Rolf AKESSON (Sweden)

The Swedish delegation endorses the statement by the Netherlands, on behalf of the EC and its Member States. We have some additional comments to make.

First of all, we generally appreciate the improved format and the presentation of the Programme of Work and Budget, which increase transparency and Member Nations’ possibilities to govern the Organization and its work, and ensure an efficient use of scarce resources. We find it especially helpful to receive the overview of total resources, the information on efficiency savings, as well as regional data, which *inter alia* provide information relevant to the basic issue on the costs and benefits of membership of various regions.

The regional data also raise a specific question about the share of general policy and direction for the European Region, which appears to be of a different order of magnitude than for other regions. We would appreciate an explanation in that regard.

Sweden urges a continuation of this process of modernization, keeping in mind the need for simplification and reader friendliness. Two very different tables on the overall resource allocation, for example, is a little bit confusing and perhaps, not entirely necessary.

We also welcome the Review of Publications in view of the crucial importance in the Center of Excellence, and endorse many of its recommendations to increase cost-effectiveness and impact and to replace obsolete distribution procedures. We also appreciate the slight reduction in the share of non-regular income activities and appreciate the reduction of the subsidy from one part of the programme to another. We find it important to continue in this direction to ensure that each activity bears its own cost, which is a basic precondition for proper management and governance.

The Swedish delegation further appreciates the initial steps towards the World Food Summit follow-up and expect, for the future, a broad approach aiming at the basic causes of food insecurity, both in general and in relation to the Food Insecurity Vulnerability Information Mapping System (FIVIMS).

Sweden expects FAO to play a central role in the monitoring, in an eco-system perspective, of global natural resources regarding agriculture, fisheries and forestry and to analyze and give technical and policy advice regarding the management and conservation, with regard to the precautionary principle. Consequently, we attach top priority to a strengthening of FAO’s capacity to undertake such constant monitoring and analysis of natural resources and also to do it in a forward looking manner - in the form of global perspective studies.

At this particular occasion, Sweden finds it particularly important to express strong support for the following areas in the Programme of Work: regarding agriculture, I would like to mention genetic resources, the role of women, Codex Alimentarius, IPPC and other Uruguay Round follow-up and agricultural policies in Eastern Europe.

Regarding fisheries, I would mention the strengthening of regional fisheries organizations, the implementation of the Code of Conduct for responsible fisheries and its technical guidelines, i.e. for consumer information.

Regarding forestry, I would say work on recommendations of the Inter-governmental Panel on Forests, regional forest commissions and national forest programmes, especially regarding institutions and capacity-building.

Without going into detail, we would like to reaffirm our support to those Programmes, Sub-programmes and elements which have been expressed as priorities by Sweden and by the Presidency of the European Community, during the PWB discussions in the Technical Committees earlier this year. Also, we reaffirm support to proposals to strengthen the PWB discussions in Technical Committees, in order to ensure that they have a more explicit effect on the final PWB proposal for the whole Organization.

Finally, regarding the two budget scenarios in the document. We are not entirely in agreement with some of the aspects, especially regarding the Zero Nominal Growth scenario. First of all, the already small share of total resources for fisheries and forestry seems to be further reduced. Secondly, the share of resources for administrative purposes will increase further. Thirdly, the TCP, which should remain a small part of the total activities in the Organization, in order to preserve its special purpose, is the only major programme that is protected and thus, will increase its share of total resources. Fourthly, the risk for erosion of the collective competence at Headquarters through decentralization will increase further. Fifthly, and finally, the proposed review of Country Offices, which holds a potential for substantive savings, has not been referred to at all.

This means that on balance, Sweden finds no strong objective reasons for a budget increase for the proposed existing Programme of Work. We would have preferred a proposal more in line with our general priorities, especially a different allocation of resources between substantive and administrative work.

Hyosuke YASUI (Japan)

I would like to state Japan's position in brief. Considering the fact that many contracting parties are in arrears, and other Member Nations not in arrears have financial constraints, we think that the Level of Budget should not be decided beyond their capabilities. From this point, Japan's position on the Budget Level for the next biennium is to seek Zero Nominal Growth or less. This is our sincere proposal. Even under the Zero Nominal Growth scenario, major progresses are relatively protected and we do not see any serious damage under this scenario, if appropriate reforms are pursued.

Japan's financial situation will go through a very serious stage in the next few years. Therefore, we find it extremely difficult to support the Budget Level which would bring us financial obligations which will exceed our capabilities of paying our contribution in full. When many Member Nation are faced with domestic financial difficulties, we should not expect to have them all in the Programme of Work and Budget.

Symeon MATSIS (Cyprus)

On behalf of my delegation, I join previous speakers in expressing appreciation to the Secretariat for preparing the analytical document under review. We do realize that the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium was not an easy task. Increased requirements deriving from the World Food Summit commitments should be adjusted to the ever-decreasing financial resources of the Organization, while the criteria established by the FAO Council, concerning priorities and cost-effectiveness, should also be applied.

Apart from the Programme, it is evident that the core issue for consideration by this body is the Level of the Budget. The two scenarios of Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth, which

are presented in the main document, are surely useful and food for thought. However, the general conclusions that can be drawn by examining the named scenarios could, in our view, be as follows.

The application of the Zero Real Growth scenario, together with improved efficiency, would secure, to a certain extent, the continuation of the normal programmed activities and established priorities, including the fundamental role of FAO in providing policy advice, investment support and field operations to needy Member Nations. Most of these activities are interrelated with the World Food Summit follow-up activities, namely, as regards assisting the Low-Income Food-Deficit countries to assist themselves.

On the other hand, the Zero Nominal Growth scenario would inevitably involve curtailing of a number of programmed activities. The required reductions to the Programme of Work and Budget in order to Reach Zero Nominal Growth, as tabulated on page 16 of the main document, will negatively affect all major programmes. As shown on the following page, paragraph 61, the impact of these reductions ranges between 2.3 and 5.3 percent on average, and affects programmes of vital importance, such as those of natural resources, crops, livestock, agricultural support systems, nutrition, fisheries, training and extension services.

In view of the fact that the difference in figures between the two scenarios might be limited to about US\$ 25 million, we believe that more efforts should be waged to reach a consensus on the Level of the Budget.

We are aware of the pressures on the public expenditure of most Member Nations. We are also aware of FAO's leading role in the fight against hunger and malnutrition. The worldwide active presence of this Organization has developed sound expectations that FAO, being the global institution for food and agriculture, is in the position to know how to respond to the urgent need for food security and agricultural development in general.

In concluding, while expressing our support to the proposed Resolution on page 7 and the respective Programme of Work and Budget, we believe that this Programme of Work should be accompanied by strong support from all of us for the implementation of a real programme that would see the Organization achieve cost-saving and enhanced efficiency. We, indeed, believe that continuous change and adaptation are essential and therefore we support proposals for streamlining the Organization through management reform, new methods of organization and a results-oriented approach.

Julian Alexis THOMAS (South Africa)

Our delegation aligns itself with the statement made by Senegal on behalf of the Africa Group. Our delegation is satisfied with the approach adopted and assumptions made to arrive at the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99. We feel that it provides more than adequate information to make an informed decision about the objectives and programmes for the Organization, about the objectives and programmes the Organization should pursue and the funds needed to finance such actions.

We wish to express our appreciation to the Director-General and the Secretariat for their considerable efforts and sacrifices in producing document C 97/3, as well as providing explanatory information during the course of its preparation and thereafter.

After examining the various scenarios presented for the next biennium, we support the Zero Real Growth option as reflected in the draft Resolution on page 7 of the document. This option is regarded as the minimum required for a number of reasons, including the following:

Firstly, we consider that the programmes and activities included in the Zero Real Growth scenario have been thoroughly examined during the course of the programming and budgeting process, and represent the minimum FAO should be doing to fulfil its mandate and meet its challenges, which were reconfirmed and refocused by the World Food Summit.

Secondly, it reflects priorities regarding Member Nations needs.

Thirdly, it provides balance between the normative and operational activities of the Organization. Here we would like to align ourselves with those who have emphasized the importance of the operational side of FAO activities for developing countries, particularly in Africa.

Fourthly, reductions in the FAO budget, particularly during the last two biennia, have been largely absorbed by efficiency savings. Further reduction now will cut into the major programmes and functions thereby, negatively affecting output to the detriment of developing countries. To illustrate this point, we wish to refer to the concerns expressed in paragraph 10 of the Finance Committee Report, document CL 113/4, concerning potential risks to FAO if budgetary provisions for Support Services and Common Services are further reduced. The negative signs of on-going budgetary reductions are already evident on technical and economic programmes. Because these effects are, in many ways, insidious they are likely to impact even on those programmes some of us may consider to be protected from reductions. We also know that correcting the outcome of mistakes or counterproductive trends is usually more costly than preventing them in the first place. In this regard, we recommend that the provision and delivery of information, in all its forms, be closely monitored.

Fifthly, progressive budget reductions, without an indication of when this may end, are likely to worsen the already low morale and hence output of FAO staff. Excessive fiscal pressure at this stage is likely to have more negative than positive effects on the Organization. As pointed out by others, budgetary reductions would send the wrong signals to public and private investors in agricultural and rural development. It is time to provide a positive message to FAO staff, developing countries' governments and the international agricultural community.

Our delegation believes that FAO needs to consolidate and rebuild momentum after the on-going reforms and reductions it has experienced over the past years. Time is needed for the anticipated benefits of decentralization and other reforms to materialize. This call to enable FAO to remarshal itself does not exclude the need to continue searching for on-going savings through improved effectiveness and efficiency. Indeed, yesterday's debate on the new programming and budgeting framework indicates the need to continue to re-examine FAO's visions, objectives and ways of achieving these. Possible new directions, new coalitions, greater synergy and savings, borne out of such a well-thought through process, would surely be more rational and durable than relatively arbitrary and hasty amputation of resources now. We should be better equipped in one or two years time to objectively identify if and how FAO can do more with less, which we believe is the goal of all Members.

Before concluding, you may recall that in the debate on the Medium-Term Plan, our delegation underlined our interest in FAO paying more attention to water management, livestock issues and trade negotiations. We would like to emphasize the latter.

In order to support the continuation of the reform process in conformity with the Uruguay Round of Agreements, the World Food Summit called upon FAO to assist developing countries in preparing for the coming Multilateral Trade Negotiations, including agriculture, fisheries and forestry through studies, analyses and training. We would thus encourage the Director-General to step up normative and operational support to Member Nations for implementation of the Marrakech Agreement, and request FAO to raise its capacity to assist developing countries, help prepare for future trade negotiations. This should be done in close cooperation with organizations such as WTO, UNCTAD and the World Bank. In order to enable FAO to undertake these tasks, which are of priority importance to the Member Nations of this Organization, in particular to the developing countries, FAO needs the support of extra-budgetary funding from donors. In this connection, it is noted that at the Ministerial Conference of the WTO in Singapore in December 1996, the Ministers agreed not only to improve the availability of technical assistance but also to give full consideration, in the context of the aid programme, to requests for financial assistance to least developed and net food-importing countries. We would thus urge donors to support FAO in

its technical assistance to developing countries related to the Uruguay Round Agreements and to their preparations for the coming Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

In conclusion, we confirm South Africa's support for a Zero Real Growth budget and commit our Government to paying its contribution in full, in time and without conditions at whatever budget level is agreed to. We expect no less from other Members.

Mustafa YOUSIF ALHOLI (Sudan) (Original language Arabic)

I would like to express my gratitude to the Secretariat for having prepared these excellent and practical documents. I would like to state firmly that my delegation supports everything that has been said by the Director-General concerning the very positive trends and indicators which are enshrined in the priorities which are part of the Programme of Work and Budget, as well as the Medium-Term Plan, particularly as concerns a sustainable rural development and food security.

Preparation of the Medium and a Long-Term Plan should be carried out with full participation of all our countries, countries which have comparative advantages in providing food supplies because of their natural resources and heritage, in the case of Sudan. The World Food Summit's priorities should be enshrined and implemented through the Medium-Term Plan as well.

We would like to underscore the fact that FAO must attend to drought, desertification, crop and livestock sectors, development of water resources, disaster prevention assistance, *inter alia*. My delegation supports Zero Real Growth. After having gone through the documents relevant to this topic in detail, we can firmly support Zero Real Growth. I will not dwell on the details that relate to that position, quite simply because they have been adequately developed by previous speakers.

We would like to further stress the importance of the document which the national offices have prepared in respect of implementation of the programmes and the need for providing assistance to needier countries. We would also re-affirm that these offices' work is of paramount importance. They should be strengthened, reinforced and equipped so as to carry out a greater volume of work, again within the context of decentralized policy programme work in the FAO.

Luigi FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)

First of all I would like to support the statement made by the Presidency of the European Union and its Member States and, particularly, the last paragraph expressing hope of a discussion on the Budget Level in an open and constructive spirit aiming at reaching a consensus. As a matter of fact, we noted with particular interest this constructive contribution of many delegations.

We agree, of course, on FAO being called to ensure a comprehensive response to the World Food Summit Plan of Action as referred in paragraph 46. We agree also on other major international conferences and other high level events such as: the Fourth Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources, in relation to which it is necessary to implement a Global Plan of Action; the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development, in relation to which FAO is a Task Manager for Chapters 10, 12, 13 and 14 of Agenda 21; the World Social Summit and International Conferences on Women and Population; the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries; etc. We are convinced of the need underlined in the same paragraph to protect the core of FAO substantive output under Chapter 2, Technical and Economic Programmes, and Chapter 3, Development Services to Member Nations.

I have already talked, on several occasions, of the importance we attach to Forestry. In relation to paragraph 51, we attach particular importance to Sub-programmes 2.4.1.1 and to 2.4.3.2. concerning Forest Resources Assessment and Outlook Studies and to Community Forestry, Capacity-building and FAO's Task Manager Role in Forest and Mountain Development. The Forestry Department is a Centre of Excellence where FAO is unique, and I did not refer explicitly in paragraph 46 to the reference of the CSD and its Panel of Forestry because I think that FAO has a primary role in that field.

In the document -- and I want to compliment Mr Wade once more -- there are certainly some economies which are welcomed but there are also some savings that could have disquieting consequences. I am referring, for example, to paragraphs 250 and 257 on pages 79 and 80 of the English text, and I think that those paragraphs highlight the risks of losing highly qualified personnel. I would like to refer to, and support, what the delegations of Trinidad and Tobago and Senegal have just said, referring to personnel and to try to avoid any solution that could compromise the morale of the staff, who are doing an excellent job and could be demotivated by indiscriminate criticisms and cutbacks.

Another point that could create some worries is the problem of biodiversity. I see on page 100, the risk and the importance of phasing genetic erosion. Comparing that with paragraph 342, I wonder why in paragraph 4, FAO and IPGRI Guidelines on Safe Germplasm Transfer are eliminated. I refer to page 110, and I would like to ask the Secretariat what it means? It is a reduction in one of the sectors that many delegations referred to as priority for them, as it is a priority also for us.

In relation to the table in paragraph 60 and paragraph 61, we are concerned about the reduction foreseen in the Major Programme 2.1 in relation to the Natural Resources Programme, Crops Sub-programmes, Livestock Programmes and, in particular, to the strong reduction of 10 percent in the Farming System Development and Food and Agriculture Industries Programmes.

We are also concerned about the reduction foreseen in the Major Programme 2.2 in relation to Nutritional activities, Statistics and Commodity-related activities in the major programmes.

I would like to ask on these points if these reductions are not compromising the essence of the activities in which so many Member Nations are justifiably and particularly interested.

Paul PAREDES PORTELLA (Perú)

En primer término deseo agradecer a la Secretaría por el documento C 97/3 y los otros que han sido publicados alrededor de este documento base, y también por las explicaciones del señor Wade que han sido bastante sustantivas y que nos han dado una orientación en nuestros debates. De otro lado, señor Presidente, deseo dejar constancia que la intervención del Perú parte de las reflexiones hechas fundamentalmente por Panamá, Dominica, Argentina y Chile, que han tratado este mismo Tema.

Mi intervención va a tratar lo que viene a ser el centro del debate y que como bien lo dijo el señor delegado de Argentina, desgraciadamente se refiere a la definición de un monto, en pocas palabras. De otro lado trataré de ver las implicaciones que entrañan la definición de un monto y finalmente justificaré porqué se debe acordar un presupuesto que afronte de manera realista los requerimientos de la FAO. Es una pena, señor Presidente, que nuestro debate actual ni siquiera trate del Presupuesto sino más bien de una cifra, deberíamos centrarnos de manera profundizada sobre los temas álgidos de la FAO, los mismos que se multiplican si tenemos en cuenta un seguimiento efectivo de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, así como los otros que se vinculan al trabajo cotidiano de la FAO y a su vigencia como Organismo en el Sistema Multilateral.

El Perú propone más bien que todo tipo de discusión se centre en lo que viene a ser un Crecimiento Real. Nosotros avogamos por un Presupuesto que esté vinculado a lo que el organismo necesita. Ni siquiera hablamos de un Presupuesto de 675 millones de dólares ee.uu., creeríamos que hablar de una cifra más elevada de esa como 700 millones de dólares ee. uu. sería más razonable. Nuestra posición la vamos a justificar.

En primer término, señor Presidente, creemos que lleva a confusión definiciones que no dicen lo que implican, Crecimiento Real Cero o Crecimiento Nominal Cero, no significa crecimiento. Entonces yo me pregunto porqué debemos referirnos a la realidad de una manera velada. Recordemos para comenzar que el Presupuesto para el bienio 1994-95 fue de 673 millones de dólares ee. uu., este Presupuesto para el bienio siguiente 1996-97 se redujo a 650 millones de

dólares ee. uu.. Aún si ahora, señor Presidente, mantuviéramos esta última cifra que ya ha sido reducida, estaríamos hablando de un decrecimiento real, más aún si se tiene en cuenta lo que alguna delegación señala con un monto inferior incluso a este umbral. Hay que considerar la inflación mundial que reduce en términos reales ese monto.

Pero señor Presidente, veo que no ocurre en esta ocasión, deberíamos debatir y aprobar sólo un Presupuesto que tenga en cuenta el diferencial de la inflación y por lo menos los programas en curso que deben incluir las orientaciones de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. Es por eso que juzgamos que un Presupuesto que no se ciña a estas cifras rígidas es el único que podría ubicar a la FAO en la línea de su trabajo, me refiero a un Crecimiento Real Positivo hasta 700 millones de dólares ee. uu.. Si no fuera así, señor Presidente, la discusión es inútil en este contexto y consecuentemente no daremos a la FAO los recursos necesarios para el cumplimiento de sus objetivos ni tampoco para que pueda mantener una cierta eficiencia de su trabajo en curso.

En este punto me quiero remitir a las declaraciones de Dominica y Argelia de esta mañana en el sentido que los gastos de los proyectos están bajando a nuestro juicio de manera excesiva. Por ejemplo, para el bienio 1992-93 estos gastos significaban 700 millones de dólares ee. uu., mientras que para el bienio posterior 1994-95 los gastos en proyectos representan ya sólo 544 millones de dólares ee. uu.. Para el bienio en curso, señor Presidente, estos gastos se reducen a 514 millones de dólares ee. uu.. Estas reducciones, que resultan de enfoques restrictivos, por la fuerza misma de las cosas afectan a los países y a las regiones más pobres, especialmente a las áreas rurales.

Otro aspecto que vale la pena destacar es que *el déficit* que viene arrastrando la Organización, por ejemplo para el bienio 1996-97, de 113,6 millones de dólares ee. uu., se debe exclusivamente a la falta de pago a tiempo de las contribuciones. Obviamente, esto acarrea serias limitaciones en los trabajos de la FAO en su conjunto. Dicho esto, si efectivamente deseamos traducir en los hechos las palabras de casi todos los señores delegados que participan en esa Conferencia, ello debería significar un incremento de los recursos, suficiente no sólo para contrarrestar la presente tendencia de reducción de los mismos en los proyectos sino también para cambiarla de forma tal que los flujos mantengan una constante positiva, ahí ya se suma la necesidad de que a todos los países y gobiernos, por supuesto también el mío, debemos hacer todas las gestiones y esfuerzos conducentes al pago puntual de las cuotas. A nuestro juicio toda falta de cumplimiento del pago de las cuotas es la que ha llevado a la Organización incluso a centrarnos en este tipo de debate y obviamente a lo que la Organización actualmente padece. Tenemos así una reducción de las actividades normativas y operacionales de la FAO consecuentemente un alejamiento cada vez mayor respecto del cumplimiento de sus objetivos. ¿Cómo, pues, podemos seguir hablando de que la Organización sea eficiente si se le asignan mayores responsabilidades pero al mismo tiempo se le retiran recursos? La delegación de Chipre hace unos momentos ha mostrado esa realidad al tiempo que la representación de Sudáfrica de manera, a mi juicio, muy acertada se refiere a las señales erróneas para la inversión agrícola en caso se apruebe un Presupuesto restrictivo. En este punto, señor Presidente, quisiera hacer una precisión en el sentido que para mi delegación es necesario que los recursos se orienten hacia los proyectos de desarrollo agropecuario en el terreno para ver, de manera efectiva, el impacto de los proyectos en nuestros países. En ese sentido nosotros insistimos en que se deben privilegiar dentro del organismo los Programas de Cooperación Técnica. Es a partir de ahí que podemos pensar en una expansión de los proyectos si tenemos en cuenta que estos programas son reducidos en su origen pero pueden muy bien constituir un capital semilla para generar proyectos de mayor envergadura.

Por otra parte, señor Presidente, la celebración de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación ha traído consigo nuevas y urgentes obligaciones a la FAO y por supuesto a nosotros, los Estados Miembros. No obstante lo anterior, habiendo transcurrido un año desde la celebración de la Cumbre, el número de personas que padecen hambre en el mundo no ha disminuido, señor Presidente, al contrario ese número no ha hecho más que aumentar. Si hacemos una simple extrapolación aritmética, vemos que si en noviembre del año 1996 eran 800 millones las personas

que padecían hambre, ahora teniendo en cuenta las tasa de crecimiento poblacional, cuyo gran porcentaje está ubicado a nivel de los países más pobres, tendremos unos 50 millones de personas más, que se suman a estos 800 millones. Esas son las cifras ¿Cómo, pues, podemos esperar que la FAO afronte este reto si no se le dan los recursos necesarios? Señor Presidente, quiero decir también que mi delegación ha seguido con suma atención el debate y se complace haber escuchado declaraciones constructivas y llenas de sentido común. No me refiero solamente a las efectuadas por los países del Grupo de los 77, sino también por ejemplo a las realizadas en este contexto de la Conferencia por Finlandia por ejemplo, en el Consejo pasado por los Países Bajos, por Francia, por Italia y por los Estados Unidos. Respecto a esta última intervención acogemos las palabras del señor delegado de Estados Unidos que muestra, entre otros, aspectos bastante constructivos como por ejemplo la necesidad de trabajar en lo que es Seguridad Alimentaria, obviamente y hacer un seguimiento efectivo de la Cumbre. Así también reconocemos la franqueza con que ha explicado las condicionantes para la situación de recursos de su Gobierno en el sistema multilateral.

En resumen, señor Presidente, creemos que debemos buscar un punto de equilibrio en donde se sitúen las posiciones de una manera razonable. Que no suceda como en la anterior ocasión en que las delegaciones, luego de extensos y dilatados debates se encontraron con situaciones de hecho que en última instancia, a mi juicio, afectan la credibilidad de la Organización y la limitan severamente, en cuanto a ser un Organismo de excelencia en las áreas de su especialización, en un mundo cambiante, fluido, globalizado.

Finalmente, señor Presidente, me permitiría solicitar a la Secretaría se digne tomar nota de algunos análisis que creo serían buenos para nuestro debate quizá no en esta ocasión pero sí en el futuro. Me gustaría saber con mayor detalle las economías efectuadas por la FAO en los últimos años como resultado de la racionalización de sus gastos. Otro trabajo que me gustaría ver sería cuales son los recursos mínimos que se consideran necesarios para poner en marcha la ejecución de las obligaciones dimanantes de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación, así como también lo que es necesario para asegurar el normal desenvolvimiento de sus actividades. De otro lado también tendría interés en que haya un resumen diferenciado entre las actividades normativas y las operacionales por regiones y países. Consideramos que esa información podría ayudar aún más en el debate, en la eficiente asignación de recursos, así como en la búsqueda futura de un Presupuesto equilibrado, en que no se discuta una cifra sino más bien que nos centremos en temas sustantivos que tienen que ver con el devenir de la Organización.

Marcos NIETO LARA (Cuba)

En primer lugar, mi delegación desea expresar su gratitud a la Secretaría por los esfuerzos realizados para presentarnos un documento del PLP, muy mejorado respecto a las ediciones anteriores. Así mismo saludamos al señor Wade por la clara presentación de este Tema.

Una vez más y por más de una década seguimos en la misma paradoja, cuando en tiempos tan lejanos como el año 1985 se planteó por primera vez en esta misma sala el criterio de crecimiento Cero, cuando las demandas de los necesitados y el desafío que tiene la Organización son cada vez mayores.

Tenemos un mandato de la pasada Cumbre para que se atiendan con urgencia las necesidades de alimentos para los más de 800 millones de habitantes de la tierra que padecen hambre. De otra parte, apreciamos los esfuerzos realizados por la Secretaría y en particular por el Director General para introducir economías, pero no se puede perder de vista que hay límites a las reducciones financieras, o que de seguir así, podría disminuir de tal modo la masa crítica de la capacidad operacional de la FAO que pudiera traer consigo un colapso para la Organización. Esta triste perspectiva, señor Presidente, hay que desecharla a toda costa. Algunas reducciones propuestas como por ejemplo un nivel del 2 por ciento en el PCT para el bienio 1998-99 respecto al bienio anterior, son muy sensibles particularmente por el papel benéfico que tiene el PCT en atender situaciones de urgencia y para asistir a los Países, especialmente a aquéllos de Bajos Ingresos y de Déficit Alimentario, en operaciones concretas de transferencia de tecnología y promoción del desarrollo.

Deseamos también sumarnos a las muchas delegaciones que nos han precedido en el uso de la palabra para reiterar la pertinencia del trabajo de los Representantes de la FAO en los países, como factor de lazo indispensable entre la Organización y los beneficiarios de sus servicios.

Mi delegación expresa su profunda preocupación si tuvieran que hacerse reducciones ulteriores a la propuesta de presupuesto presentada por la Secretaría con la consiguiente afectación a actividades prioritarias de la Organización.

Para finalizar, queremos expresar nuestro apoyo a las declaraciones formuladas en nombre del GRULAC por los distinguidos delegados de Panamá y Dominica.

Mi delegación apoya firmemente el nivel de Presupuesto propuesto por la Secretaría sobre la base de un Crecimiento Real Cero y esperamos que esta ilustre Asamblea lo apruebe por consenso.

Raphaël RABE (Madagascar)

Monsieur le Président, le Chef de la délégation de Madagascar, dans son discours à la Plénière, a déclaré que le Gouvernement de ce pays appuie la proposition du Directeur général, à savoir un budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro, et indiqué qu'il est confiant que le consensus se réalisera sur ce niveau. En effet, les Etats représentés à cette Conférence ne désirent nuire à une Organisation qu'ils ont solennellement soutenue et à laquelle ils ont confié un rôle déterminant dans leur mise en oeuvre des actions contenues dans le Plan d'action du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. C'est en examinant avec profondeur et beaucoup d'attention le document C 97/3, que notre délégation a pu relever que les augmentations de coûts sont en fait des majorations auxquelles l'Organisation ne peut se soustraire. Les chapitres 152 à 193 du document donnent les explications y afférentes et devraient donc normalement contribuer à éviter des discussions inutiles, fastidieuses et vaines comme l'a signalé à juste titre le délégué du Pérou. De nombreux documents indiquent les effets négatifs et insidieux d'un budget à Croissance Nominale Zéro. Par exemple, il est démontré que, dans cette option, des programmes techniques importants devront être supprimés. Tout en faisant l'effort de comprendre le raisonnement de ceux qui proposent cette alternative, on ne peut éviter de se poser la question de savoir comment vaincre la pauvreté et l'insécurité alimentaire, en opérant des coupes drastiques aux programmes destinés à améliorer la productivité et la production agricoles dans les Pays à Déficit Vivrier Importateurs Nets de

Denrées Alimentaires. Des réductions arbitraires devront être opérées dans ce cas au Programme relatif à la gestion des eaux, à la conservation et à la bonification des sols et, dans cette option également, on fait fi des résolutions de la Conférence internationale sur la nutrition, puisqu'on est décidé à sacrifier des programmes destinés à soutenir les Etats dans leurs actions.

De très nombreux Programmes et Sous-programmes du Chapitre 2 devront aussi être sacrifiés malgré leur importance. Je ne pourrai pas les citer tous car le temps nous manque, mais je voudrais quand même comprendre la logique de ceux qui acceptent que, en supprimant ou réduisant les Sous-programmes Vulgarisation, Enseignement et Communication, l'assistance aux agriculteurs pourrait être satisfaisante.

Monsieur le Président, employons-nous donc à trouver comment améliorer les performances atteintes au lieu de chercher comment freiner une Organisation qui essaie d'atteindre sa vitesse de croisière. Enfin, Monsieur le Président, pour clore mon discours, je voudrais indiquer que ma délégation fait sienne la déclaration du délégué du Sénégal au nom du Groupe africain.

Yohannes TENSUE (Eritrea)

My delegation fully supports all those previous speakers who supported the minimum accepted Budget Level for the Zero Real Growth level for the year 1998-99. There are several reasons to support this Budget Level as many previous speakers have already indicated. I do not want to indulge and repeat them again, but I would mention few which have not been mentioned.

Any reduced Budget below the level of Zero Real Growth will adversely affect the normative and operational activities of the Organization. To set conditions to reduce the budget and to hold back contributions instead of paying on time is unacceptable so soon after the World Food Summit.

The expectations of FAO to solve problems relating to agriculture is very high in the view and in the mind of developing countries. The reduction of the Budget reduces the field representation of FAO experts in the field. For the sake of savings, FAO permanent field experts' activities are replaced by consultants. My delegation agrees with the feeling that an FAO presence in the field makes a lot of positive difference.

FAO is the main Organization which is entrusted with tackling the problem of poverty and malnutrition. Reduction of the Budget is reducing the credibility of the Organization. This is morally unacceptable.

Once again, my delegation fully supports the Zero Real Growth Budget Level.

Fabian REDHEAD (Grenada)

My delegation would like to endorse the comments made by various delegations today concerning the Programme of Work and Budget of FAO for the ensuing period. In particular, we would like to endorse the comments made by Dominica speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, and other Members of that Group who spoke. Some of them spoke earlier and, since my delegation only arrived last night, we were not able to hear the presentations, but we are certain they made valuable contributions and we are inclined to say that we would support what they have said.

Let me say that having looked at the document submitted by the Secretariat, we find that this document is an admirable one. It sets out in very good form the essentials of what we ought to be considering here today. It demonstrates the very high standard which the staff of FAO have set themselves and of which all of our countries are the beneficiaries. I am particularly impressed by plans to further decentralize the operations of the Organization. My delegation believes this is a step in the right direction, and it is something that we would like to encourage. We believe that this trend will not only improve the cost-effectiveness of FAO but certainly would bring FAO closer to the countries which it serves.

I want to echo particularly a comment made by the representative of Dominica and echoed by one or two other delegates here today, that is about the fact that the FAO Budget for programmes is being reduced year by year. At a time when the problems of the world -- poverty, malnutrition, low nutrition levels -- are increasing rather than decreasing, despite the fact that we have improved technology, we have improved overall wealth, we have improved the amount of trade, we have improved the amount of financing, yet we have these problems with us. All of this leads me to come to the conclusion that we cannot, at this time, support any reduction in the FAO Budget. I say reduction because, although we are using expressions which talk about Zero Nominal Growth, we are in fact talking about real reductions, real personnel being cut, real programmes being affected.

I support, and my delegation strongly supports the idea that we need more efficiency and effectiveness from FAO. The countries that are proposing the reductions in the Budget are really saying to FAO: we want you to do more but with less money. This is a call, in view of the fact that my country is a poor developing country, that we can support. However, we have to be realistic, we cannot always expect the Organization to do miracles. What is worse is that we know that, by cutting the budget, the problems which the developing countries encounter are going to multiply.

I want to suggest -- I do not know if this is an appropriate compromise -- that while retaining the Budget at the current levels in terms of real money, that is to say Zero Real Growth, we at the same time exhort the Secretariat to continue the programmes relating to decentralization to see if savings can be achieved. In other words, do not cut the programmes for the developing countries; see if savings can be achieved through efficiencies not through cuts in the budget.

My country is very appreciative of the work that has been done by FAO in the past, and we look forward to FAO continuing to do good work. We offer them our support and we urge all other countries around this table to do so.

Mme Béatrice DAMIBA (Burkina Faso)

Après une évaluation plutôt encourageante de la période qui est en train de s'achever, malgré le coup sombre qu'il a fallu opérer, ma délégation pense que notre ambition au niveau des Etats Membres conjuguée avec la FAO, notre ambition devrait être de faire plus et mieux. En effet, lorsque l'on regarde un peu autour de nous, la sous-alimentation, la famine, la pauvreté persistent de façon inquiétante.

Je voudrais signaler en passant, la situation assez catastrophique de la campagne agricole dans la zone de l'Afrique de l'Ouest sahélienne à laquelle appartient le Burkina Faso. La campagne s'est soldée par un déficit important au niveau des récoltes céréalières et disons que, ce n'est pas parce que les populations ne se sont pas investies mais c'était dû à une insuffisance de pluie. Alors, comment pouvons-nous faire plus et mieux sans augmentation de ressources? Comment tenir les engagements pris par les Etats Membres au Sommet de Rome l'année dernière sans moyens supplémentaires? D'aucuns me diraient je suis bien d'accord il faut serrer encore davantage la ceinture, il faut faire encore des sacrifices, il faut réaliser encore des économies supplémentaires. Cet effort a été déjà entrepris, nous en avons constaté les résultats, et cet effort va certainement se poursuivre grâce au concours de tous, il nous faut beaucoup d'imagination pour continuer cet effort, d'une part. Mais j'ai bien peur qu'à trop serrer la ceinture on ne finisse par étouffer notre Organisation.

L'équation qui est donc posée est difficile à résoudre, c'est vrai compte tenu du contexte international général, mais ce n'est pas une équation impossible à résoudre si toutes les bonnes volontés se conjuguent, et parmi ces bonnes volontés devrait venir en tête un effort pour le paiement des contributions et surtout des arriérés des contributions pour permettre à l'Organisation de tenir la route par rapport à son mandat.

Vous savez, les bénéficiaires que retirent les populations, les pays en voie de développement - tel que le Burkina Faso, pour citer le cas que je connais - les bénéficiaires que retirent les populations dis-je, sont vraiment importants par rapport donc aux interventions de terrain de la FAO. Malheureusement, je crois que les grands contributeurs ne sont pas toujours peut-être bien informés justement de ces bénéficiaires que retirent les populations des opérations de terrain de la FAO. S'ils en étaient bien informés, ça m'étonnerait qu'ils rechignent à délier un petit peu la bourse pour continuer d'aider ces populations.

Je pense donc, qu'il faut que nous essayions dans un élan commun de solidarité, de faire au moins autant qu'au cours du précédent biennium, au moins autant, si l'on ne peut faire plus, le souhait étant bien sûr de faire plus comme d'autres délégations l'ont déjà dit avant moi. Et pour ce faire, le Budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro semble être pour notre délégation l'option la plus sage et la plus raisonnable. En effet, nous n'osons pas, nous ne voulons pas penser que la FAO soit obligée de réduire ses programmes tels que présentés dans le document C 97/3-Sup. 2, si son budget avait une Croissance Négative, particulièrement notre attention est retenue pour les programmes s'intéressant aux femmes, les programmes concernant l'élevage ainsi que surtout le Programme spécial pour la sécurité alimentaire, le PSA, qui sont tous des programmes vitaux pour les pays à faibles revenus et à déficit vivrier.

Quant à la Croissance Nominale Zéro, nous pensons qu'elle n'offre pas non plus la force de frappe nécessaire pour combattre cette insécurité alimentaire persistante, parce qu'il s'agit en réalité du recul. Aussi, la délégation du Burkina Faso voudrait soutenir le scénario d'un Budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro, comme le Ministre de l'agriculture du Burkina l'a déjà dit dans sa déclaration, et ce soutien nous l'affirmons à la suite de beaucoup d'autres délégations, notamment du Groupe africain qui a été représenté ici par son porte-parole, le Représentant du Sénégal, et beaucoup d'autres sous-régions effectivement qui ont su tenir le niveau de Croissance Réelle Zéro.

Mlle Aïcha RHRIB (Maroc)

Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord je voudrais remercier le Secrétaire de son Projet de budget qui fait preuve d'efforts sérieux, afin de rencontrer les impératifs d'austérité qui s'imposent actuellement. L'Organisation a besoin d'un budget qui lui assure les moyens suffisants pour exécuter d'une manière efficace l'émission de son mandat. De ce fait, tous les Etats Membres, sans exception, sont tenus de remplir leurs obligations financières pour le paiement de leurs contributions courantes et de leurs arriérés le cas échéant. Ma délégation voudrait se joindre au Représentant du Groupe des 77, au sein de cette Commission, pour appuyer la proposition du Directeur général du Programme de travail et budget 1998-99, préparé sur la base d'une Croissance Réelle Zéro conscient du fait que la situation actuelle n'offre pas d'autres alternatives meilleures. Ce scénario est le plus indiqué, car il garde un niveau plus ou moins acceptable des priorités de la FAO. Ma délégation a quelques observations sur le Programme de travail, qu'elle voudrait communiquer à la Commission.

Programme 2.2.2. En ce qui concerne le Programme information alimentaire et agricole, il y a lieu d'ajouter dans la section Analyse des marchés et évaluation de la sécurité alimentaire, l'action concernant la mise en place de systèmes d'information sur les marchés, compte tenu de l'importance de ces derniers, dans la transparence et le développement des marchés agricoles.

Programme 2.2.3. concernant le Programme analyse du développement agricole et économique, on note l'absence de programmes et actions relatives à la protection et à la gestion des ressources naturelles en particulier l'eau et la forêt. Concernant le Programme politique alimentaire et agricole, il est souhaitable d'introduire des actions relatives à la mise en place de normes, pour les produits agricoles, vu leur importance dans l'amélioration de la qualité et le développement des marchés agricoles.

Grand Programme 2.4., Programme forestier. Il ressort que certains objectifs de la stratégie forestière nationale ne sont pas pris en considération. Il s'agit en particulier de la forêt et la lutte contre la désertification, l'aménagement des bassins-versants et la lutte contre l'érosion, la conservation de la biodiversité, le développement des zones péri-forestières. Il est donc opportun, d'inclure les objectifs cités plus haut, dans le Programme de travail 1998-99 et de prévoir le financement des activités inhérentes à la réalisation de ces objectifs.

Enfin, Monsieur le Président, ma délégation est d'avis, que les activités normatives ne doivent pas se développer au dépens de l'assistance technique, il faut qu'il y ait un équilibre entre les deux volets du mandat de la FAO, sinon un renforcement de la présence de la FAO sur le terrain, car ces deux volets contribuent à faire de notre Organisation, je dis bien notre Organisation, un Centre d'excellence dont tous les Membres, dans leur grande diversité tirent bénéfice.

Monsieur le Président, j'appuie ce qui a été dit ce matin par le Représentant du Groupe des 77, notamment le Sénégal, l'Algérie, la Libye et d'autres délégations pour ce qui est des efforts entrepris et qui seront entrepris par la FAO, pour la décentralisation de ses opérations, via ses bureaux nationaux et régionaux. Seulement ces représentations pour mieux s'acquitter de leur mission devront se doter de plus de ressources humaines et matérielles.

Kezimbira Lawrence MIYINGO (Uganda)

Allow me first of all to express appreciation of the work of FAO on behalf of my delegation. Ever since the World Food Summit we have seen a lot of efforts put in by FAO to ensure that what our leaders committed themselves to is being fulfilled. I would like, in particular, to thank the Director-General together with staff of FAO for that effort which I think is yielding results.

I would like to take on some of the subjects related to the Budget and the Work Plan. I would like once again, as I said in my statement, to appreciate the decentralization policy that has been developed by FAO. To us in the developing countries, this is a very positive move because the services which we have always required and which were far away in Rome are now coming home. It is much easier today to talk about FAO because our people can easily reach the offices which have been decentralized and, therefore, believe what FAO does for them and what they contribute for. This particular policy must be pursued and must be strengthened so that these offices get the facilities that are also located at Headquarters, not in terms of building but in terms of facilitating the different projects that run within the areas where these offices are supposed to operate.

Allow me also to touch on to the Special Programme for Food Security and commend the Director-General for his tireless efforts to have this understood by everybody and to have it supported. We in the developing world see this as one of the ways in which we shall get food security attained. Most of the malnourished and the hungry people are within Africa and the developing world and, until we get these people to produce for themselves, it is going to be very difficult to have food security for all. Besides food aid cannot be a solution, it can only relieve a situation for a short while and the best way out is production by that particular country.

I also support the "Telefood" programme initiated again by FAO under the leadership of the Director-General. This Budget, which is being created under this particular line, I think is going to go a long way to aid in the feeding of those who are malnourished and those who are not able to feed themselves. I call upon all able-bodied people, especially those who have enough to eat, to sacrifice and contribute to this fund so that it becomes a source of income to supplement the Budget.

As regards the option for the Budget, Uganda supports the Zero Real Growth Budget because FAO has taken on more responsibilities ever since the day of the World Food Summit. Unless we support it with more funds, I think we shall make it unable to fulfil what you were supposed to do and then two years from now we would be lamenting and blaming the Organization for not being able to fulfil its commitments.

Allow me to comment a little on some of the things which I think could be improved. I think the TCP section of the Organization could be bettered. There is a belief within FAO and within the TCP region that TCPs are monies which are small and cannot do anything real. These are supposed to be spent on travel, supposed to be spent on documents and they are unable to put up something which has been left behind in the country which is the recipient of the TCP. We would like to say that a little money in some of our countries really makes a great difference. Yesterday I pointed out that putting a hundred thousand dollars into a village, and giving out two rabbits to each of 2 500 families, would cause a great change in that particular village. It would have a multiplier effect if these rabbits were widely distributed among other people after they have reproduced. I would like, therefore, to urge FAO to look into the TCP structure and see if these monies, in addition to giving technical assistance, could also leave within that country something that can be seen.

I hope the Budget will allow us to have work done on genetic improvement. Our genetic resources, especially in the developing countries and Africa in particular, require improvements, require study; there is a lot of potential in it but it is undeveloped. I hope there will be money to handle both animal genetic resources and crop genetic resources.

Let me end by, once again, renewing my support to the Director-General's efforts and to FAO in general, and commend all Members to continue supporting FAO.

Jean S. CAMARA (Guinée)

Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le Secrétariat, notamment Monsieur Tony Wade, pour la présentation de ce Point qui est très important, de ce point le plus important, je crois, de notre Ordre du jour.

Je partage entièrement la déclaration du Sénégal au nom du Groupe africain de même que la déclaration qui a été faite ici ce matin, que j'ai beaucoup appréciée, de la représentante de la Dominique. Ce partage porte notamment sur le soutien de ma délégation aux principales orientations de la FAO et au Programme de travail et budget proposé par le Directeur général.

J'ai l'impression qu'on se trouve dans une étrange situation depuis quelques années. D'un côté, on se mobilise à travers de belles déclarations à lutter contre la pauvreté, à éliminer la faim et la malnutrition, de l'autre, on hésite ou on se refuse à fournir les ressources financières requises. Lors du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, des engagements ont été pris par tous les Etats; efforts à fournir par tous les Gouvernements et tous les secteurs du développement, mais il y en a qui sont plus nantis que d'autres. Ne revient-il donc pas à ces premiers, c'est-à-dire les nantis, d'aider les seconds dans le cas d'une coopération solidaire et politiquement engageante?

Dit cela, je voudrais mentionner que ma délégation accorde une priorité toute particulière à certains secteurs du Programme, à savoir notamment la sécurité alimentaire dans sa globalité, la promotion et le renforcement des activités en faveur des femmes. Dans de nombreux pays 80 pour cent tirent leurs activités de l'agriculture, des pêches, la gestion des forêts pour un développement durable, l'amélioration des sols, la conservation des eaux et enfin l'importance pour notre délégation des activités opérationnelles de notre Organisation.

Revenant au Programme de coopération technique, je voudrais rappeler qu'il y a quelques années une étude d'évaluation avait été faite justifiant son maintien et son renforcement, et ce Programme, je pense, a fait ses preuves comme vient de le dire le représentant de l'Ouganda.

Concernant le rôle des représentations, je crois qu'il n'est plus à démontrer leur valeur et leur efficacité. Depuis de nombreuses années, tous les Etats Membres parlent de la décentralisation, c'est un souhait qui a été exprimé dans toutes les enceintes internationales. Et aujourd'hui que cette décentralisation est en train de se concrétiser dans notre Organisation, on cherche à remettre en cause cette politique et le rôle des représentations qui restent un outil irremplaçable pour nos Etats Membres. En effet, la Représentation permet de rapprocher l'Organisation des Etats

Membres. Je voudrais donner un exemple: tous les pays africains ne sont pas représentés à Rome, la Représentation de la FAO est donc le premier lien de contact du Pays avec l'Organisation basée à Rome. Donc, nous saluons et encourageons le Directeur général dans sa nouvelle politique visant à réduire les coûts par la nomination d'Attachés de programme nationaux compétents et dont la sélection est très rigoureuse. Si je ne me trompe, je crois qu'il y a eu presque huit millions de dollars d'économie. La Représentation est également une source d'informations pour les universités, une source également pour les partenaires au développement et un instrument de conseil pour le système des Nations Unies sur le terrain. La représentation de la FAO joue donc un rôle vital et central dans la mise en oeuvre des projets et la fourniture de l'assistance technique.

Je voudrais également saluer le renforcement de la coopération Sud-Sud à travers le nouveau schéma. Et ici, je voudrais me référer au discours que vient de prononcer l'honorable Ministre de la Malaisie dans le cas de la coopération de la Malaisie et de la Guinée pour la sécurité alimentaire.

Monsieur le Président, enfin, pour terminer je voudrais dire que nous sommes ouverts pour l'adoption par consensus d'un Budget raisonnable mais pas un Budget négatif. Nous ne voulons pas d'un couteau tranchant à notre gorge ou d'un couperet suspendu au-dessus de nos têtes. Nous soutenons donc les propositions du Directeur général et ses efforts à rationaliser le travail et le Budget de l'Organisation, à rassurer les Etats Membres par une transparence dans la gestion et la mise en oeuvre des programmes.

Georges MANSOUR (Liban) (Langue originale arabe)

Je tiens à remercier le Secrétariat pour les excellents documents qu'il a préparés sur le projet de budget 1998-99, mais je voudrais m'arrêter sur les trois points essentiels suivants:

Le Liban, comme nombre d'autres pays, a bénéficié des Programmes d'assistance technique parrainés par la FAO; ces projets qui ont eu un effet d'entraînement sur le développement du secteur agricole et sa durabilité, à un moment où toutes les activités des institutions de l'Etat ont été forcées d'interrompre ce type d'activités. C'est la raison pour laquelle nous appuyons les Programmes de coopération technique et nous sommes pour une augmentation des crédits alloués à cette fin, parce que nous pensons que ces projets ont des retombées directes sur le développement des secteurs agricoles dans les pays du tiers monde. Dans le cas où des restrictions budgétaires seraient imposées, nous vous prions que ces restrictions toucheraient encore plus les domaines que le Directeur général a fait allusion dans son discours et qui n'engendreraient pas des répercussions négatives sur les travaux de terrain que la FAO exécute en coopération avec les Pays Membres et par la suite créeraient un impact sur la productivité des aliments dans le tiers monde.

Deuxièmement, je voudrais insister sur la nécessité de mettre en oeuvre une politique de décentralisation. Cette décentralisation devrait reposer sur un plan intégré donnant aux bureaux dans les pays toute latitude pour organiser les activités, ce qui permettrait de réaliser des économies importantes, au niveau tant des efforts consentis que des ressources financières allouées.

Troisièmement, nous soulignons la nécessité d'adopter une approche adéquate et correcte pour l'exécution des projets, de façon à éviter les gaspillages et une utilisation non optimale des ressources, et à se protéger ainsi contre toute critique qui pourrait être formulée à ce propos.

Nous estimons, dans cette optique, qu'il faut établir des critères précis pour faciliter la mise en oeuvre des programmes financés grâce à une aide des donateurs. Nous pensons également que chaque fois qu'un projet est achevé, un rapport d'évaluation devrait être établi à l'intention des pays donateurs.

Peter FERGUSON (New Zealand)

I have some brief comments to make. First, our thanks to the Secretariat for the extensive work it has undertaken for this Item. In New Zealand's view the Budget Level for the next biennium must be realistic in the level set, provide adequate resourcing for priority programmes, including both normative and technical work, and be able to be fully financed from the contributions of Members. We believe that FAO, as an organization, should maintain its on-going quest for efficiency gains and continue to pursue a sensible allocation of programmes and priorities in the coming biennium, including a close examination of its administrative costs. Over the medium to longer term, the strategic planning processes we have already discussed will have a positive effect on determining budget requirements.

This Organization is no different from others in the UN System, nor indeed many Member Governments, in facing the need to work within the financial means allocated to it. With limited financial resources available, there is a need for financial responsibility in the careful management of such resources. We believe that the Organization has shown, in recent years, a recognition of this and that it should continue along this path.

It would certainly assist the Organization if the question of arrears were to be settled expeditiously by Member Nations involved. The arrears question, as some other delegations pointed out, is a further reason for establishing a realistic Budget Level that can be fully financed.

For these reasons, we support a Budget Level for FAO in the next biennium based on Zero Nominal Growth. We are prepared to work constructively with other Members in reaching an agreed Budget Level at this Conference.

Nehad Ibrahim ABDEL-LATIF (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)

In the name of God, merciful and compassionate.

My delegation fully supports the Zero Real Growth option for the budget that we have before us for the 1998-99 biennium so that there may be no negative impact on the activities and work of the Organization. We would like to urge donor countries to support FAO, so FAO may carry out its work so as to ensure that we can move forward towards the target of world food security.

How can this Organization go ahead with such activities if the budget is cut back every biennium? We need to support the Technical Cooperation Programme, in particular, which solves a lot of specific problems in developing countries, and the Special Programme for Food Security which requires a lot of support.

Our Organization is trying to improve the food situation in many countries. We also support the strengthening of FAO Country representations so that they may support field activities. We would agree with and support what the Representative of the Near East Group said in this connection.

Khairuddin Md. TAHIR (Malaysia)

My delegation would like to thank the FAO Secretariat for the document C 97/3. In our view, the content and presentation have been clear and comprehensive, and reflect the interest and concerns of Member Nations.

Malaysia supports the Zero Real Growth budget level, which we feel provides a programme of work that reflects a good balance between the normative and operational programmes -- a programme balance often requested by many Member Nations.

Anything below this Zero Real Growth budget, in our opinion, will disturb this delicate balance, and may have more dramatic consequences and impacts than we would imagine, especially at grassroots levels and to potential investors and collaborators.

My delegation is happy to know the increasing attention being given to the forestry and fishery sectors, including aquaculture development. However, we feel that there is still room for programmes on the development of genetic resources, as has been raised by some other speakers.

With respect to forestry, special attention should also be given to forest fire control and management, and the study of the impact of haze on agricultural productivity and, related to this, the impact of the "El Niño" on agricultural production and productivity. We have also raised this issue in discussing the Medium-Term Plan Agenda Item.

In the normative programmes, my delegation applauds the excellent work done by FAO and, in collaboration with other UN Agencies, in developing standards, guidelines, codes of practices, and conventions. These international instruments and mechanisms will facilitate sustainable management of resources and international trade.

In this regard, in the applications of these instruments and standards, we hope developing countries are not left behind or disadvantaged. There is urgent need to increase the capacity and capabilities of the developing countries in this area.

Therefore, adequate resources must be made available in the Budget in these areas, especially with respect to human resource development and technical advice on upgrading technological infrastructure and facilities in developing countries.

Malaysia also proposes that FAO should conduct studies and analysis as to whether there are negative impacts on the economies of developing countries and countries in transition, as a consequent to the application of these international instruments and mechanisms.

Vaino P. SHIVUTE (Namibia)

Namibia also wishes to convey her congratulations on your election as Chairman. We wish to express our appreciation to the Secretariat for many hours of hard and dedicated work to produce a Budget which reflects realism.

The World Food Summit, in November 1996, ushered in a new era of support to the hungry and undernourished people all over the world. The decisions taken created expectations among millions of disadvantaged people and countries, resulting in a tremendous responsibility resting on the shoulders of FAO, to achieve the objectives set at the World Food Summit.

With this in mind, nothing should be done which could curtail the operational activities of FAO.

It is, therefore, crucial to continue with the professional and operational support to developing countries through FAO, in order to achieve the national and global goals pertaining to hunger. Crucial issues which need to be addressed are: sustainable agriculture, against the background of the alarming degradation of natural resources; the development of new income-generating opportunities; more effective water management, especially in arid and semi-arid areas; livestock and crop programmes, with special emphasis on FAO's role to build the capacity of developing countries to be more competitive in international trade and negotiations, in terms of the Uruguay Round Agreement.

We need to level the playing field in many aspects -- information systems, training and capacity-building.

In this regard, it is essential that we maintain close linkages with FAO through Regional Representations.

In conclusion, it is the considered opinion of Namibia that we cannot progress into the new millennium with anything less than the Zero Real Growth Budget. I, therefore, support the view expressed by Senegal, on behalf of the Africa Group.

Yeong-Moo CHO (Korea, Republic of)

As we are aware, FAO, as the specialized agency of the UN System in food and agriculture, plays a substantive role in implementing its specific mandate to achieve food security, sustainable agriculture and rural development, and especially in supporting Low-Income Food-Deficit countries.

For the last years, budget restraints of United Nations and other Specialized Agencies have brought about many reforms in the UN System. My delegation is pleased to see the steps taken so far by FAO.

The important point is not the Budget Level, but the will to reform, for example, streamlining, restructuring and the decentralization of authority of the Organization.

However, my delegation would find it very difficult to support the proposed Budget, which may cause negative effects on the main activities of FAO.

My delegation thinks that, through further reductions of administrative costs not to affect the assistance to Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, the key activities of FAO, and redefinition of regional, sub-regional and country offices, more savings can be achieved.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to emphasize the need for further reform processes, but the key activities of FAO in the field of food and agriculture should not be undermined as well.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak a second time, regarding the Programme for the biennium 1998-99.

On behalf of the Near East Group, I want to reiterate that the Near East Group states its support for the regional and field offices, or country offices, and to increase their numbers for the link between FAO and the developing countries, that are in need of assistance from FAO in this regard.

CHAIRMAN

We shall need to come back to discussion of this Item. A number of countries have indicated a wish to speak tomorrow.

I would like to take the opportunity of our being here this afternoon, and the remaining time available to us, to ask Mr Wade, on behalf of the Secretariat, to reply to the points that have been made so far.

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

What I will do, if I can, is go through the questions which I am immediately able to answer. There are a couple on which I do not think I received replies yet, and with your indulgence I might just fill in anything that is missing tomorrow morning.

I would like to thank delegates for a very, very extensive debate and also for, I think some satisfaction amongst us that, at least, the document is not the cause of any problems we may have in settling whatever final Budget we come up with.

Starting off with this morning's intervention and Panama's remark that there is a need for procedures for involvement of Regional and Sub-regional Offices in the various processes of the Organization. I think I would like to explain what has been happening there.

Decentralization presented us with new challenges and new problems because what we were doing was putting out into Regional and Sub-regional Offices some one-third of our technical capacity, a very significant level of Professional staff out in those Regional and Sub-regional Offices. Amongst them, Operational people -- that is people from the Operations Divisions; people from the policy assistance area -- there is a policy assistance branch in each Regional Office; and then finally Technical staff at both the Regional and Sub-regional levels.

The particular challenge dealt with the Technical staff because they, in a way, rely on their Headquarters technical mother Units -- if I can call them that, their mother Divisions -- for technical guidance but they still have to operate within the office which is managed by the Regional Representative or the Director of the Sub-regional Office. After a great deal of

discussion, we produced a circular for all of the Organization explaining the relationships between Headquarters and decentralized locations. It may be worth sharing with you the conceptual basis on which that was developed.

What it came down to was that we recognized that there are two dimensions to the problem. There may be more than two but there are two that we addressed immediately. The first is the interest of the Region -- the geographical dimension -- and the second is the substantive technical discipline and the interest in maintaining that capacity throughout the Organization. The Netherlands referred to this particular concern.

What we basically said was that, when it comes to determining regional priorities, we expect the Regional Representative to be the person who provides advice to the Director-General. In fact, in the budget preparation process that, be it at the strategic level in the development of the Medium-Term Plan or now the new Strategic Plan, or the Budget itself. The Director-General specifically asks each Regional Representative and Sub-regional Representative, through the Regional Representative, to provide advice on regional priorities and how they would expect resources to shift between those priorities. That is one dimension.

The other dimension is that when it comes to advice about what should happen in the priorities within a technical discipline, the Director-General does not go to the Regional Representative but goes to the Assistant Director-General responsible for the Technical Department. We have to reconcile these two, as you can see sometimes they can disagree with each other.

In effect, we have designed our budgetary allotment procedures and our allocation procedures to work the same way. For example, the Regional Representative is responsible for implementing the Budget and the Work Plan that has been agreed with the Technical Division from Headquarters, because the Technical Division from Headquarters, is responsible for determining the technical work. When it comes to implementation, it is the Regional Representative who is responsible and, in fact, he can shift resources around within any Major Programme. If he wants to go outside a Major Programme -- for example, if he wants to shift money from Fisheries to Forestry -- we are saying, you are going too far, you have already agreed a programme with Fisheries. If you are going to shift money from Fisheries, then you must come back to the Assistant Director-General at Headquarters and get his agreement.

I wanted to explain that because a lot of thought went into it. It has only been implemented over the last twelve months, maybe a little bit less. It has its problems, but they are being addressed and I think we have, at least, a conceptual basis that is correct.

Panama implied in the same question, I think, that we should allocate more resources to the Regional Offices. That possibly is true. The resources are scanty but they are scanty throughout the Organization and that, I guess, is what the whole argument is about.

Norway suggested starting with the recommendations of the External Auditor to identify further efficiency savings. We have looked at that already, and where we can do it, we have done it. Remember, the Report you are looking at is the Report on the 1994-95 Accounts so, as you can imagine, we have had it for some time. It is really only new to you.

In the case of travel operations we have, of course, implemented a new policy on travel, which involves the use of tickets purchased at much cheaper rates under a new contract. Basically, we are talking about non-endorseable tickets; that is tickets that cannot be changed. These are much cheaper but, of course, they are somewhat less convenient if you have changes in travel plans. We have extended lump-sum payments, although there are still some issues outstanding which are still awaiting decision in that particular area.

In the area of cash management and investment, the External Auditor called for improvements in the procedures in the policy for managing short-term and long-term investments to speed up decision-making. An underlying objective here was to increase the returns on our investments. But, I have to say that the amount attributable to the Regular Programme here is absolutely

negligible because we do not have a cash balance in the Regular Programme for reasons with which you are very familiar. The cash he is managing, of course, is the Trust-Fund money. Incidentally, were we to be successful there, that is the Regular Programme, the advantage would be to Miscellaneous Income, which would eventually effect the Regular Programme assessments.

It might be worth jumping to Argentina's comment that if people paid on time we would have more Miscellaneous Income to deal with. If you take the London Inter-Bank Rate of five percent and apply it to the Assessed Contributions -- if they were received on 1 January, every year, as they are meant to be -- then, he estimated quite correctly that we would be US\$ 10 million better off. Can I extend that a little bit further? If you all paid the US\$ 200 million you owe us, we would be a further US\$ 20 million better off. So, a further US\$ 20 million better off, on top of the US\$ 10 million that would come in with current contributions, and you see that we would have no argument at all today in meeting Zero Real Growth. So, the contribution issue is alive and well.

Norway, commended the efforts of the Director-General in trying to bring down the grade structure and suggested that we should be trying to broaden the pyramid. I would just like to confirm that considerable progress has been made. If you take it from the 1994-95 budget as your base, and see what has been achieved since then, we have taken out ten D-2s, twenty-two D-1s and forty-two P-5s. We, however, have increased P-3s by twenty-seven and P-2s by four. There is, I think, quite considerable progress in that area.

I believe it was Norway again, who expressed some concern about Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information Mapping System (FIVIMS). In the case of FIVIMS, you will already be aware that there was a meeting in April 1997, which was reported to the CFS in C 97/INF/8, describing a Technical Consultation and the work plan for establishing FIVIMS. You will be pleased to know that this approach of working with other Agencies in the System continues and there is another meeting which will be held on 8 to 10 December 1997. To give you a feeling of the extent to which we are working with other Agencies, the list of invitees includes: IPGRI, the UN Population Division, CIDA, UNICEF, the Save the Children Fund, Helen Keller International, United Nations High Commission for Refugees, GTZ, UNFPA, the World Meteorological Organization, USAID, the World Health Organization, IFAD, WFP, the World Bank and UNDP. I have the Agenda and further information on that but I just want to assure you that the call by the Summit itself that we should be working on a cooperative basis and be the catalyst in that particular exercise, is being headed very seriously.

If I can go to the comment by the distinguished delegate of Switzerland. I have not been able to verify, precisely, the figures he stated but something he said did concern me as it was the basis for an argument that we should be careful about increasing contributions. His second reason for not supporting the ZRG budget was that US\$ 50 million less had been paid in this year, than last year. That was an indication of the fact that, perhaps, the political support for the Budget was declining and we should go for a 'realistic budget'.

The difference is entirely attributable to the fact that the United States of America paid its arrears from 1995. It did not make its payment in 1995, it paid it in early 1996, hence you get this sudden increase in payments in 1996. In 1996 they also paid their current contribution at the end of 1996 -- not quite all of it but most of it -- and therefore, you see the situation where you have this large increase resulting from that payment. This is not a reflection of a reduction in support. If anything, it is good news because they were catching up on a payment that they had missed.

The United States of America raised the issue of the Inspector-General and the need for strengthening of management control, and supported the idea of an Independent-Officer, similar to the United Nations Inspector General. We have not gone as far as the United Nations partly because we do not entirely agree with the concept that has been implemented there, for, I think, very sound practical management reasons.

I would like to point out to you that the Director-General has upgraded Internal Audit to include investigations and furthermore, has now titled the Head of that Office as the Inspector General for FAO. This may seem on the surface of it as comestic, but I would like to inform you that the Terms of Reference for that particular position have been changed, including independent reporting to the Finance Committee. That is, that the Inspector General will prepare his annual report to the Director-General and submit it to the Finance Committee as produced. I could read out the revised Terms of Reference but given the time, I think I will not, but if the distinguished delegate is interested in a copy, we can arrange for him to have one.

There was also strong implications coming from various delegates that the answer lay in cutting administrative costs. The United States of America said that there was insufficient amounts being cut from Chapter 5, "Support Services" and from Chapter 6, "Common Services".

The Netherlands implied that its flexibility in the Budget was entirely based on further reductions in administrative services in 1998-99 Budget. There is the impression that there is some unwillingness on the part of the Secretariat to respond to these calls for reduction in administrative costs. Can I say that we have made enormous efforts to reduce the administrative costs of this institution and your own Governing Body structure recognizes that. In fact, I think it was the distinguished delegate of South Africa, who very properly referred to the Report of the Finance Committee to the Council -- that was paragraphs 10 and 11 of CL 113/4 if I remember correctly -- which states, quite explicitly, that the Finance Committee, on which the European Union and the United States of America are represented, recognized that the cuts in Chapter 5 were so severe that if we went for the ZNG scenario, they felt, we would be risking various aspects of the administrative control structures of the Organization.

That body, the Finance Committee is appointed because of the expertise of its individuals. If the Council and the Commission wish to ignore the warnings of that Committee, that is entirely up to you but please do not come back to us and say -- it all went wrong, why did it go wrong? We told you if we keep cutting there without changing the underlying procedures and systems, there will be problems.

I would like to add, in fact, of course, that there have been enormous cuts. For example -- in Major Programme 5.2, which is Administration and Finance -- we took out in the original 1996-97 budget US\$ 1.3 million, a modest 3.5 percent. When we cut the budget for the US\$ 56.9 million reduction, in your second effort at the Budget for 1996-97, we took out a further US\$ 5.2 million. That amounts to another 13.6 percent on top of the 3.5 percent already taken. It has taken much greater cuts than almost any other part of the Budget, and they are relatively desperate people, I can assure you.

In the case of Chapter 6, we, in fact, in 1996-97 were concerned we had already overdone it but, when you gave us the major reduction, we went in and took out an enormous number of staff, went into outsourcing and reduced the budget by 12 percent. You cannot repeat it year after year without seeing very severe consequences, Mr Chairman.

I am sorry to be so adamant about it, but exactly the same statement was made twice so, I was obviously not insistent enough the first time round.

In fact, just to return for a moment to Argentina's comment on the financial cost of not having resources come in to the institution on time, I would just like to say that the US\$ 10 million estimate of Miscellaneous Income compares, for interest, to an actual, in 1996-97, which is currently estimated at US\$ 3.8 million. Just that change in getting the payments in on time, would pick up the difference between the US\$ 10 million and the US\$ 3.8 million.

The distinguished delegate of Senegal asked for information on the savings that we have made, to be provided in writing. He was referring to the response I made at the Council with regard to overall efficiency savings, where in fact, I made a rather long intervention -- consisting of well over a page in the verbatim -- which concluded that we had made efficiency savings amounting to US\$ 79 million/biennium, which is around 12 percent against the base from which we were

working. I will not repeat the entire thing here. I would refer you to CL 113/PV/2, page 15, which quotes all of the figures, and gives you the information that should convince you that the effort made has been very serious.

The European Union raised a number of issues, many of which it raised in its speech at the Council. I do not think that it will be very fruitful for me to repeat all the responses here. I will just take the ones that I think are really critical.

On the question of reducing Country Offices, the feeling from the Union appears to be that the Secretariat is ignoring its request for a reduction in Country Offices. I am afraid you are correct. Until the Governing Bodies agree that this is an appropriate course of action, then the Director-General cannot take action. You have to convince the Governing Bodies, at large, that this is a priority that we can afford to reduce. He has recognized your concern by making mammoth cuts, in terms of costs, in the Country Office structures. He is not prepared to reduce the number of Representations. In fact, he wants to increase them, unless there is some consensus that this should not be done.

Listening to the number of speakers today you can hear very, very clearly that these are very, very important points of contact for the Member Nations that have them. I am afraid we are in a stymied position here, in that we cannot contribute in the way that you ask because that is not the decision of this Commission or the Conference.

I would just like to handle one particular example that the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union, raised on cost increases. I think it was only an example, but maybe it is important to handle it to dispel the idea that there may be some irrational application of cost increase principles to that particular area.

The area mentioned was travel and if I understood the delegate correctly, it was that there was a contradiction in the fact that the cost increase calculations showed an increase for travel, whereas decentralization and various other actions, should have resulted in a reduction in travel. Here I think there is a little bit of a misunderstanding. We split all of our changes in the budgetary values between those which relate to programme change -- i.e. reductions in the amount of travel -- and those which relate to the cost of the input -- efficiency savings from reductions in the cost of travel for the same amount of travel. We do separate the two very distinctly.

In the case of the calculation for cost increases what we did was we took whatever base existed and we applied a factor of 3 percent. As with all our cost increase calculations, we try very hard to find an independent source for the factors that we use, so, for example, for inflationary factors in Italy, we use the forecast of the Economist Intelligence Unit.

For travel, it is really rather difficult because, as you know, there is an international system of rates there. What we use is we use the rates determined by the Swiss-based Agencies of the United Nations, through CCAQ. The reference is ACC/1996/FB/R29. There they give the results of their calculations about what the forecast increase or decrease in airfares will be. That is 3 percent for 1998-99, and that is exactly what we have used. However, on the other hand, that only deals with the cost increase side, it does not deal with the change in programmes or the efficiency side.

If I can take you back for a moment to what happened in 1996-97. The travel base for duty travel, and in fact there is other travel, there is entitlement travel as well but I think it is really duty travel that you are talking about. The travel base in 1994-95, was US\$ 32 million. In the original proposal for 1996-97, it was already being reduced by US\$ 1.6 million. However, there was a cost increase of US\$1.2 million. The point I am making there is that there was a genuine reduction of travel, but it was costing more so, we had to pay more. That took us to US\$ 31.7 million.

Again, we had to face the US\$ 56.9 million reduction. We reissued the tender for the contract, went through a whole process to come up with this new travel arrangement, and we generated efficiency savings on that amount of US\$ 3.5 million.

The Director-General then also decided that he wanted travel reduced overall. He made a number of decisions about our representation at other people's meetings, using the officers in the Liaison Offices instead of Headquarters staff. He insisted that only one person attend instead of several, and he pursued the decentralization issue. He did various things which he felt meant that we could afford to do with less money for travel, and he reduced the budget by US\$ 3.6 million, plus the US\$ 3.5, plus the US\$ 1.6. In other words, he took US\$ 8.7 million out of that US\$ 32 million. It is about 27 percent of the base. Now the cost increases you are seeing this time are simply because of the 3 percent, it is not an increase in the volume of travel.

The reason why I went through that rather lengthy comment is that each of the cost increases here are demonstrated by their calculation and by their result. The Finance Committee goes through them in quite a lot of detail. They look at the assumptions, and they say what they think about them. Their Report specifically approves the calculations and the results. The Council also approved the conclusions of the Finance Committee. So, my feeling is that we should not be raising cost increases as a potential area where there is flexibility in this Budget. They are probably under-stated.

The distinguished delegate of Germany raised a very interesting point which also concerns us, which is that the guidelines and methodology that you will find that throughout the document. The question is whether there is real demand for this material. In fact, you will recall from the Programme Evaluation Report, exactly the same question comes up with regard to publications. In fact, it is publications often about guidelines and methodologies. We are trying to address it, although it is extraordinarily difficult to identify demand when it is so distributed, if you understand me. However, we are doing two things.

One, we are setting up much better record-keeping systems for the sales of publications, to try and identify where the demand in the market is for the work we do. That, of course, is *ex-post facto*.

The other thing is we are building up within each Department mechanisms to ensure that everything that is proposed for publication is reviewed by peer groups and by the management of the Department to make sure that it is responding to a need, responding to a demand rather than, just perhaps the enthusiastic wish of the technical officer who is producing the work. We take the comment on board, the answer is not easy but I think we can make some improvements over where we are now.

The distinguished delegate of Sweden asked a question about why the share for the European Region under Policy Direction was higher than you would imagine, given the distribution of Policy Direction over all of the other regions. In fact, it is because of the phenomenon of the Liaison Office for Geneva and the Liaison Office for Brussels which are allocated, in our technique, to Europe. You may not feel that you are major beneficiaries from that allocation, but it is a reasonable assumption that Europe should be named. The alternative would be to put it under Global, which is where we would put some of the other offices that work in that particular area.

I think it was also Sweden who emphasized the need to strengthen PWB discussion in the Technical Committees. We are going to run into a little bit of trouble on this because of the fact that the timing is changing. If you take into account what has happened to the timing of the Technical Committees and what is happening to the new Programme and Budget Process, the Technical Committees meet before we have the first draft of the Programme of Work and Budget. We were always aware of this. What we intend to do is to make sure that the Technical Committees have in the new form, first of all, of the Strategic Framework, but then of course, of the biennial update of the Medium-Term Plan. That is the document that they would be

reviewing. I just want to clarify that because one or two people keep on insisting that this is the Budget. It just simply will not be possible to have the Budget for the Technical Committees.

On the other hand, we do expect to have resources in the Medium-Term Plan, and we do expect it to concentrate on all the programme priorities, so in a sense, it may well be the better document under the new process.

The Italian representative raised a number of questions, one or two of them rather specific ones. I do not think I have all the answers here but I do have one or two which may give you some comfort on the reasons why certain things were taken out in Zero Nominal Growth.

For example, you refer to the four FAO/IPGRI Guidelines on Safe Germplasm Transfer which were eliminated in ZNG. In fact, they consider them to be postponed and it is not as serious as it looks. They really want to delay it a little bit to wait for the Commission of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures. The contents of the Guidelines need to include some further information, on the distribution data on pathogens.

You also asked a question on the elimination of the Germplasm Guidelines, I am sorry this is the same issue. In fact, AG has come back to me to say that the issue is about the priority for the Secretariat of IPPC rather than the concentration on the Guidelines.

Panama, Peru and one or two other people raised the question of the accumulated deficit which was carried forward at the beginning of this biennium, amounting to US\$ 113.6 million. That accumulated deficit is, roughly speaking, the excess of income over expenditure, that means we have spent more than we have recorded as income which is what we expect to receive. The US\$ 113 million is covered from a financial planning point of view by over US\$ 200 million worth of arrears. So, therefore from the point of view of whether the Organization is effectively solvent -- yes it is.

However, they are right to point out that while you carry a deficit like that, you are constantly running your cash very low, very close to the borderline, which makes it very difficult to be flexible and to respond to situations when you need to respond to them. Hence, the need almost to borrow in the last few weeks. So it is an important point which should be recalled.

Mr Chairman, I understand that we seem to be running out of interpretation time. I will organize myself better for tomorrow morning to finish up the rest of the answers and thank you very much to delegates for their attention.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much Mr Wade.

We now have to consider how we are going to handle our proceedings henceforth, and when we meet tomorrow morning. That depends to a rather large extent on how many more delegations wish to take the floor on this subject.

We will resume our discussion of this item tomorrow morning at 09.30 hours, Mr Wade will complete his summing-up and there may be further questions that arise from his reactions. We will meet again at 09.30 hours tomorrow morning to continue our discussion.

The meeting rose at 17.50 hours.

La séance est levée à 17 h 50.

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.50 horas.

CHAIRMAN

Today is a crucial day because today is the day in which we have to conclude our substantive deliberations, items of business, we have to finish with the Programme of Work and Budget and we have to come back to, and conclude on, the Medium-Term Plan and the related issues. So, today is an extremely important day, in terms of making progress. Let me tell you how I propose to arrange matters today.

We have left over, from yesterday, the completion of Mr Wade's reply on behalf of the Secretariat to points made yesterday, in our discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget. We then, have a further six speakers who have asked to take the floor. When we have transacted that business, I propose to adjourn the debate on the Programme of Work and Budget until later. I will tell you in a moment what later means. I am then convening a meeting immediately after this Commission adjourns, of Friends of the Chair, and I will explain before we adjourn this session what that involves and where it will happen.

The Commission will reconvene in Plenary Session this afternoon, not at 14.30 hrs but at 17.00 hrs. We will then come back to the uncompleted debate on the Medium-Term Plan and associated issues, and we will also return to the Programme of Work and Budget. So that is the scheme for today. We will conclude our initial discussion of the Programme of Work and then adjourn, the Friends of the Chair will meet, this Commission will resume in plenary this afternoon at 17.00 hrs to deal with the outstanding business on the Medium-Term Plan and resume discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)

II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION (suite)

II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION (continuación)

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabic only); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (arabe seulement); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1 (en árabe solamente); C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

CHAIRMAN

I should remind you that the outstanding business on the Medium-Term Plan includes consideration of a Resolution which will be available this afternoon at around 14.30 hrs.

Returning then to the Programme of Work and Budget, I should announce that Tanzania and Angola have deposited written statements which will appear in the Verbatim Record. What I would now like to do is to turn to Tony Wade and to ask him, on behalf of the Secretariat, to complete the answers to points that were raised yesterday. I will then open the floor to others who wish to speak.

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

First of all, a response to a comment by one Member Nation, the United States of America, who argued that the TCP should be fully integrated into the Budget. This did not result in a lot of debate, but I should say that there is a problem here conceptually, in that TCP is, by its very nature, unprogrammed resources and demand-driven, in that it is utilized in response to requests from Member Nations.

So, it would be a very basic change to the whole concept of the Technical Cooperation Programme to try and programme it by the substantive programmes of the Organization. In effect,

what it would mean is we would have to guess, or to anticipate where the demand was coming between crops, livestock, natural resources, etc. I think it would be more to the disadvantage of the utility of that particular programme than to the advantage of the overall programme, to do that. So, I would have to say that I do not see how we can achieve or respond positively to that request without a very basic change to what TCP is.

The same delegate also raised the question concerning the central administrative units co-existing with MSUs in each department. MSUs are Management Support Units. This arose from the restructuring exercise through 1994-95-96-97; it was implemented in the 1996-97 Budget. Here, what we said was, as part of the decentralization concept, that the central Administrative Department should no longer be servicing the process of administration. That should be put out with the Department which wants the service, to bring the service point closer to the recipient of the service. At the same time, delegations were made to the Assistant Directors-General to allow them to make the administrative decisions that were necessary, within the constraints of the Financial Rules and the Regulations of the Organization and the procedures that were established.

The Administrative Department then became a sort of advisory service. It no longer processes the transactions but if there is a problem of interpretation of the rules, etc., the Personnel Officer that exists in AG Department can go back to their functional division, that is the Personnel Division, and ask for assistance in the interpretation of a particular issue.

Now, in effect, these MSUs were created by taking staff from two places. They took staff from the central units, and that you can see in PWB 1996-97. They took staff out of the divisions, because in many cases, divisions had one or two people working on budget and personnel-type matters, usually at the General Service level, at the actual divisional level. This was all brought together at the Departmental level and authority given to the Departments.

Now, there is a danger, of course, in that process of decentralizing from the central offices and bringing these staff up from the divisions that you increase rather than reduce the costs. The Director-General was particularly aware of that and was asking for reports all the time about what the consequences of the implementation were and, I am pleased to advise, that there was a net reduction. Before we started the exercise there were 214 posts involved in this sort of work. After the exercise, there were 170 posts, so there was a reduction of 44 posts through this consolidation of the administrative servicing capacity in the Departments, and that resulted in savings of US\$ 3.6 million per biennium, which is part of the savings I referred to yesterday.

Can I say that we have found the process to be rather successful. There was a lot of reluctance at first. It was felt that this may not work, but it has worked. We have now extended it to the Regional Offices so that they can also have the maximum level of delegation, in fact, the same level of delegation that an ADG has in Headquarters. Those are being implemented progressively at the current time.

The distinguished delegate of Italy asked some questions, and I must admit I answered one very badly last night. I would therefore like to repeat the answer. The particular question, the factual question concerned the elimination of the FAO/IPGRI Guidelines on Safe Germplasm Transfers. While it was a specific question, it also related to your fundamental question which was: "Have these reductions for Zero Nominal Growth impacted upon the essence of the programmes we are delivering?" In answer to the specific question, the Division says that really what it was doing here was saying: look, let these standards go through IPPC, the Guidelines do not have the same legislative weight and are not of the same internationally-recognized status". It is better to put the resources into supporting the IPPC Secretariat function, than it is to develop further Guidelines outside that function.

Looking at the other changes that have occurred, I think I have to answer it does not prevent us from delivering our fundamental Programme. On the other hand, it would be a lie to say it does not damage the Programme, it does. All of those things that you see listed in the outputs as either reduced or eliminated, are things that we cannot deliver under ZNG.

Now, I do not think that any of those will result in some massive dislocation in the services that FAO provides the international community, but I think it is also wrong to say that it does not have an effect. It does have an effect and we should recognize that. In fact, I think that I would echo Grenada's comment on this and that was that Zero Nominal Growth is a funny term, it sounds like nothing's happening. Zero Nominal Growth is a real reduction of 3.7 percent, and that is the context in which you should see it.

Mr Chairman, Peru sought certain information. The distinguished delegate is not here so I shall abbreviate my reply. He was interested in the savings that we had made in recent years, and suggested that the Secretariat produce a document on that. As it happens, I believe that we would be producing something on savings, but we will wait until we have got into the implementation of 1998-99. However, there is some good information in the Verbatim Record of the Council debate, and I will reference that again, that is CL 113/PV/2, and from page 15 onwards it describes savings totalling US\$ 79 million, or 12 percent of the base from which we started.

Peru also asked a rather difficult question which is: "What is the minimal level of resources needed to meet the normal performance of the Organization?" and then separately, "What is the level of resources needed to support the implementation of the Plan of Action arising from the World Food Summit?" I have to say the distinction between the two is not easy. FAO's work in support of the Summit is also part of its fundamental core activities, so to separate it is difficult. The question is a bit like the question of "how long is a piece of string". I would purport that you could double FAO's resources, and we still would not be able to meet the demand for our services, and I am talking about both normative and operational services. So I have great difficulty with the question.

The distinguished delegate of Peru also put the other question which is what is the correct balance between normative and operational activities. Again, very difficult, but I do believe that when we come to the Strategic Framework we will not be able to duck the issue. The issue of normative versus operational activities will be one of the key strategic issues that comes out of that exercise. Therefore, I think we will be addressing it in some way at that time; quite how, of course, it is a bit premature to say.

There was a comment from the Netherlands on behalf of the European Union, and it was a question regarding travel to which I did respond yesterday, but I have been asked for a clarification which I would like to give. The question that has been put to me is: "Why is the programme change, that is, the reduction in travel in 1998-99, so small? You are still decentralizing so you should still be getting the benefits of decentralization."

The delegate was picking up that fact that I said in 1996-97 we had a programme change of minus US\$ 3.6 million because of things like decentralization and the reduction in travel. This time I think we have only US\$ 250 000. The real reason is that all of the big decentralization actions that affect the Regular Programme occurred in 1996-97.

In 1996-97, we effectively completed the decentralization of the technical staff to the Technical Groups in the Regional Offices and to the multidisciplinary groups in the Sub-regional offices. With them went their travel budgets, and their travel budgets were reduced because they were travelling within the Region instead of internationally. Exactly the same story is true of the Policy Assistance Branches in the Regional Offices, they were also decentralized in 1996-97 and they are part of these savings that I have quoted.

The final stage of decentralization which you are seeing reflected in this document and which is currently being implemented is the decentralization of TCO, that is the Field Operations Division. Virtually all of the Field Operations Division will, in 1998, be out in the field, in the four Regional Offices. They too, also, have a lot of travel costs, but their travel costs are not in this Budget because they generally are travelling to the projects that they are supervising. What happens is that every time they are travelling, the cost is split between the projects that they are going to. That does not mean that the saving will not be made. The savings will be made, but you

will see it in the impact on performance against project budgets, rather than in the impact on performance in this Budget.

There were a lot of remarks on FAORs and I did respond to a certain extent last night, but I would like to say a little bit more, if you will allow me to do so. In particular, I do not think I responded satisfactorily to the cost of FAORs, although I did mention the reductions in posts in my response to the Council. I will give you that reference again so that anybody who wants to look it up can do so. It is CL 113/PV/2, and on page 16 it summarizes the savings in terms of posts. I would like to give you the dollars against those savings so that you know since the Budget of 1994-95, which reductions we have made.

The first is a saving of US\$ 8.2 million which was taken from the FAOR Budget by converting all International Programme Officers to National Professional Officers, and that is fully implemented.

The second is that over that period, we have reduced the number of General Service staff by 71 and that is worth US\$ 1.7 million. Finally, we have taken a number of other actions, the principal one being downgradings, particularly of the D-2s and D-1s, and that has saved US\$ 2.2 million. Cumulatively, from the 1994-95 Budget, through to the Budget that you have before you as ZRG, that is a total of US\$ 12.1 million which, on the base in 1994-95 of US\$ 72 million, is a reduction of 16.8 percent.

I draw your attention to that because while the Director-General finds it very difficult to respond to the requests of some Member Nations to reduce coverage, he is trying to respond to your requirement that this take up less of the Budget. That 16.8 percent reduction, compares to 12.9 percent in total savings, so you can see that this vote has taken a very heavy cut.

The second point which I did not address, which also came from the distinguished delegate of the Netherlands on behalf of the European Union, was that of integration with the UN Coordinator System. I would like to split my reply on this into two elements because they seem to get mixed up together.

One is whether FAO is fully supporting the UN Resident Coordinator System and the other one, is a rather practical thing, about common premises. On the first one, let there be absolutely no doubt, we are an integral part of the UN Country Team, and we work with the UN Country Team. In fact, in the follow-up to the Summit, we are working within the ACC Decisions on that. It is true, FAO is taking the lead, just as other Agencies take lead in their areas of competence, but we are working always within the Country Team, using the Resident Coordinator System.

As a matter of interest, FAO officers often act as Resident Coordinators. They are often the officer who replaces the Resident Coordinator when they are out of the country. Furthermore, FAO is cooperating with the System by nominating FAO staff as Resident Coordinators. At this stage, none have been appointed but we do support the concept and we will continue to recommend our best people to be Resident Coordinators and hope that at some stage, we will become part of the System in that sense as well.

Common premises is another issue altogether. I think we have to analyze the real situation before we blindly say that we should all be in the same building. Because, if you say that as a decision of the Conference, you will be imposing additional costs against our Budget and quite substantial additional costs.

Common premises have historically been more expensive than the arrangements FAO makes itself. I am not criticizing UNDP when I say that, I am simply stating the facts. We have cut the FAO Budget back so far that I can assure that if you visit any of our offices, you will see no sign of luxury, you will see very sparse arrangements. In fact, in the twelve we share with UN common premises, the average cost above what we could do against our own arrangements is 8.6 percent more. So, we are not wildly enthusiastic about running into more expensive

arrangements. However, that is relatively minor, one could live with that, if you felt that there was a tremendous functional gain.

The problem gets much more serious. FAO in fact has 54 percent of its Offices provided free by you, by the Governments, rent-free, usually utility-free as well. We estimate, if those Offices became common premises, most of which you have to pay for because very few of them are provided by the Government, then we would have to pay US\$ 2.7 million more per biennium.

I think I have responded to all the questions, if I have missed out one I apologize and would be happy to come back on anything that I have missed.

Shahid RASHID (Pakistan)

We have heard a number of statements on the subject and the very elaborate clarifications of the Secretariat given by Mr Wade. I would just like to make this statement essentially for the purposes of the record at this stage.

We are now towards the culmination of the debate on the Programme of Work and Budget for the Organization for 1998-99. We have been involved in this process throughout the year, and have expressed our opinion on numerous occasions. At this final stage of our deliberations we would like to reiterate that FAO has, time and again, proved that it is an indispensable institution and it is an institution which has as much relevance and need today as it had when it was established, with the noble aims and objectives of ensuring a world free from hunger. These objectives and goals have been reaffirmed from time to time, the latest reaffirmation having been made at the highest political level during the World Food Summit. The World Food Summit did not take place just as another of a series of Summits, it was not an end in itself. The World Food Summit, we view, as a defining moment, a moment which placed FAO firmly in the vanguard in the struggle to overcome hunger and malnutrition. At this time when we are deliberating the Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium -- the first one after the World Food Summit -- we cannot afford to betray the millions of hungry who have pinned their hopes on FAO. It is therefore more imperative than ever before that the membership should collectively ensure that the Organization is adequately equipped and sufficiently resourced to fulfil its mandate, to deliver its much needed services and assistance to the developing countries. The capacity of FAO was built over decades and needs to be strengthened, not eroded. The morale of its staff requires to be boosted, not dampened. Its mission has to be reinvigorated, not diluted and diminished.

Over the last few years, particularly since 1994, FAO has taken the lead in reforming itself, in restructuring and reinventing itself, with the very conscious goal of delivering more for less and to cut down waste and bring in efficiencies. The various measures taken have had beneficial effects. While reform is a continuing and ongoing process, we feel the time is also here to pause and take stock of what has been accomplished, to see how reform is working. We must put on hold any effort to continuously unravel the institutional fabric which is already stretched to its limits, under constant pressures to cut and slash. Further insistence on cuts will imperil the capacity and health of the Organization.

It is against the background of the reformer years, and in the context of the aftermath of the World Food Summit, that the Pakistan delegation has no hesitation in supporting the proposals of the Director-General for the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99. These proposals for the Zero Real Growth Budget Level are far short of our expectations, but we embraced these only in order to seek consensus approval and the broadest of agreement of the membership. The Budget Level, even at Zero Real Growth, is about the same as was approved four years ago. In other words, taking the 1994-95 budget, the proposals are actually for a Zero Nominal Growth. It is only with such a budget that the core programme of the Organization can be maintained and the specific programmes to which we gave a special emphasis, like the TCP and Special Programme for Food Security, can continue to make useful contributions to elevate the conditions of the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries. We therefore would strongly urge for a consensus approval

of the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99 at Zero Real Growth level, as proposed by the Director-General.

Ms Linda BEAULIEU (Canada)

My delegation would like, first of all, to thank Mr Wade for his presentation on the Programme of Work and Budget.

At the 112th Session of the Council, Member Nations requested the Director-General to present options for the Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99. Canada believes that the effort to present the scenario for the Zero Nominal Growth option was successful in that it captured not only the essential priorities of the Membership, but also the guidance provided by our Technical Committees. We need only refer to the excellent Australian intervention which listed those priority areas.

The Membership has expressed widely-divergent views on the question of resources. The reconciliation and bridging of these differences on the Budget Level must proceed in a manner that protects the viability of our Organization. We maintain that the Budget must take into account that Governments around the world are facing restraints on their expenditures. While appreciating that all international organizations are under pressure to deliver the key programmes for the Members, the Budget Level must also take account of Members' ability to pay. In framing the Budget, we understand the difficult challenges faced by FAO as we are also dealing with similar fiscal challenges in Canada. As a result, we have had to fundamentally review how we operate and carry on the business of Government with a greater focus on priorities, efficiencies and results. During this time, the budgets of multilateral organizations have been protected at the expense of other forms of Official Development Assistance.

Framing the Budget Level as a tool for reform is currently being carried out at the United Nations where, for the third biennium in a row, the UN Budget will be near the same level. To make this possible, the UN Secretary-General has recognized that administration, overhead and public information costs are too high and plans to decrease these types of expenditures by one-third by the year 2002. We believe that whilst similar efficiency gains have been achieved at the FAO, further improvements are still possible. Within the context of budgetary constraint, Canada believes that greater efficiency and broader impact can be achieved by improving cooperation and coordination among UN Development Organizations at the policy and operational levels. The impact of limited development resources could be greatly enhanced by moving towards more coordination at the field level.

I would also recall that Membership of FAO comes complete with both rights and obligations. Among the latter is the obligation to pay Assessed Contributions in full, on time and without conditions. If all Members honour this obligation, as do Canada and a few others, then FAO's capable cash managers would have the possibility of earning many millions in investment income. The effect of this could be to make available additional resources for priority programmes while respecting budget restraint. We urge all Member Nations to pay their Assessments in full and on time, so that the effectiveness of FAO can be assured. Canada's view is based upon an unremitting commitment to the multilateral system and on the honouring of all our obligations. FAO is an integral, important and vital part of that system.

Canada believes that the essential programmes of the FAO can be protected under the Zero Nominal Growth Budget Scenario. Canada has supported this Zero Nominal Growth option in the UN and the Specialized Agencies. We have applied this policy equitably to all organizations. Nevertheless, we have listened closely to the arguments of those which desire growth in the Organization's resources as well as those which are calling for restraint. We have also listened carefully to the arguments of the Director-General and the Secretariat concerning various budget levels. Our job here is to find a budget which allows the Organization to meet its priority activities, a budget which can be fully funded by the Membership and one which is in the best

long-term interests of the Organization. We look forward to a frank and constructive debate which will allow us to arrive at a Budget Level by consensus, a Budget which we can all support.

Rabi Bahadur BISTA (Nepal)

I would like to commend the work of the FAO in coming up with a very convincing Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1998-99.

Much has been said, with many I concur. Nevertheless, I would like to add some other things which were not touched upon, hopefully, by others.

The Programme of Work is well-focused in the areas of general policy and direction, technical and economic programmes, technical cooperation programmes, support services and common services. However, in my opinion, the adequacy of budgetary provision is yet to be seen by the projected results that will follow in the various areas. For the same reason I had stated earlier, during the discussion on the Medium-Term Plan, that the priority in forestry, watershed management and biodiversity conservation is ensuring that sustainable agricultural production is realized. Unless forestry is given fair attention, we may find agricultural production dwindled, watershed deteriorated, water management failed, soil erosion escalated, thereby increasing people's misery even further.

While saying that, I never meant to disregard the importance of food security, agriculture or fisheries for that matter. One of the earlier speakers well said that the farmer who knows exactly what to do, when to do it and why to do it, may not have the means to do it. Our efforts should be to strengthen his or her capability to carry out his or her normal work, of course with deeper knowledge and wider application. This is why, in my opinion, the requirements of the people, indigenous knowledge, information on the project area should be well incorporated or reflected in the Programme of Work. I question whether we have done this at all.

The basis for certain exercises should be people-oriented, gender-based, participatory and people-focused. Decentralization does not end up at certain Regional Offices but goes beyond, involving beneficiaries or stakeholders in the overall decision-making process.

May I also take this opportunity to request FAO not to implement programmes without the concurrence or investment of the respective Governments, whether under Programme of Work, TCP or under Trust Fund or, for that matter, under any collaborative arrangement be it through INGO or NGO. Let Member Nations' priority and requirements be the basis for programme formulation. Emphasis should be given to investment in activities rather than to expertise. What I mean to say is that it should be investment-oriented, rather than expertise-oriented.

Our yearly contribution becomes the basis for a staff recruitment that is harsh for a country like Nepal. Nepal now can only have two professionals in FAO. It is also high time that FAO consider secondment from governmental agencies for a fixed-term period. Therefore Nepal, although it would have liked an increased budgetary allocation, for obvious reasons under the circumstances, however supports the Zero Real Growth proposal.

L. BINARD (Belgique)

Monsieur le Président, la Belgique a pris la déclaration faite par les Pays-Bas au nom de l'Union européenne.

Elle attire l'attention du Secrétariat sur le Sous-Programme 2.2.2.6 WAICENT/FAO/INFO, Elément 07, paragraphes 566 et 567 (c'est à la page 194 de la version française) et met en garde l'Organisation de vouloir mettre en oeuvre une simplification des règles de préparation des données pour le système AGRIS afin de l'introduire dans le système WAICENT sur Internet. Actuellement, le système AGRIS est une banque de données inestimables regroupant des informations scientifiques et techniques dans le domaine agricole, de haute qualité et de consultation à un coût modique. Il est basé sur une coopération mondiale de 158 centres nationaux, deux régionaux et les institutions scientifiques internationales du CGIAR qui

préparent des notices très complètes pour chaque publication avec un résumé explicite. Ces données sont indexées par des mots clés tirés d'AGROVOC, thésaurus multilingue créé par la FAO. Mensuellement les données sont transmises au Centre AGRIS, à l'Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique de Vienne où une petite équipe contrôle les données et les introduit dans la banque de données AGRIS. Ces données sont incluses dans des CD-ROM qui sont périodiquement mis à jour et distribués gratuitement aux centres AGRIS nationaux, régionaux et internationaux où ils peuvent être consultés facilement, indéfiniment et à très bon compte. La simplification envisagée en éliminant de nombreux renseignements pertinents et la diminution des 140 codes d'AGROVOC à vingt amputeront très fortement la pertinence de la banque de données AGRIS qui actuellement est un outil indispensable à la recherche agronomique. Je demande que cette déclaration soit incluse dans le PV.

J.J. NEETESON (Netherlands)

On behalf of the European Community and its Member States, I would like to come back on the reaction by Mr Wade yesterday afternoon on a point raised in our intervention, the FAO Country Offices. We do appreciate Mr Wade's further commenting on the issue this morning but I still want to make our point clear.

As we understood it, Mr Wade's reaction essentially said that the number of Country Offices could not be reduced because so many countries asked for it. Consequently FAO would not have the mandate to do so. I must say that we do not follow this reasoning. In our view -- and this is pointed out in our statement -- FAO has got the mandate to work out objective criteria in which it could be decided which Offices have to be maintained or not.

Careful cost evaluation is always part of FAO's mandate. Integration, inter-UN Country Representation within the UN present Coordinator System is a path to follow. This is favoured by us, and this is in line with the on-going debate in New York on UN reform.

Reduction of costs through common or separate premises is only one aspect of this integration process.

Mohammad Saeed NOURI-NAEENI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)

I have carefully listened to several statements and debates in Plenary, Commission I and this Commission. While I have greatly enjoyed them, at the same time I was surprised. Surprised because in the Plenary our Ministers are talking favourably about solving the problems of humanity as a whole. They particularly emphasize the fight against hunger and malnutrition the world over and environmental control, creation of employment and income for the poor, and so on. One can say that they talk global. In fact, some see globalization as our destiny.

In Commission I, we have spent half our total time on the World Food Summit and its follow-up. The Commission reaffirmed the commitments to what was decided in the World Food Summit exactly one year ago in the very same building. The major commitment of each was to reduce the number of hungry people to half by the year 2015, that is, to help the 400 million existing hungry human beings to have access to sufficient and safe food and to prevent the current flow of hunger to be added to this mass. So we talked global in Commission I.

However, ironically when we come to the Red Room we pushed a brake, just like facing a red light. We no longer talked global. Here we spent hours and hours of our time to cut the biennial Budget of the largest and only Specialized Agricultural Organization of the UN System by something around US\$ 25 million, an amount most probably less than all the delegates together have spent to come here to Rome to participate in the FAO Conference. I hope this is not related to the colour of the room, otherwise I would recommend you Mr Chairman, to convene your meeting in the Green Room.

Related to ability of payment, on several occasions here in FAO we have approved assistance to countries which will suffer from the negative impact of implementation of the Uruguay Round

Agreements. On the hand, according to FAO the average annual gain from implementing the Agreement is more than US\$ 100 billion, that is US\$ 200 billion in two years. The difference between Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth scenario which has dominated our debate is around US\$ 25 million, that is less than one per US\$ 8 000 of this gain, all of which goes to exporting countries. So, if you are serious about helping developing countries, let us set aside one cent from each US\$ 80 the Uruguay Round gains and give it to FAO to be spent on technical assistance to agricultural sectors of developing countries. This is logical, on the basis that each dollar withheld from technical assistance to the agricultural sector of developing countries would not be saved; it definitely would be multiplied a hundred times and will be needed as food and emergency aid to the same countries. If we really believe in comparative advantage, let us assist developing countries with the help of experts from FAO in producing food, rather than giving them food aid.

While my delegation strongly believes in issues of efficiency saving and cost effectiveness, people like myself who are in daily contact with FAO clearly see that this Organization has reached its limits of savings and structural adjustments during the past four years. Any further push in this direction would lead to the decreased quality of services provided to Member Nations. We have already listened to Mr Hjort, the Deputy Director-General of FAO, when speaking at FAO Council a week ago, who after a long time of sincere service to this Organization honestly said that even a Zero Real Growth Budget is insufficient.

Regarding these facts, my delegation is of the strong belief that a zero real growth budget level for 1998-1999 is the minimum level acceptable and the last resort for this Organization.

Ms Janet F. BITEGEKO (Tanzania, United Republic of)

On behalf of the Tanzanian delegation, I would like to commend the Secretariat for the work done in producing a detailed Programme of Work and Budget for the biennium 1998-99. We also commend Mr Wade for his good presentation.

We acknowledge the coherence inherent in the document in line with the priorities established by the World Food Summit; however, initiatives to reduce by half the hungry and undernourished in the next decade may not be accomplished fully if the level of funding does not improve.

Today, 800 million people do not have enough access to food to meet their basic nutritional needs. Most of those people, whose population rate is ever-increasing, live in rural areas of developing countries. These people have very low incomes. The challenges before us therefore are whether we can produce enough food to feed the ever increasing population to ensure food accessibility to all. Moreover, can the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries produce enough food to meet their requirements? Again, how can we ensure effective linkage between agricultural production with economic and social development so as to reduce poverty incidences? Another challenge is related to sustainable agricultural production so as to ensure the environment is not degraded, but protected.

In the light of the declining in financial resources in FAO and the growing demands, priority setting and programme focusing are absolutely necessary for best returns. In this regard, my delegation supports the priorities set by FAO, especially under the Technical and Economic Programmes in the Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99. We strongly support the programmes that provide direct assistance to food and agricultural production and supply. We feel the Special Programme on Food Security, which has started in some countries (Low-Income and Food-Deficit), should be strengthened and replicated in more areas within those Countries, as well as in other countries. We also feel the Food and Agriculture Policy and Development Programme should be supported and strengthened. EMPRES, "Telefood" and Partnership Agreements are also very important and they should be strengthened.

Promotion of effective delivery by the rural communities of which women are the majority and facilitation of an enabling environment for their effective production through the 'Women and

Population' elements in the programme are supported. We also support advocacy of policies and legislations that empower communities, and more so the women and youth, in food security. My delegation would like to see fruitful actions in this areas in the next biennium.

In the fisheries programme, facilitation of implementation of the relevant articles of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing is an area of priority to ensure its contribution to food security.

With regard to forestry, we support international interventions spearheaded by FAO towards sustainable forest resources development highlighted in the Forestry Programme. Elements covering forest resources assessment, development of agro-forestry systems and capacity-building in the implementation of National Forest Plans are also envisaged to contribute towards realization of our goal in reducing hunger and undernourishment.

On Governance, we support the decentralization process being spearheaded by the Director-General in pursuance of cost reduction and improvement of the Organization's efficiency and delivery mechanism. My delegation feels that the Regional and Sub-regional Offices should be strengthened to enable them to respond to the requirements of Member Nations in respective regions. We also strongly feel that country Representative Offices have crucial roles. It is our opinion, as also expressed by the distinguished delegate from Guinea, that those offices could be made more efficient and less costly by recruiting able local experts.

In relation to the budget we support the zero real growth. We understand the proposed budget will not permit FAO to fulfil its mandate but under the zero real growth proposal most of the priority programme components will be taken on board.³

Kiala Kia MATEVA (Angola)

Monsieur le Président, ma délégation félicite la FAO pour le document bien élaboré, j'ai cité le Programme de travail et budget qui répond parfaitement à certaines préoccupations posées lors du Conseil de juin 1997. Ce document couvre toutes les activités de la FAO. Le Ministre de l'agriculture et du développement rural et chef de la délégation de l'Angola qui est intervenue le 11 novembre 1997 a été clair en disant que notre pays approuvait et appuyait le scénario 1, c'est-à-dire, la Croissance Réelle Zéro pour permettre à la FAO de s'acquitter de ses tâches habituelles et de celles que lui a confiées le Sommet mondial de l'alimentation. Cependant ma délégation a quelques préoccupations en ce qui concerne le document C 97/3-Sup.2.

En Angola, la pêche constitue un secteur économique important. Par conséquent, ma délégation attache une importance capitale aux activités de formation. Ceci est valable pour le Grand Programme 2.4: Forêts, c'est-à-dire, la suppression des ateliers nationaux sur le transfert de technologie pour la transformation du bois, les activités visant à renforcer les institutions forestières et la planification du secteur forestier.

Ma délégation regrette que depuis la 28ème session de la Conférence de la FAO on continue à considérer le Grand Programme: Forêts comme l'enfant malade des activités de la FAO. On ne cesse de réduire les fonds alloués à ce Grand programme.

Le Programme spécial pour la sécurité alimentaire est un Programme qui a été approuvé par le Conseil et la Conférence en 1995. Je ne voudrais pas ici rappeler son objectif puisqu'il est connu de tous. La phase pilote a commencé avec 15 pays, si mes souvenirs sont exacts. Les fonds alloués à ce Programme ne sont pas suffisants pour couvrir tous les 80 pays. Par conséquent, la Conférence devrait augmenter les fonds alloués à ce Programme au lieu de les réduire afin de permettre à la FAO de répondre positivement à la demande des pays.

En ce qui concerne les bureaux de représentation de la FAO dans les Pays membres, le document nous dit qu'il existe actuellement 75 bureaux de représentation de la FAO. Entretemps, le nombre de Pays membres de notre Organisation a augmenté. C'est pourquoi, ma délégation est

³ Statement inserted in the Verbatim Record on request.

d'avis que la FAO, pour mieux servir les Pays membres avec leurs spécificités, devrait avoir des Représentants dans ces pays tout en renforçant les Représentations régionales et sous-régionales.

Ma délégation se réjouit de la décision du Directeur général de la FAO sur la nouvelle formule qui est en vigueur depuis cette année, en application des décisions prises par la Conférence lors de sa 28ème session.

Enfin, je voudrais, Monsieur le Président, aborder le Programme qui tient beaucoup à coeur aux pays en développement. C'est le Programme de coopération technique. Ce Programme, comme il est dit au paragraphe 987, répond aux demandes d'assistance technique urgentes ou imprévues des Etats Membres, en étroite coopération avec les autres composantes du Programme ordinaire. Ma délégation exprime sa préoccupation et demande à ce que des fonds nécessaires et suffisants soient alloués.

Pour terminer, ma délégation appuie les délégations qui l'ont précédée, telles que celles du Sénégal, du Burkina Faso, de Madagascar et du Gabon.⁴

CHAIRMAN

I am intrigued by the notion that the colour of the room might have an effect on our deliberations.

What I now propose to do is to give the floor again to Mr Wade to deal with one or two points which have come up this morning, which I think require a Secretariat response, and I will then ask if delegations wish to add anything to that.

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

Very briefly. More as a comment than a response to a question -- because I do not think it was put as a question -- I note that Canada refers to the Track II Reform proposals of the Secretary General to reduce administrative costs by one-third which of course is not something we, in any way, would suggest he should not do. However, what we do not understand from the paperwork that we have on Track II Reform is how he calculated his starting point. In fact, if I remember correctly -- I do not have the document here -- he talks about the administrative cost of 25.6 percent and he describes what it covers. If you take the same items in our Budget it is about 18 percent. So I do not believe that we have perhaps the same extent of the problem that he is facing in taking over the UN.

The point I am making is that I think we have already made considerable progress down the same -- if you will pardon the expression -- "track". I am not saying that there is not room for further efficiency savings and I would like to add -- because maybe I was a little overheated last night -- I am also not saying we will not make further savings in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. We will but we just cannot yet, because we have got to make some rather fundamental changes in those areas before we can go any further, the fundamental change being the implementation of the new financial and administrative systems which are currently being developed.

In fact Mr Ruddy, who is the interim Director of Finance, made the comment to the Finance Committee that, "yes" he thought future savings were possible but it was the first occasion where he had been asked to produce the return on investment before anybody gave him the money to make the investment. There is a little bit of cynicism in that they feel that they are being asked to take the cuts before they have, in fact, done the work which would allow them to do so.

The distinguished delegate of Canada also made the comparison with the UN concerning their efforts to maintain their budget level. We are always very reluctant to go into comparisons because they are usually fraught with problems, but I would just mention that the United Nations in its 1996-97 Budget was one of two organizations that took a real nominal reduction and its real nominal reduction was 0.8 percent. FAO's real nominal reduction was 3.4 percent. FAO's Budget

⁴ Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.

now is lower than the budget in 1994-1995. So, in nominal terms, we are not talking about the same scale of reductions. I just think it is important that people are aware that there is a difference here.

I was very concerned by a comment from the distinguished delegate of Nepal, and perhaps we could take this up outside the meeting. I think I got the implication that there was a situation where FAO was doing work in Nepal without the specific approval of the Government, and I say that is totally against any policy we have. If you have a situation where we have in any way acted in that way, we should know about it and we will act upon it. We agree with your principle that we must work through the Governments.

The distinguished delegate of Belgium raised the issue of AGRIS/CARIS and the simplification there. I am concerned about that, and I can assure you that we will bring your point to the attention of the Inter-Departmental Working Group that deals with the policy issues surrounding WAICENT, of which AGRIS/CARIS has become part. This is chaired by the Deputy Director-General. I am at this moment drafting a note to him with a copy of your intervention so that we take the issue up. I cannot promise you an answer in accordance with what you are saying yourself because I do not know the technical issues, but I can assure you that it will receive proper attention.

I think I have said enough on FAORs so, on that basis, I will close.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you Mr Wade for those observations which are, as always very clear and helpful.

Rolf AKESSON (Sweden)

We actually have a comment to make about an answer that Mr Wade gave yesterday. If it is agreeable to you perhaps I could take it up now.

It deals with the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping System and the Expert Meeting that is going to take place a few weeks from now. We heard that an impressive number of other Agencies and Bodies had been invited. We appreciate that very much and we hope that they will all not only come to the meeting, but will also be prepared to cooperate constructively in the meeting as well as in the process of monitoring the global food insecurity situation.

However, we did not hear of any invitation to the organization which is responsible for the two most significant factors determining food security, namely wages and employment. That organization is the ILO, the International Labour Organization. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that nowadays there is impressive evidence which shows that, in the past, sharp and extensive drops in food security have been caused not by a drop in production, but by a loss of purchasing power which is determined mainly by wages and employment.

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

I do not have an answer to that and I will definitely draw it to the attention of the Assistant Director-General who is responsible.

The meeting rose at 11.10 hours.

La séance est levée à 11 h 10.

Se levanta la sesión a las 11.10 horas.

II. ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE ORGANIZATION (continued)**II. ACTIVITES ET PROGRAMMES DE L'ORGANISATION** (suite)**II. ACTIVIDADES Y PROGRAMAS DE LA ORGANIZACION** (continuación)**14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003** (continued) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)**14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003** (suite) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)**14. Plan a Plazo Medio, 1998-2003** (continuación) (C 97/9; C 97/LIM/10)**CHAIRMAN**

We are meeting to resume our discussion of two Agenda Items. The first one is the Medium-Term Plan and associated issues, that is to say, Agenda Item 14, which we adjourned during the course of Monday.

Having dealt with that, I would like to resume our discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget, with my own summing-up of the debate so far.

As you all know, a Resolution has been tabled in connection with Agenda Item 14, the Medium-Term Plan. The paper reference is C 97/LIM/36. The title of the Draft Resolution is "Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project".

What I propose to do is to attempt my summing-up of our discussion of this Agenda Item first, by way of recalling where we got to when we adjourned the discussion on Monday, and then to turn to the Draft Resolution.

I will begin with my summing-up.

This is the summing-up of a debate in which 30 delegations took the floor. I drew from that the following points.

The present Medium-Term Plan, that is to say document C 97/9, which is substantially rewritten each biennium, takes account of the conclusions of the World Food Summit. A large number of interventions endorsed the document. They underlined the balanced presentation of priorities and expressed appreciation for the focus on sustainable food security.

Other interventions pointed out shortcomings in the Plan, and said that the Plan fell some way short of natural expectations for a document of this kind.

I think it is right to conclude from that, that the time is ripe for FAO Governing Bodies to review the present arrangements and, in particular, the scope for long- and medium-term planning in the Organization. As you know, discussion in the Council last June invited the Secretariat to submit proposals on that score.

I think the discussion we had also re-emphasized the feeling expressed at earlier meetings of the Governing Bodies, that there was some scope for rationalizing and simplifying the overall programme budget process.

As you know, a new programming model has been pilot-tested in the Programme of Work and Budget. This is the, by now well-known, Programme 2.1.1, Natural Resources.

We also have the benefit of the analysis of proposals for a revised Programme Budget Process from the Programme and Finance Committees, the conclusions of which were largely endorsed by the Council. The relevant document is C 97/LIM/20.

The recommendations to which I draw your attention are as follows.

First of all, the formulation of a longer-term Strategic Framework.

Secondly, a modified approach to the formulation of the Medium-Term Plan and the programme and budget documents. In particular, the new style Medium-Term Plan would essentially

illustrate the context and the objectives in the new model. The Programme of Work and Budget would concentrate on the biennial budgetary implications. It would be, to a much greater extent, a document about the Budget rather than about the Programme.

The end result of that, to use a phrase that Mr Wade has used on a number of occasions, would be a better integrated and more fully-articulated family of Programme documents.

I think there is widespread agreement to dispense with the Outline Programme of Work and Budget and with a Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees early in the Conference years.

There was also, I believe, very widespread support for the proposition that the development of the Strategic Framework should be based on the widest possible inter-governmental consideration.

I conclude that the Commission generally endorsed the present version of the Medium-Term Plan, noting that it would be the last one based on current arrangements, and welcomed and endorsed the steps that were in train to develop a new Strategic Framework and to make the associated changes to the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget.

May I ask whether the Commission is content that that summing-up captures the points that need to be made?

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

I think, in terms of the current Medium-Term Plan document, you have correctly identified that there were certainly a large number endorsing but there were a number of others who pointed out shortcomings. Also, that this is likely to be the last Medium-Term Plan in its current format.

I am wondering whether, in order to try and reconcile the differences between those who felt that there were a number of shortcomings and those who endorsed, and the fact that this is the last Plan, in fact it may be more appropriate, rather than generally endorsing the current Medium-Term Plan, as you noted, to simply note the current Medium-Term Plan and recognize that it is likely to be the last in the process.

I think that the Council itself similarly noted, rather than endorsed, the Medium-Term Plan.

CHAIRMAN

The proposal from Australia is that the Medium-Term Plan, document C 97/9, should be “noted”, rather than endorsed.

Does anyone have any difficulty with that proposition?

I should say that, in discussing this subject, we were talking about two things. We were talking about the substance of the current Medium-Term Plan, which is a document about what the Organization is going to do, and we were talking at quite considerable length and, I believe, very productively about the process of producing its successor in the context of a set of documents, starting with the Strategic Framework and ending with the Programme of Work and Budget.

I think it is important to bear that distinction in mind.

If I may, I will repeat my question. Would anyone have difficulties with the proposal by Australia that we should “note”, rather than endorse, document C 97/9? I myself have no difficulties with it.

I see that no one is asking for the floor. We will therefore “note” it.

Luigi FONTANA-GIUSTI (Italy)

I will certainly endorse, because I prefer endorsed to “noted”, because “noted” is such a neutral verb. A lot of delegations expressed approval of that, so there was no major objection to the endorsement of the document. You can perhaps utilize some wording such as “the large majority

endorsed”, but you cannot just remain neutral and say “noted”, which is something that is really the minimum of minimums. After such a long discussion, just to “note” the document does not seem to be an adequate word.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

I too wish to speak, and to speak on behalf of the Near East Group.

We already said we are willing to adopt this Medium-Term Plan, as Italy has said. I believe that most countries -- and there have been 30 speakers on that Item, and therefore 80 percent of participants, 30 delegates -- asked that we adopt the Plan. Therefore, how can we just “take note” of the Plan at this stage, when so large a number of delegates asked that we adopt it.

I suggest that we do.

Algirdas ZEMAITIS (Lithuania)

On behalf of Lithuania, I would support what Italy and Libya just said.

CHAIRMAN

Are there any other comments on this point?

I have to say that I would very much prefer to move the discussion on into more productive areas. Can I ask the representative of Australia whether he would have very serious problems with endorsement, rather than noting?

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

No, it is not a serious problem. It is simply a reflection of the discussion.

Therefore, your summing-up of “generally endorsed the current Medium-Term Plan” would probably have to suffice for me.

CHAIRMAN

I am grateful.

The Drafting Committee will give some attention to this and, no doubt, will come up with a satisfactory solution. Whether they do or not, we can make a judgement on when their Report comes to us, tomorrow evening.

Having reached this point, I would now like to turn the Draft Resolution, the so-called “FAO 2000 Resolution”.

This is sponsored by the European Community and its Member States, and no doubt the Netherlands would wish to take the floor to introduce the Resolution.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

I think this is a very important issue. I will be very brief on this issue because the Resolution speaks for itself.

To be very clear what is aimed at with this Resolution, the European Union would like to further strengthen the FAO 2000 Project, and we should work on the basis of the work which has already been done by the Director-General.

We think it is very important to involve the full membership of this Organization in this process, because it should lead this Organization into the next millennium. We think that the process should be accelerated because it is so very important for the future of this Organization. We think also that we should not only have a Strategic Framework, but we should develop a Strategic Vision, including a Mission Statement for the Organization, a set of Core Strategic Objectives and an Implementation Programme.

Furthermore, let there be no doubt about it, that the formulation of this Strategic Vision should be done within the framework of existing structures of this Organization. We think it should be a full participatory process, as I said before, involving not only the Secretariat but also involving the full Membership of FAO.

Let me be also very clear that, while we are working within the existing structures of this Organization, we do not think this Resolution has any financial consequences for the Programme Budget. Of course, we discussed, in our Commission, different possibilities about how we should deal with the Strategic Vision but we try to get as many opinions as possible of colleagues in this room on board, so we speak about existing structures and not setting up new institutional structures.

Of course, I think for this Organization, which is working so closely with other organizations and NGOs, it is also very important to involve those organizations and those Stakeholders, especially NGOs.

I hope that this Resolution can get the support of this Commission.

Hirotsugu AMAMIYA (Japan)

It is not easy for us to make a full evaluation as to the new proposal from the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union.

My delegation has not completed its careful reading of this Draft Resolution. I just barely read it through.

Therefore, my statement today is of a very, very preliminary nature.

The first point I would like to make is that I am not convinced that we need to launch or initiate such a deliberation process of philosophical arguments, which would definitely involve all the Member Nations concerned, as well as the Secretariat.

We now share the product of the long preparatory process that preceded the World Food Summit. There is the Rome Declaration and the Plan of Action. Every possible avenue to be explored by individual Governments and FAO to achieve our common objectives is listed in those documents. We need to recognize that, once this proposed deliberation process starts, it would entail the participation of a wide range of Stakeholders and a lot of inputs from the Secretariat, absorbing various resources from the parties concerned.

It is very difficult to reach a conclusion on this matter, right on the spot. This is not an issue to be decided over a short period. I have a couple of questions regarding this Draft Resolution.

What mechanism is envisaged in the framework of existing structures and what is meant by a full participatory process in the framework of existing structures?

J.P. HOOGVEEN (Netherlands)

I am pleased to give a direct reaction, and answers, to the two questions made by my colleague of Japan.

What mechanisms do we foresee with this Resolution? We see that, of course, the development of a Strategic Vision will be partly done in the Committees of Programme and Finance. But, of course, we all know that not all the Members of this Organization are Members of the Programme and Finance Committees. Therefore, when we speak about participatory process, we think that all Members of this Organization should be involved. I believe, the Committee on World Food Security should and can play, a very important role in the formulation of a Strategic Vision. That is the second part, or second element, of this mechanism.

When we speak about the Committee on World Food Security, and we have of course a lot of experience with that Committee, when we look at the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit, which I think was a very successful process.

In that process, also, the NGOs and other Stakeholders were involved, and that is what we mean with the full participatory process within existing structures. We do not have to invent or build new structures. We can work through the existing Bodies of this Organization, especially through, for example, the Committee on World Food Security.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

As a Bureau Member of the Committee on World Food Security and also, a Bureau Member who was very involved in the processes during 1996, I would need some clarification, from the EU's statement regarding the use of the CFS. A great deal of our work done last year was, in fact, in four *ad hoc* groups which met. They certainly operated under the umbrella of the CFS.

I am concerned that the CFS, at the moment, has a very difficult Agenda facing it, particularly, the May meeting of 1998, where the meeting will be attempting to make the first conclusions and do some work on further questionnaires to try and understand the work being done by Member Governments, civil society and international organizations. Although I think it is very important that we do strive, to develop a Strategic Vision for this Organization, I would not want that Strategic Vision developed at the cost of the work in the CFS, that has got so important a role, in terms of not being the inter-governmental focus for the FAO 2000 Project. It is the inter-governmental focus for the follow-up to the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

I think there is a distinction. The FAO 2000 Project does not equate to the World Food Summit Plan of Action. The Plan of Action is certainly an important part of it, but it is not the entire part. So, while I am anxious to support the principles and the thrust behind this Resolution, I think it is one that the Programme and Finance Committees have worked very hard on. The Secretariat has worked very hard on. I am still unclear about, in particular, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 and exactly how the elements are going to be wound in.

This brings me to another point, in general, about Draft Resolutions. We have seen, and we will be seeing more coming in, at extremely short notice -- and I do agree with my Japanese colleague -- and I hope that in future all Members can have greater opportunity to assess Draft Resolution matters in a timely fashion.

That being said, I am supportive of the principle of this Project but I would still like some further clarification from the EU about how they see the effects on the current efforts of the CFS and what impact that might have on its capacity to follow-through on its very clear Agenda and very clear Mandate that came out of the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

CHAIRMAN

I note your support for the principles and thrust behind the Resolution. Your concern about the process by which it arrived in front of this Commission and your concerns whether the CFS is the right vehicle to take this process forward.

Canada has asked for the floor. May I ask, Madame, whether you wish to pick up these points or whether you want to take the debate into a new area?

You will pick up these points. Thank you very much. Canada, you have the floor.

Ms Susan MILLS (Canada)

I think that the points raised by the delegate from Australia are very serious points, particularly, with regard to the Committee on World Food Security and the important task that it has before it, particularly in the on-coming meeting in 1998. Certainly, for the first few years of its work it has its hands full with a very serious and heavy Agenda, in following-up in the immediate term and setting-up in the mechanisms for the follow-up to the World Food Summit.

Therefore, I would seriously question myself about the use of the Committee on World Food Security, as a mechanism, to carry out the task that is laid out in C 97/LIM/36. Again, Canada would certainly agree with Australia as regards the principles and the thrust, particularly with the

desire to accelerate the process to support the work being done in house, on developing the Strategic Vision Mission Statement and Strategic Objectives.

However, we feel strongly that work within the framework of the CFS on this is not acceptable. We do wish to have some kind of timeline, i.e. an endpoint indicated in this. If it is an issue to do with acceleration, what did the European Union have in mind in preparing this Resolution?

Sra. María E. JIMENEZ de MOCHI ONORI (El Salvador)

Con relación a este Proyecto de Resolución, nuestra delegación comparte algunas de las dudas que acaba de expresar el delegado de Australia. Nos gustaría, antes de poder indicar si lo compartimos o no, poder discutirlo con nuestro grupo. Yo quisiera solicitar de parte de la delegación de los Países Bajos una aclaración: en el numeral segundo, se plantea solicitar al Director General que acelere el proceso que conduzca a la elaboración de una Misión Estratégica de la que ya aquí se ha hablado, incluyendo una Declaración del Cometido de la Organización.

Quisiera que se me ampliara un poco más qué implica esa Declaración del Cometido de la Organización.

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

Agradecemos a la Unión Europea por la presentación de este Proyecto de Resolución cuyo tema fue ampliamente debatido en el Tema del Plan a Plazo Medio. Señor Presidente, al igual que mi colega y amiga del Salvador, tenemos algunas dudas sobre este Proyecto de Resolución y sí nos gustaría tener el tiempo para discutirlo, dado que es un Tema -como nuestra delegación lo señaló en su momento- de gran trascendencia, nos gustaría verlo en detalle, por lo menos mi delegación es la primera vez que tiene acceso a este Proyecto de Resolución.

Yo quisiera referirme al párrafo primero y cuarto resolutivo; sobre el primero resolutivo se habla de la necesidad de fortalecer a la FAO y de hacer intervenir tanto a Miembros de la FAO como a actores de la sociedad civil. Aquí se están poniendo en un mismo plano dos entidades, que como tenemos entendido, tienen un rango muy diferente en esta Organización; Estados Miembros que tienen una representación plena en la sociedad civil, que desde luego damos la bienvenida, pero dentro de su nivel y dentro de su propio status.

Nos gustaría aclarar en este Proyecto de Resolución y, vinculado con esto, también encontramos un cierto tipo de contradicción. Esto es una reacción inicial, desde luego, que el primer resolutivo fuera todavía una parte preambular, porque el propio verbo que lo inicia es el típico de una parte preambular. Porque la misma situación se aborda en el cuarto resolutivo, que dice: "...estimule la intervención...". Una reacción inicial sería: "...estimule el aporte de todos los interesados...". Pero, vuelvo a repetir, esta es una reacción inicial, y al igual que mi colega de El Salvador nos gustaría tener una discusión más detallada dentro de los grupos regionales, dada la trascendencia de esta iniciativa.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

First of all I would like to thank the European Union on their initiative in preparing this Draft Resolution.

However, my delegation shares the views expressed by our colleague from Australia. We also endorse their proposals.

Since this Draft Resolution has just been distributed, we need time to submit this Draft Resolution to our Groups and, therefore, to my Group, the Near East Group, before we can have a say on it. We need some time to examine the text.

We also note that it contains some contradictions. There are some inconsistencies in paragraph 1, where we read that all the Members of FAO and of civil society are involved. Now, we are involved in all the Bodies of the Organization, and we are the decision-makers.

In paragraph 4, it encourages the involvement of all Stakeholders, especially NGOs and the private sector. It is true that the latter have an important role, but only through Member Nations.

Therefore, to sum-up, we need some more time to study this Draft Resolution in our Group, the Near East Group.

Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)

On behalf of the Group of 77, I would like to mention that we are supplementing the positions of El Salvador and Libya on their proposals to postpone the discussions of this issue.

There are certain contradictions here that we find require more debate. This, basically, hinges on the development of the Mission Statement because it would simply imply that the Mission Statement, which means the goals of FAO set in 1945, are no longer valid at this point in time. So, we would like a critical analysis, whether those goals are still valid, for the development of such a Mission Statement.

There also seems to be some potential misinterpretation in paragraph 4, which encourages the development of all the Stakeholders, and so on and so forth, especially when it comes to the portion on other international organizations. There had been some debate whether, in fact, the development of this Strategic Vision should be in-house or given to outside consultants.

We do not want any big decisions on that point, and for those reasons we would very much appreciate it if we can postpone the deliberations on this, pending further studies and comments by other Groups.

CHAIRMAN

Are there any other comments or observations before I give the floor to the Netherlands?

Abdou Karim DIOUF (Sénégal)

Nous venons de recevoir ce texte de Projet de résolution présenté par l'Union européenne et nous voudrions dire qu'à l'instar des Philippines qui ont parlé au nom du Groupe des 77, nous n'avons pas eu, non plus, le temps de l'étudier à fond. Par contre, ce que nous pouvons faire comme première observation, à la lecture rapide de l'alinéa 5 de ce projet, c'est qu'il est demandé au Directeur général de présenter en novembre 1998 un rapport intérimaire approprié, et nous nous demandons si cela est possible, si le délai qui est imparti dans ce Projet de résolution pourra être respecté, dans la mesure où on ne sait pas exactement, en fait, à moins que le Secrétariat ne nous éclaire là-dessus, si les Organes qui devraient étudier ce texte se réuniront avant cette date.

Eduardo Jorge LIMA BARROS SILVA (Cap-Vert)

Monsieur le Président, nous aussi nous voulons nous rallier aux interventions des Philippines, du Mexique, du Sénégal et d'autres, pour dire que nous n'avons pas pu, parce qu'on vient de recevoir ce Projet de résolution, analyser les détails et surtout les implications d'une telle Résolution. Donc, on aurait préféré avoir un peu plus de temps pour pouvoir voir toutes les implications qui ressortent des points pour une première analyse du point 1, comme du point 2, comme du point 4.

Il nous reste, et cela est une question que nous voulions poser au Secrétariat, le même doute que le Sénégal de savoir si le point 5 est faisable dans les délais qui sont ici présentés. Mais de toutes façons, même avec cette explication, on aurait préféré avoir un peu plus de temps pour faire une analyse plus substantielle de cette Résolution.

CHAIRMAN

I will ask Mr Wade, on behalf of the Secretariat, to reply to the point that has just been made by two speakers, and I will then give the floor back to the Netherlands.

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

The question being put to me, I think, concerns the timing of the process. We always saw the process as consisting of an interactive series of steps by which the Strategic Framework would be gradually improved through consultation with the Governing Bodies at their various levels. It seems to us that this document, at some stage or other, has to go through the Programme and Finance Committees, it has to go through the Technical Committees of the Council, and I would have thought not just the CFS, but COAG, COFI and COFO for at least their elements of the work, through Council itself and eventually through the Conference in 1999.

So, in a sense, no you cannot have the final Strategic Framework for the Council in November 1998, but yes, something will exist at that stage. There will be some progress made and it will not be completed until November 1999 when the Conference finally adopts such a Framework.

I am not sure that I have answered the question. We did not see it as having an end date that soon.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

I will be fairly brief because I think, as previous speakers have asked, that they should be given more time to study this Resolution, and, of course, I apologize for the late hour that we submitted it to this Commission.

To be clear about the Committee on World Food Security, I mentioned that Committee as one of the examples of how we could work and how we could develop this Strategic Vision. Of course the other committees should be involved. The Secretariat already mentioned COFO, COFI and COAG, but, of course, I see also an important role for the Committee on World Food Security, and it should be included in the development of the Strategic Vision, but also of course the other committees.

It is up to the committees how they will deal with this development and if they create, for example, some kind of *ad hoc* groups or something like what has been done for the World Food Summit Plan of Action and can be done, of course, also for the development of this Strategic Vision.

Secondly, in paragraph 5 there was a timeline but in point 5 we do not state that November 1998 is the end of this process. It is only that we see, when we speak about accelerating the process, that there will be a Progress Report for the Council in November 1998 and, of course, we foresee an end of this process by adopting a Vision or Report in the Conference of 1999. I think it is important when we speak about involving the full Membership, or the Members of FAO, that there is a Progress Report so that they can give their opinion about progress made on this project.

I think I will not make any further remarks for the moment and give the delegations time to study this Resolution. I am ready to answer any questions here in this Commission tomorrow, or informally outside of this Room.

CHAIRMAN

Are there other comments? In that case I conclude as follows: There is a degree of interest in this Resolution and what lies behind it. There are, nevertheless, a number of hesitations. Several Members have asked for further time to study and reflect on what is proposed. I therefore suggest, for the Commission's agreement, that we should adjourn our consideration of this Resolution tonight, and return to it when we resume our deliberations tomorrow afternoon. Would that meet with general assent?

Thank you. In that case we will come back to this tomorrow afternoon. I am sure that delegations will have noted the offer of the Netherlands to discuss, informally as well as formally, on the floor of the Commission.

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 (continued) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 (suite) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 (continuación) (C 97/3; C 97/3-Corr.1-Rev.1; C 97/3-Sup.1; C 97/3-Sup.2; C 97/3-Sup.2-Corr.1; C 97/LIM/3; C 97/LIM/11)

CHAIRMAN

I would like to inform you that Gabon has deposited a written statement for the Verbatim Record.

Mme Ivone ALVES DIAS DA GRACA (Gabon)

La délégation gabonaise voudrait avant tout remercier Monsieur Wade pour sa présentation du Programme de travail et budget 1998-99. Nous remercions également le Secrétariat de la FAO, ainsi que son Directeur général, pour le travail accompli.

Nous faisons nôtre la déclaration faite par le Représentant du Sénégal au nom du Groupe Africain et appuyons également celles du Burkina Faso, de Madagascar, d'Afrique du Sud et du Pérou.

Comme ces délégations, ainsi que tant d'autres qui nous ont précédé, nous estimons que l'option d'un niveau de budget à Croissance Réelle Zéro représente le minimum des ressources indispensables à la FAO pour la poursuite pleine et entière de son action, et pour la mise en oeuvre du suivi du Sommet mondial de l'alimentation, et en conséquence, l'appuyons.

En ce qui concerne le Programme de travail, nous tenons à réitérer notre appui au Programme de coopération technique, au Programme spécial pour la sécurité alimentaire et au Programme EMPRES.

Enfin, nous formulons le souhait de voir se renforcer la présence de la FAO sur le terrain: à travers les bureaux régionaux ou nationaux, en accord avec la décentralisation mise en place, et sur la base des mesures prises depuis 1994 pour réduire les coûts et améliorer l'efficacité des Représentations de la FAO, entre autres l'utilisation des cadres nationaux.⁵

CHAIRMAN

I now propose, as the last Item of business today, to start drawing to a conclusion our discussion on the Programme of Work and Budget. The issue of the Budget Level remains unsettled, and that is something to which we will have to return tomorrow. I think it would be useful, at this stage, to attempt to sum up the points that have been made in a very long and rich discussion about the Programme of Work and Budget.

Starting with the format and approach of the document, there was general appreciation of the format of the document which many delegations said was a considerable improvement on its predecessors. There was a particular welcome for the integrated presentation of income, something which reflects recommendations by the Programme and Finance Committees and the Council.

We noted that the PWB proposals have been the subject of very extensive consultation since January this year, and that the advice of the Technical Committees meeting earlier this year had been appropriately reflected. We noted, also that the document presented two main scenarios, one of Zero Real Growth, one of Zero Nominal Growth and that a supplement had been produced dealing with a scenario Below Zero Nominal Growth.

In our discussion of the document, attention was drawn to the need for an appropriate balance between the Organization's normative and operational activities. We noted the use of a provisional exchange rate of Lire 1 690 to the US dollar, as requested by the Council. There was general endorsement of a New Programming Model as represented by the presentation for

⁵ Texte reçu avec demande d'insertion au procès-verbal.

Programme 2.1.1, Natural Resources. A lot was said on the issue of Decentralized Offices of FAO. Many Members drew attention to the importance of the Decentralization Policy and to the significance of the Regional, Sub-regional and Country Offices, but there were other Members who felt that a review of these Offices was warranted.

On the important question of administrative streamlining and savings, many Members stressed progress that already had been made and the substantial savings that had been delivered. There was a caution against searching for additional savings for their own sake. Others, however, urged vigorous attention to the pursuit of further savings and streamlining within the Organization.

So far as the priorities of the substantive Programme were concerned, there were many references by individual Members to its use in matters of interest to their own country or region. Highlighted in those interventions were: the role of forestry, including forest resource assessment, and a sustainable management of forest resources; fisheries, in particular the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and aquaculture; biodiversity and the conservation of plant and animal genetic resources; the International Plant Protection Convention and Codex, and their contribution to the facilitation of trade; the management of natural resources, especially the conservation and enhancement of water resources; work in support of the control of pests and diseases, including catalytic action by FAO and EMPRES; a new sub-programme mandated by the World Food Summit (FIVIMS); women in development; policy advice, especially in the context of the follow-up to the Uruguay Round; and the Technical Cooperation Programme and the Special Programme for Food Security. The report of the discussion will, I am sure, do proper justice to those topics. I should remind you that detailed comments made by delegations will appear in the Verbatim Records.

As far as the budget level is concerned, the discussion focused essentially on the two main options in the document, that is to say, Zero Real Growth and Zero Nominal Growth, and there was a restatement of positions which were well-known and which had been rehearsed in earlier discussions of this subject. The largest group of Members was in favour of Real Growth, pointing out the extensive requirements for assistance in countries and the need to implement the commitments of the World Food Summit. Those who spoke in that sense were prepared to contemplate the Zero Real Growth option in a spirit of compromise. There were objections to the substantial reduction of outputs implied by the Zero Nominal Growth scenario.

Other Members spoke strongly in favour of the Zero Nominal Growth, and they argued that that Budget Level would still allow the Organization to pursue its mandate and to implement its Programme in an effective manner. They pointed to the current pressures to contain public expenditure in many Member Nations.

One Member spoke specifically in support of ZNG or below. There were some hints that there might be flexibility on the part of some delegations, subject to further cuts being made in non-programme areas.

One Member maintained its Government's view that the Budget Level should be set in the range of US\$ 610-615 million.

That is how I sum up the lengthy and, as I said, rich debate on this subject. May I ask if you are content with that summing-up, have I adequately captured the points that were made?

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

Thank you, Mr Chairman, for your very lucid summing-up which I believe faithfully reflects the discussions which went on in this very room. I should like to ask you, Mr Chairman, and through you the Secretariat, a certain point. You have said that the vast majority of speakers and countries, and I should like to know the number of the speakers who took part in that particular discussion. You said that the vast majority supported the ZRG option and that regarding the second scenario, that is the ZNG, there were those who supported it but the majority said that this would certainly affect the economic and technical programmes. This was emphasized by the

Programme and Finance Committees in their meetings, and particularly the Programme Committee.

CHAIRMAN

I cannot give you an answer to your question, I am afraid. There were fifty-five speakers on this subject. We would have to analyze the Verbatim Record in order to tell you how many spoke in favour of which scenario. I would be happy to provide that information tomorrow.

Are there any other points? In that case I propose to adjourn our debate on this Item until tomorrow when we shall have in front of us the report of the Drafting Committee dealing with it and when, I hope very much, it will be possible to say something about the Budget Level.

I intend to reconvene Commission II to address those issues at 17.00 hrs tomorrow afternoon in the Red Room. We shall meet again at 17.00 hrs tomorrow afternoon to resume our discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget and to consider the draft Report.

The meeting rose at 18.50 hours.

La séance est levée à 18 h 50.

Se levanta la sesión a las 18.50 horas.

CHAIRMAN

I intend that this should be the final meeting of Commission II. Explaining what we still have to deal with and how we are going to deal with it is slightly complicated. The position is as follows. On today's Order of the Day we have two unconcluded Agenda Items: first of all Item 14, the Medium-Term Plan, and secondly, Item 15, the Programme of Work and Budget. We also have to adopt the Report. We cannot conclude here deliberations on the Programme of Work and Budget, because the issue of the Budget Level has yet to be settled. That is being taken forward in active negotiations which are being conducted informally. It will not realistically be possible to settle that while this Commission is in session, and I am therefore proposing that the Budget Resolution, with a figure in it, should go straight to Plenary for the vote tomorrow afternoon.

I am intending to complete the rest of this Commission's business this evening, leaving aside the Resolution and the figure. I hope tonight we can adopt the Report, with that exception, so that the Report can go to Plenary for adoption next week.

The way I propose to order the business this evening is as follows: the discussion on the Medium-Term Plan, that is to say Agenda Item 14, has been kept open so that we can consider the FAO 2000 Resolution put forward by the European Union. I understand that the Resolution needs some further work and needs some further discussion and that a Contact Group has been formed, or has formed itself, and that the Contact Group has offered to go away now and very speedily produce a Resolution of the outstanding issues and to bring the Resolution back for debate on the floor. What I therefore propose is that the Contact Group, the composition of which I will announce in a moment, should immediately adjourn and should come back as quickly as possible, I hope within half an hour, and we will then take up the substantive debate on that Agenda Item.

The Contact Group consists of Mexico, the acting Presidency of the European Union, Japan, Libya, Senegal, Canada, Australia and the Philippines. I would be grateful if it would begin its work as soon as possible and return quickly, I hope very much within half an hour.

In the meantime, we will move on to the Adoption of the Report. Let me explain how we are going to deal with this because this is in itself complicated. We have available text of the Report relating to three items, that is to say, Part I, which is document C 97/II/REP/1 which deals with the activities and programmes of the Organization's Review of Statutory Bodies. The second part of the Report is C 97/II/REP/2, Draft Report of Commission II, Part II, which is the Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97. We also have available, but cannot for the moment look at, Part III of the Report, C 97/II/REP/3, which deals with the Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003. The reason why we cannot get round to that immediately is because we need to deal with the FAO 2000 Resolution first.

Later this evening, at 20.00 hours, we will have Part IV of the Report, dealing with the Programme of Work and Budget. So to recapitulate, what we are going to turn to next is Part I of the Report and then Part II. We hope we will then be able to move on to debate the FAO 2000 Resolution and the associated Report, which is Part III, and we will then see where we have got to in relation to Part IV, Programme of Work and Budget, which has yet to appear.

I hope I have made my proposed way of proceeding clear. If so, I will now give the floor to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee.

**ADOPTION OF REPORT
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT
APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME**

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Presidente, Comité de Redacción)

El Comité de Redacción de esta Comisión II se reunió en dos largas sesiones en el día de ayer y en el día de hoy. Pasamos aproximadamente diez horas a examinar los textos. No fueron los primeros textos que voy a presentar los que nos llevaron más tiempo; quiero destacar, en particular, la cooperación estrecha que hubo entre las distintas delegaciones, en particular las delegaciones que asistieron durante estas diez horas, el Grupo de los 77, la OECD, China y todos los grupos que asistieron, tuvieron una actitud permanentemente cooperativa, lo que nos permitió terminar con este programa de trabajo que nos habíamos establecido.

Ya que usted tuvo a bien adelantar que los REP/3, REP/4 y REP/5 serán repartidos luego y que el Grupo de Contacto fue a tratar la Resolución que presentó la Unión Europea, me voy a referir exclusivamente a los REP/1 y REP/2, Documentos C 97/II/REP/1 y luego C 97/II/REP/2.

Estos Proyectos de Informe de la Comisión en la parte primera, que se refieren a las actividades y programas de la Organización, fueron examinados ya por el 113° período de sesiones del Consejo, que expresó su reconocimiento por el informe que el Grupo Especial de Contacto sobre los Órganos Estatutarios se había creado y tomó en cuenta los Proyectos de Resolución. Este examen de los Órganos Estatutarios se realizó en la conciencia de la necesidad de seguir acrecentando la eficiencia de la Organización y el ejercicio de su gobierno en una época de dificultades financieras que todos conocemos y para asegurar procedimientos de trabajo que tengan una mayor flexibilidad y una orientación práctica para todos los países participantes.

En consecuencia este Proyecto de Resolución que está frente a ustedes y que el Consejo ya aprobó, tiene la decisión de proponer que algunos órganos de alcance mundial que dependen de los órganos auxiliares sean eliminados, se supriman, pide al Director General que celebre consultas con las organizaciones que se enumeran en el Apéndice C, que al mismo tiempo pide a la Comisión del Codex Alimentarius que prosiga el examen de la utilidad de los órganos del Apéndice D.

Quiero indicarle que yo no he visto ni hemos visto, en particular en el Grupo de Contacto, ningún inconveniente que se presentara con la Parte I de este Informe. En cuanto al REP/2, que es el Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, yo no sé si usted desea señor Presidente que yo haga la presentación en este momento o prefiere pasar a la aprobación de esta Primera Parte y luego hacer la presentación de la Segunda.

En este entendido yo he finalizado con la presentación de la Parte I que la someto a su consideración y a la consideración de todos los Estados Miembros aquí presentes.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much Chairman of the Drafting Committee for a very clear explanation of the process and the outcome.

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART I (C 97/II/REP/1)
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - PREMIERE PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/1)
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISIÓN II - PARTE I (C 97/II/REP/1)

22. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters
22. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques
22. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos

22.1 Review of FAO Statutory Bodies (including Resolution .../97) (paras 1-7)
22.1 Examen des organes statutaires de la FAO (y compris la Résolution .../97) (par 1-7)
22.1 Examen de los Órganos Estatutarios de la FAO (incluida la Resolución .../97) (párr 1-7)

CHAIRMAN

I would like to propose that we adopt Part I of the Report *en bloc*. May I ask you to adopt Part I *en bloc*. Are we content?

Draft Report of Commission II, Part I (including Resolution), was adopted
Projet de rapport de la Commission II, première partie (y compris la résolution), est adopté
El proyecto de informe de la Comisión II, Parte I (incluida la resolución), es aprobado

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART II (C 97/II/REP/2)
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - DEUXIEME PARTIE (C 97/II/REP/2)
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISIÓN II - PARTE II (C 97/II/REP/2)

13. Programme Evaluation Report 1996-97 (paras 1-7)
13. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 1996-97 (par 1-7)
13. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 1996-97 (párr 1-7)

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Presidente, Comité de Redacción)

El Tema 13, Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa 1996-97, mereció también una consideración rápida por parte del Comité de Redacción, que examinó el Informe de acuerdo con las observaciones y las recomendaciones que había hecho el Consejo relativas al Informe de Evaluación del Programa. Se apreciaron las mejoras introducidas en el Informe que presentaban un contenido más claro y la incorporación de respuestas de los directores a cada uno de los programas de evaluación y la introducción de una evaluación resumida en los voluminosos documentos que ustedes tuvieron frente a ustedes.

La Conferencia - ustedes recordarán el debate que existió en esta sala pero destacó la necesidad de un análisis, de un nuevo análisis - aprobó el Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa 1996-97. Resultó interesante el debate que se realizó en el Comité de Redacción para una plena integración de la información de esta evaluación dentro del marco del proceso de planificación.

La necesidad de asegurar una cobertura de los programas de operaciones de la FAO entró en la consideración de esto y la introducción de mejoras progresivas, de acuerdo a lo propuesto por los Órganos Estatutarios de esta Organización.

El Informe es tan breve que yo he hablado más de lo que está escrito en el mismo, de manera que recomiendo su aprobación.

CHAIRMAN

I propose that we adopt Part II of the Report *en bloc*. Are we content?

Draft Report of Commission II, Part II, was adopted
Le projet de rapport de la Commission II, deuxième partie, est adopté
El proyecto de informe de la Comisión II, Parte II, es aprobado.

CHAIRMAN

My apologies, a lot of people have been working very hard to ensure that we can proceed as swiftly as possible and in an orderly manner, but it has not proved very easy to resolve the issues.

What I propose to do is to suspend this Session until 21.00 hrs. We need until 21.00 hrs to translate and reproduce the new text of the Resolution, FAO 2000, which has been produced by the Contact Group. It is also necessary that the draft of the Report, relating to the Medium-Term Plan should be adapted to reflect the Resolution. The proposal, therefore, is that Plenary is suspended until 21.00 hrs. It will resume then, to consider the Draft Resolution which will be available in all languages, to consider the Medium-Term Plan Draft Report, which by then will also be available and to consider the Programme of Work and Budget, the text of which you already have.

The Drafting Committee will meet immediately in the Lebanon Room.

I trust that is clear.

The meeting was suspended from 18.30 to 21.50 hours.

La séance est suspendue de 18 h 30 à 21 h 50.

Se suspende la sesión de las 18.30 horas a las 21.50 horas.

SEVENTH REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE (C 97/CG/1)

SEPTIEME RAPPORT DU COMITE DES RESOLUTIONS (C 97/CG/1)

SEPTIMO INFORME DEL COMITÉ DE RESOLUCIONES (C 97/CG/1)

Draft Resolution: Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project (C 97/CG/1)

Projet de résolution: Renforcement du projet FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1)

Proyecto de Resolución: Fortalecimiento del proyecto FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1)

CHAIRMAN

Thank you for your forbearance and patience. We now return to our substantive business.

We are going to look, first of all, at the revised Resolution, the title of which is: "Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project" and we will then turn to the Draft Report, the Medium-Term Plan which is document C 97/II/REP/3. You should all have a copy of the new draft of the Resolution. This is document C 97/CG/1 and the heading is: "Seventh Report of the Resolutions Committee, Commission II", Item 14, and the text of the Draft Resolution is on page 3 of that document.

I will turn, in a moment, to someone who has been one of the midwives assisting this difficult birth but perhaps, I could begin by posing a couple of questions on which I think it would be helpful to have clarification.

The two questions which occur to me are as follows.

First of all, I think we need to have a very clear understanding as to what is meant by the term "Strategic Vision", which is used at the top of page 4 of the Resolution? Secondly, I think it would be helpful to know what this Resolution will do that would not be done under the process which is currently in train and which we discussed earlier in the week. In other words, what difference would this Resolution make to the action which is already contemplated and which has been discussed in Committees and by the Council?

Having posed those two questions, may I turn to the Netherlands as one of the, perhaps the principle, certainly one of the midwives.

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

I think it would be wise to explain the words "Strategic Vision" and to say something about the process. I think they were the main two questions you asked for answers.

First of all, the “Strategic Vision”. What do we mean by that? What we are aiming at is a long-term approach for this Organization, so a Strategic Vision is a long-term vision for the Organization, how it will operate in the next biennium. It has everything to do with what the Organization should become to play a very very important part in the international community. Aiming at the goals set, of course, for example, in the World Food Summit Plan of Action. One of the elements of a Strategic Vision, is the key things which the Organization needs to do in the future so that it includes strategic objectives. What will be the core tasks of this Organization in the next biennium, of course, based on the mandate which is given to this Organization.

The third element is, of course, an implementation programme. How are we going to implement that long-term vision or long term approach? What is it not, Mr Chairman? It has nothing to do with the Mandate of this Organization. Its Role and its Mandate remain unchanged.

Mr Chairman, about the process. We are aiming at a full participatory process. What do we mean by that? We aim at an involvement of the full Membership of this Organization, not only the Secretariat, but the full Membership of the Organization. Furthermore, we think that it is fairly important to get contributions from all stakeholders and civil society. That is what we are aiming at for the process.

Now, what is the relation with the proposals of the Director-General, mentioned in the document entitled “Strategic Framework”? It has to be built upon the already existing work done by this Organization, it has to further it. Of course, the question can be raised; why do we not use the word “Strategic Framework”? We think that word can be confusing because, on one part it is the title of a document but on the other, ‘framework’ is also the environment in which this Organization must operate, and the environment in which the process should take place to formulate a Strategic Vision and of course, it is not a new word. This word has often been used for not only private, but also public and international organizations within the UN System.

CHAIRMAN

Any other comments from sponsors, members of the Contact Group, intended to elucidate the issue so we have the best possible understanding of what we are talking about.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

Not so much to elucidate the issues but just to explain a little bit how the Draft Resolution arrived before you all. The text reflects some very rapid concerted work by a small Group drawn from the different regions of the Membership, and it represents a consensus within that small Group.

I would just point out for everybody that there is in fact a typographical error in the fourth preambular paragraph which begins “Recognizing the need to further strengthen...”. At the end of that preambular paragraph, the words after “the full membership of FAO...” that is “and actors of civil society” should, in fact, not appear. It had been agreed that those words would be deleted, but in our haste there has been the accidental inclusion. I can assure you that those words were agreed for deletion by the Group. The text otherwise is as reflected by consensus of that small Working Group.

CHAIRMAN

May I just clarify the deletion. Is it all words after “FAO”?

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

What I perhaps will do is just read that preambular paragraph to confirm for everybody. We are talking about the fourth preambular paragraph, which should read “Recognizing the need to further strengthen the FAO 2000 Project and to involve the full Membership of FAO”.

Julian Alexis THOMAS (South Africa)

Just a question of clarification, following the explanation we have had.

Following the second question that you posed about what does this add to what is already anticipated in terms of the strategic planning process that we discussed, we understood that the Strategic Framework, which was the longer-term period that would be dealt with from a planning point of view, would cover a more or less 15-year period, and that would include a “Strategic Vision”. Does this mean that this “Strategic Vision” is a vision beyond those 15 years we talked about? We heard words about “into the next millennium”, so is this a “Vision” beyond the sort of “Vision” that would be contained in a Strategic Framework, or is it the same thing?

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

To be clear, when I said everything to do with the long-term vision for the Organization, we mean a vision for FAO in the Twenty-first Century, and it goes, of course, beyond only the timeframe of 10 or 15 years. It is a long-term vision, a long-term approach for the Organization.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

At the beginning, I wanted to ask the same question posed by the distinguished representative of South Africa, but I realize that it is quite late and I have listened to the explanations given by the distinguished delegate from the Netherlands.

However, I would like to say, with regard to the Draft Resolution that is in front of me in Arabic, that I can see that there are some mistakes in Arabic and it does not reflect what is in English. For example, in paragraph 1, “Requests the Director-General to further the process leading to the development of a Strategic Vision for the FAO for the years 2000-2015, including *inter alia* a set of core strategic ...”, then it is not very clear. I guess there should be some corrections to this paragraph.

In paragraph 3, the speaker is mentioning some mistakes in Arabic. Instead of “making reference”, we should say “should recognize”, instead of “should refer to”.

In paragraph 5, “Requests the Director-General to prepare an appropriate progress report for consideration ...”, there is another mistake in Arabic grammar and I hope that the Secretariat will take it into account.

Inge NORDANG (Norway)

I am just seeking some clarification on point 3. As it reads now, it says “that the prime responsibility of the CFS is to support the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action”.

I just want to seek a clarification, perhaps from the Secretariat, whether this is the wording of the Basic Texts for the mandate of the CFS, or whether we are introducing some new language here on interpretation of what the work of the CFS really is.

CHAIRMAN

An answer to that question is being sought and will be provided shortly.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

In relation to the last point by Norway, I would just raise that Objective 7.3 of the World Food Summit Plan of Action has given the CFS a very expansive role in ensuring monitoring of the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

The wording in paragraph 3 was an attempt to reflect a very fundamental part of ensuring that the Plan of Action has effect and impact so that, although it may not be exactly the text in the Basic Texts of the Organization, I would suggest that Objective 7.3 now is of crucial importance to all of us, in what the CFS will be doing.

CHAIRMAN

I am indebted to the Deputy Director-General for suggesting that, in that paragraph, the word “support” in the second line -- “responsibility of the CFS is to support the implementation” -- should better read “should monitor the implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action”.

The proposal is to delete the word “support” and substitute the word “monitor”.

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

First of all, I would like to signal that my delegation strongly supports the thrust of this Resolution.

However, we believe that there are some elements which can be improved because, frankly speaking, my delegation also very much welcomes the proposal of the Secretariat in response to initiatives taken in the Programme Committee, the proposal which was explained to us on Saturday and Monday by Mr Wade.

Therefore, I believe it is important, in order not to create confusion, to use all these terms which are crucial to this exercise and to put them in proper relation.

Therefore, I would like to propose some language changes in this Resolution.

Just going to the last point, I fully support what you said and what Mr Hjort had said. The role of CFS is obviously to monitor and, therefore, I would just keep this paragraph 3, “Decides further that this process should recognize that one of the main responsibilities ...”. It is not the only one. One of the main responsibilities of the CFS is to monitor. I believe that would be the right thing.

With your agreement, allow me to just come back to some other points a little bit earlier.

In the third preambular paragraph, I would propose the following. As the Netherlands has said, the term “Strategic Framework” is used both for the title of a document and, on the other hand, we also understand it in the sense that it is the environment in which FAO operates. To be clearer -- in this paragraph, we introduce some of the documents. Let them, therefore, call it documents, so that there is no doubt on this.

So it is “Welcoming the proposals of the Director-General to strengthen the strategic management of FAO, especially the formulation of a ..”, we do not need to have the word “long-term”, but just say “Strategic Framework document ...”. That is one of the documents, and consequently modify it to read “Medium-Term Plan document and Programme of Work and Budget document ...”.

These are three documents which we will have in the future and we very much support the proposals of the Secretariat going in this direction. Let us use the terms which we have as they appear, otherwise we will have confusion. The “long-term” is not necessary because that is terminology.

I would like to turn to the second page, the first operative paragraph. I would propose two or three changes there, to make this not as a counter exercise, but as supportive of the exercise of the Secretariat, with some additional proposals.

“Requests the Director-General ...” and to insert there “in the context of the preparation of the Strategic Framework document ...”. I will read it again. After “Requests the Director-General, in the context of the preparation of the Strategic Framework document, to further the process leading to the development of a Strategic Vision ...” -- that would be one of the products which would be developed within this document -- “... Strategic Vision for FAO for the years 2000-2015 ...”. I understand we want the Strategic Vision for 15 years, not for more, and I hope that we do not have confusion about this. At least that is what I read here in the text.

Let us remind what we have in the document JM/1. Let us not question it, and say therefore “... and of a mission statement ...” -- that is another product -- “... with a set of core strategic objectives ...” and then add “*comma* as well as of an implementation programme.”

We therefore have all the pieces together.

I have already referred to the proposed changes in paragraph 3, I do not have to revert back to this.

CHAIRMAN

I confess I am unclear about your second proposed change to operative paragraph 1. Could you kindly re-explain where “Mission Statement” should appear?

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

My first proposal would be after “Requests the Director-General” to add “in the context of the preparation of the Strategic Framework document ...”. Then the sentence would read “... to further the process leading to the development of a Strategic Vision for the FAO for the years 2000-2015 ...” Here, I would delete the words “including *inter alia*” and replace them by “and of a Mission Statement with a ...”, then I continue with what we have, “a set of core strategic objectives”, then I add a comma and I add “as well as”, “of” instead of “and”, “... an implementation programme.”.

We would have “Strategic Vision”, “Mission Statement”, “implementation programme”. The Mission Statement would be more defined in this set of core strategic objectives.

CHAIRMAN

Let me recapitulate the changes which you are proposing.

In the third preambular paragraph, the one beginning “Welcoming”, you are suggesting that, at the end of the second line, the words “long-term” should be deleted; that after “Strategic Framework”, the word “document” should be inserted; that after “modified Medium-Term Plan”, the word “document” should be inserted; and that after “Programme of Work and Budget”, the word “document” should be inserted.

As I understand it, you propose those changes to make it clear that these words, “Strategic Framework”, “Medium-Term Plan”, “Programme of Work and Budget”, refer to documents which are already in prospect, in a process that is underway.

Over the page, operative paragraph 1, you are proposing it should now read as follows:

“Requests the Director-General, in the context of the preparation of the Strategic Framework document, to further the process leading to the development of the Strategic Vision for the FAO for the years 2000-2015, and of a Mission Statement with a set of core of strategic objectives, as well as of an implementation programme.”

In operative paragraph 3, you indicated a problem, but did not propose a drafting solution. Can I suggest that the point you are making could be catered for by deleting “the” at the end of the first line, and inserting “a”?

The text would read: “... should recognize that a prime responsibility of the CFS ...”.

Switzerland is indicating that he is content with that recapitulation.

Before I move on, could I turn to one of the sponsors of this Resolution to ask whether they are content with those proposed amendments.

Would a sponsor care to speak?

José ROBLES AGUILAR (México)

Queríamos comentar la propuesta que ha hecho el distinguido delegado de Suiza en relación al primer párrafo resolutivo. Queríamos señalar sobre esto que fue precisamente la parte más controvertida del texto. Llegamos a un consenso tratando de evitar una referencia explícita a lo que en inglés se llama *Mission Statement* que en español se traduce como una Declaración de

Mandato. Yo instaría al distinguido delegado de Suiza que no insistiera en esta parte porque fue la que creó más problemas a varios países; en aras del consenso, se dejó esta formulación que señala, entre otras cosas, que esta redacción deja abierta la posibilidad de discutir posteriormente algunos elementos, sino prácticamente se volvería al punto del que se inicia todo este debate por lo que respecta a este párrafo.

CHAIRMAN

May I ask the representative of Switzerland whether, in the spirit of compromise, he could live with the text as tabled?

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

Yes, I got some words about this difficulty which seems to have arrived when the term "Mission Statement" was discussed in the Contact Group, to which my delegation did not belong.

I would like to remind you that the Mission Statement is one of the very important products which is supposed to be prepared in the context of the Secretariat proposal, a product to which my delegation would lend its full support. There seems to have been some translation problems regarding this. I assume that when translators consult the document JM/I, there should be no difficulty to find the proper term for Mission Statement in this context.

Why I believe that it is important not to avoid reference to this -- I mean obviously one could try to go over this problem -- my delegation, by putting this term back in, would like to underline the broad support we give to the Secretariat proposal. We believe that this Mission Statement is an important element in this proposal. We would like to support this element. We are just saying that, in the Secretariat proposal, there is only one additional element which we would like to see proposed in this Resolution and that is "Strategic Vision". We believe this is a very useful addition. We, therefore, want to support this.

CHAIRMAN

To just be clear, may I repeat my question? Could you live with the text as tabled?

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

Do you understand me well? Are you proposing that the text remain as tabled with no changes at all? I would have some difficulties because I find the text not clear enough and, since my delegation seeks to have clarity on the relation between what is proposed here and the Secretariat's proposals, we feel it is important that this relation is clarified. The amendments which my delegation has made were in this spirit, to contribute to clarifying this. Therefore, we would like to ask you to consider these proposals of amendments.

CHAIRMAN

A number of other delegations has asked for the floor. May I ask whether the Netherlands, as one of the sponsors, is prepared to address the point just made by Switzerland, because I would like to deal with it before passing on?

Would the Netherlands be content?

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

I would like to make an appeal to my colleague of Switzerland not to insist on introducing, in this Resolution, the words "Mission Statement". It became very clear in the discussions in the Contact Group that the use of these words could lead to confusion. Why? Because, I think in the translated text in -- at least Spanish, but perhaps also French -- it looks like it is also referring to the Mandate of this Organization. I have to be clear. This Resolution is not about the Mandate of this Organization. It works on the basis of the existing mandate of this Organization and to overcome that problem, I would like to ask, because it was a part of the consensus in the Contact

Group not to insist on introducing in this Resolution, the words “Mission Statement” but to go along with the words “including in the area”.

CHAIRMAN

If I may, I will ask Switzerland to reflect on that observation for the moment. We will park it and come back to it.

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Argentina)

Desde el principio mi delegación tuvo muchas dudas con este Proyecto de Resolución. Muchas dudas porque nosotros no estamos satisfechos con las explicaciones sobre el término “Visión Estratégica”, que se nos informa que es un proceso a largo plazo que va más allá del año 2015, cuando en realidad muchos otros delegados que intervinieron aquí precisaron que el proceso va más acá del año 2015. Esta es la primera contradicción que yo veo en el curso de estos debates.

La segunda explicación que se nos dio es que tienen que implicar a todos los miembros de la sociedad. Esto ya lo tenemos, señor Presidente, en la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación; está en los compromisos que nosotros tenemos. Por otra parte, se nos explica que tiene que contener una participación de todos los miembros de la sociedad civil y, al mismo tiempo, en el cuarto párrafo preambular se ha eliminado la palabra “los actores de la sociedad civil”. Tercera contradicción.

Se habla de los objetivos estratégicos que han sido definidos ya en diversas Conferencias de la FAO y que han sido, también, definidos en la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación los objetivos estratégicos de la FAO. Cuarta contradicción.

Se habla también de la ejecución de este Programa. Tenemos compromisos para la ejecución de todos los programas de la FAO en la Cumbre, en el Consejo y en las posteriores intervenciones. Quinta contradicción.

Se habló del largo término y el largo término tampoco puede ser contemplado. Señor Presidente, yo no estoy en contra de la presentación de un Proyecto de Resolución. Yo lo que creo es que este Proyecto de Resolución necesita un mayor detalle, necesita un mayor debate, necesita que le demos instrucciones claras a la Secretaría para saber que es lo que va a tener que hacer. Necesita, también, que sepamos si esto va a tener repercusiones presupuestarias y si va a tener repercusiones presupuestarias ¿cuáles van a ser ellas? ¿Cuánto va a costar y qué podremos decidir sobre bases reales y concretas? Yo creo, señor Presidente, que sería bueno que los autores de este Proyecto nos presentaran probablemente en el próximo Consejo o en alguna de las reuniones próximas un detalle adecuado, claro, preciso y concreto de lo que significa cada uno de los temas que se encuentran en esta Resolución. Porque cuando hablamos, también, en el párrafo 4, de invitar a los actores interesados a las organizaciones e instituciones, ésto también existe ya en la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación.

En consecuencia yo quiero evitar la repetición. Quiero que aprobemos cosas sobre las cuales tengamos una gran claridad y quiero, al mismo tiempo, que ya que estamos tratando el presupuesto de manera clara y ajustada, tengamos muy en claro cuales van a ser las tareas de la Secretaría que tienen repercusiones presupuestarias sobre su propio personal y, si hubiera otras, cuales van a ser ellas. Como consecuencia de eso, señor Presidente y a menos que tengamos algún tipo de desarrollo ulterior, mi delegación no estará en condiciones de sumarse a ningún consenso en este texto y en estas condiciones, puesto que entiende que este documento tiene que ser más desarrollado, mejor explicado, más centrado, presupuestado y razonablemente presentado.

Yohannes TENSUE (Eritrea)

If we look to the background of this Resolution, it is clearly explained in the first paragraph, which says “the commitment in the Rome Declaration on World Food Security and the World

Food Summit Plan of Action to reduce the number of undernourished people to half their present level no later than 2015”, and the second paragraph also of the Quebec Declaration.

In response to this, the Director-General has initiated or set “Horizon 2015” and he set a Plan of Work for 43 Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries. There was a panel discussion for each country in general and then for each country, country by country, in front of the main international financial institutions like the World Bank, African Development Bank and other financial institutions.

So this has already been done last March, June and July. That was very specific and this has already been initiated. The heading of that was the “Strategy for Horizon 2015”, but this one also just came with a new heading, “Strategic Vision”. That one was very specific but this becomes very ambiguous, as in the introduction it talks about the World Food Summit and the Declaration made. The Director-General’s approach was very specific to that, to reduce the number of hungry people by fifty percent by 2015. His approach was to concentrate on the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, and he did by referring to some of the documents or reports of each country and sending the opinion for comment from each Low-Income Food-Deficit Country. I remember I participated in the Panel Discussion and there were other countries which also wanted to include not only the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries, but the Low-Income countries, as well. They found this approach very interesting. So, he was expanding to Low-Income Countries, as well.

If this is about the World Food Summit, the approach has already been initiated; but if we leave it only just for the Strategy 2015, it becomes very ambiguous. In the introduction it talks about the World Food Summit and the approach has already been established by the Director-General, how he should implement it. He has identified the constraints, the investment requirements and he set the priority as a Pilot Phase and as an Expansion Phase. The approach was very good, and he has already started it. If this one starts as if nothing has been done, it complicates the matter unless the person who tabled this Resolution can give us some clarifications.

CHAIRMAN

I believe, if I may say so with due respect, that you are operating under a misapprehension and that a clear distinction can be made between what is envisaged here, and what you have just been talking about. You are, of course, absolutely right to invite that point to be clarified and when, in a moment, I turn back to one of the sponsors of this Resolution, I would ask that the distinction should be made very clear.

Mansour Mabrouk AL SEGHAYER (Libya) (Original language Arabic)

Yesterday, we asked that this Resolution be submitted to the Regional Groups. We did indeed study this issue in the Near East Region, and we were of the view that certain amendments were necessary.

The Contact Group has done its task and certain amendments have been introduced, but our colleague from Switzerland has raised an issue on which we were not in agreement from the very outset, concerning the definition of the actual “Mission” of the Organization. This is a point which gives rise to fundamental differences of view. If our colleague from Switzerland insists on the need for this reference to the “Mission”, then we, in our turn, would insist that we could not accept such an amendment.

I agree with my colleague from Mexico and what he just said. I would like to make an appeal to our colleague from Switzerland and invite him to withdraw his amendment, which I just referred to, as regards to the paragraph which would define the Organization’s “Mission”.

CHAIRMAN

Our Swiss colleague is already reflecting on that issue and I am sure will take full account of the points you have just made.

Paul PAREDES PORTELLA (Perú)

Para comenzar, me parece que el debate está saliendo de su curso. Llevamos más de una hora tratando ese asunto. Voy a tratar de ver si se encuentra una salida a esto, pero si no, simplemente por procedimiento busquemos otra solución. Mi propuesta es la siguiente: desde el punto de vista de mi delegación, concordamos con las contribuciones que ha hecho Suiza al Proyecto original, quitando obviamente esta referencia al *Mission Statement*, que en realidad es una propuesta de la Secretaría, ni siquiera de Suiza. Acompaño esta propuesta porque me parece que aclara el contenido y el alcance del Proyecto. No obstante, si hubiera divergencias u oposiciones de algunas delegaciones, quizás convendría que detuviéramos la discusión en este Punto de inmediato para no perder más tiempo; se reúnan pequeños Grupos, escogidos por el Presidente y resuelvan la cuestión, si es posible esta noche. Si no, con cargo a tener esto resuelto mañana a primera hora. Entretanto, señor Presidente, podríamos seguir trabajando en los textos que están pendientes. Otra vez, señor Presidente, me permito reiterar mi pregunta: si los señores delegados acompañarían el texto con las atenciones de Suiza, eliminado *Mission Statement*, o no. De no ser el caso vamos a pequeños Grupos de Trabajo, y pasemos a aprobar el resto de los documentos.

CHAIRMAN

For reasons which I think are understandable, and I think will be widely shared, I am very reluctant to suspend these proceedings again. We will, if you agree, keep that issue parked for the moment, and we will come back to it.

Mme Hariba YAHIA-CHERIF (Algérie)

On peut reprendre la discussion tout à l'heure mais moi, dans un premier jet, j'ai quelques réflexions; j'avoue que je n'ai pas étudié à fond, et dans notre Groupe aussi africain on n'a pas étudié le Projet de résolution, mais, comme Monsieur l'Ambassadeur d'Argentine l'a dit, ce Projet pêche par trop d'imprécisions. Il est vague, notamment au paragraphe 2, où on nous dit que les Etats doivent s'appliquer pour reformuler la Vision de stratégie du Secrétariat et nous savons que le Secrétariat, Monsieur le Président, ne fait que traduire les orientations que les Etats Membres de la FAO formulent à travers les Organes de l'Organisation, c'est-à-dire la Conférence, les Comités et en passant par le Conseil. Or, au paragraphe 2 on nous demande, aux Etats de la FAO, en plus du Secrétariat, d'être partie prenante pour formuler et élaborer la Vision stratégique du Projet 2000. Comment les Etats Membres pourront-ils encore travailler pour formuler ces stratégies pour le projet de FAO 2000, sinon par les rouages cités plus haut? En plus, pour le paragraphe 4, on parle d'acteurs intéressés et cela est très vague. Qui sont ces acteurs intéressés, et les institutions internationales? Qui sont ces institutions internationales? Celles qui sont intéressées ou celles qui ne sont pas impliquées?

Igor MARINCEK (Switzerland)

We all, and no doubt everybody, have listened very carefully to the proposals of the Secretariat, which were presented by Mr Wade last Saturday and Monday. He explained what the Secretariat intended to do on the basis of the initiative which was taken by the Programme Committee and the Secretariat, and it was then supported by the Council in last June. The Secretariat brought forward a very good proposal which found very strong support in the Programme Committee. This has been endorsed by the Council and I hope we will not go contrary to this. We have had a very constructive process, let us not forget that.

In this constructive process we have given our blessing to the project for a "Strategic Framework" document, which will play its role in a set of documents which we know a little bit more already.

So, this is something new. I would compare this, basically, to what the World Bank has done recently. The World Bank has adopted for itself, has developed a document which is "Rural

Development from Region to Action”. That is their kind of “Strategic Framework” document for rural development.

I believe that the expectations we have is that we would have something similar for FAO. We are very content with the proposals which we find in the Secretariat. So let us not go against these proposals, let us support these proposals. Let us give them the blessing after the Council, also of the Conference.

We believe there are two main reasons to have a Resolution on this. First of all, this is a very important issue for the future of FAO. We want FAO to have, in future, more influence. We believe that in the long past it had lots of influence. We want to move it more to influence, and whoever has influence will also stand in a better position for the competition of resources. We believe that this is an important element for the future of FAO.

What will the future look like? The future will be a future of an emerging network of partnerships and alliances. In the context of such a future, FAO will not have to work on the full weight of its mandate. It will be able to concentrate on a Mission which should not be at all in contradiction with the Mandate, but should give the priorities of action within this Mandate. There is no contradiction in it, and that is the way we understood the proposals of the Secretariat. The term “Mission Statement” is a proposal the Secretariat has made. Let us not go away from it. It has the blessing of the Council, let us stop there.

Regarding the cost of this exercise, this is a project which is already in the Programme of the Secretariat -- the Secretariat has worked on it, so there is nothing new. So we expect, and we had received the explanations that this is obviously in this process, there should be no additional cost for it. So we do not see any difficulty with that.

I hope that we will be able to go in the direction of this Resolution. I hope that the amendments which my delegation has made to it will help clarify some of the issues. I hope that we can stick with, and not question, the terms which have been utilized in the Secretariat documentation for this project, which we consider very important.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

J.P. HOOGEVEEN (Netherlands)

Only a procedural question, I do not know for sure, but I do not think there is any quorum any more in this Committee.

CHAIRMAN

We are indeed short of a quorum and are therefore unable to proceed. The Commission will have to reconvene to complete its business on a day and at a time to be determined, possibly Saturday, possibly Monday. At the moment, I am afraid, there is nothing more we can do. I wish you a very good evening.

Draft Resolution: Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project, not concluded

Projet de résolution: Renforcement du projet FAO 2000, est en suspens

Proyecto de resolución: Fortalecimiento del proyecto FAO 2000, queda pendiente

The meeting rose at 22.50 hours.

La séance est levée à 22 h 50.

Se levanta la sesión a las 22.50 horas.

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)
APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART IV (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - QUATRIEME PARTIE
 (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE IV (C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1)

15. Programme of Work and Budget 1998-99 - Approach (paras 1-6) - **General Considerations** (paras 7-10) - **Substantive Priorities** (paras 11-14)
15. Programme de travail et budget 1998-99 - Approche (par 1-6) - **Considérations d'ordre général** (par 7-10) - **Priorités de fond** (par 11-14)
15. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 1998-99 - Enfoque (párr 1-6)
 - **Consideraciones generales** (párr 7-10) - **Prioridades sustantivas** (párr 11-14)

CHAIRMAN

I invite the Commission's attention to Part IV of our Draft Report. This is document C 97/II/REP/4-Rev.1. This is the Draft Report of the Commission on Item 15 of the Conference Agenda, the Programme of Work and Budget for 1998-99.

The first thirteen paragraphs were prepared by a Drafting Committee chaired by the distinguished representative of Argentina, Mr Roberto Villambrosa, who is in the Hall. I am very grateful to the Drafting Committee and to its Chairman for their work.

Paragraph 14 of the Report, which begins on page 4, contains a Draft Resolution on the Budget. This Draft Resolution is the product of extensive, informal consultations throughout the week. The discussions and negotiations have been difficult and protracted. As I said, when we began as a Commission our consideration of this Item, budgeting and budget agreement is an intrinsically difficult progress in any organization. I am very grateful to the many people and groups whom I consulted for their time, their wisdom and most of all for their willingness to engage actively and constructively in the dialogue. I believe that the outcome, as reflected in the Draft Resolution, commands general acceptance.

Let me invite your attention to the Resolution itself. I should begin first by pointing out a typographical error which appears at the foot of page 5, in sub-paragraph d). The second line in the text before you reads "the scale adopted at the Conference at its Twenty-eighth Session". Twenty-eighth should read "Twenty-ninth".

Paragraph 1 in Section A of the Resolution endorses the Programme of Work. The paragraph immediately below it, paragraph 2, approves a net appropriation of US\$ 650 million, that is to say Zero Nominal Growth. US\$ 650 million is the amount on which Assessed Contributions will be based.

If you turn over the page to Part B of the Resolution, you will find text which provides a further authorization to the Director-General to spend up to an additional US\$12 million on the costs of re-deployment and separation, which are not provided for in the US\$ 650 million. The source of funding for that additional sum of up to US\$ 12 million is not Assessed Contributions. It is such voluntary contributions as may be made by Members and the existing capital of the Organization.

As I have said, I believe that this Resolution is generally acceptable to the Membership. I should like to invite Commission II to adopt this Report, that is to say Part IV of our Report, including the Resolution, *en bloc*. My proposal is that Commission II should adopt this part of the Report, including the Draft Resolution *en bloc*. May we please do so?

The Report is adopted.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. You are asking for our consent with regarding to approval of the Report. That is my first question. Does that include the Draft Resolution as well?

CHAIRMAN

It does indeed.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

Then I would like to ask your attention for the following.

We can go along with the budget proposal of US\$ 650 million. The EC Member States support that amount. However, we have some reservations on the amount as mentioned in several chapters, in particular Chapter II. I would like to remind the Conference that the EU -- the EC and its Member States -- have expressed their preference for a shift, an increase of the budget devoted to technical and economic programmes. Therefore, we would like to propose a shift of resources from administrative and financial services to the technical and economic programmes up to an amount of US\$ 300 million. That means an increase of US\$ 7 094 000 and we would propose at the same time to decrease Chapter V by US\$ 5 million and Chapter I by US\$ 2 094 000.

CHAIRMAN

So that we are all entirely clear what it is that you are proposing, could you very kindly repeat the figures.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

We would like to increase Chapter II to US\$ 300 million, and to decrease Chapter V by US\$ 5 million and Chapter I by US\$ 2 094 000.

Since I have the floor, I would like to propose another change in the text in paragraph (b) of the Resolution, and number two, we would like to propose to delete paragraph 2 of (b) of the Resolution.

Fabian REDHEAD (Grenada)

I am a little bit confused about what has happened or what is happening here. My understanding was that the Report and Resolution has been approved by this meeting. Is the European Union now entering reservations concerning these things or is the European Union asking us to go back and look at the Resolution, cancel the approval that has already been given and go back and examine the matter?

Mame BALLA SY (Sénégal)

Monsieur le Président, vraiment, moi aussi, au nom de la délégation sénégalaise, je suis très étonné qu'on se mette maintenant à renégocier un texte qui nous semblait provenir de longues et difficiles négociations pour lesquelles on vous félicite particulièrement, parce que nous savons ce que vous et proprement votre région, qui vient maintenant au moment le moins choisi possible pour nous créer de telles difficultés,.... En réalité, je pense: au sujet de 2 millions, 5 millions. S'il s'agit de 5 millions, 3 millions ou 7 millions qui feront que les programmes techniques et économiques seront plus efficaces qu'ils ne le sont maintenant, sincèrement, je pense que la démarche devrait changer de direction, mais ce n'est pas en termes de 7 millions qu'on peut nous convaincre que les programmes techniques et économiques seraient encore beaucoup plus efficaces.

Deuxième chose, comment peut-on s'opposer avec tant de véhémence à une invitation à des Etats à faire des contributions volontaires? Moi, je pense que, très sincèrement, est-ce qu'on ne pourrait pas demander à la délégation européenne, pour rendre hommage aux efforts que vous avez faits, et qui, au demeurant, au fond, ne constituent pour nous qu'un compromis qui nous laisse sur notre faim?

Nous n'avons jamais pensé nous associer à un consensus à ce niveau. Jamais. Mais vous avez été tellement convaincant dans votre recherche de consensus que nous avons voulu donner l'exemple. Et il est très mal venu que nous puissions perdre du temps dans de petits amendements de ce genre qui vont entraîner d'autres, et d'autres, et d'autres, et qui vont naturellement vous renvoyer à d'autres consultations.

POINT OF ORDER

POINT D'ORDRE

PUNTO DE ORDEN

Noel D. DE LUNA (Philippines)

On behalf of the Group of 77, I would simply like to remind you that this Conference has already approved the Draft Report, including the Draft Resolution. All the negotiations were already painstakingly done for the past week, and we have done our best to arrive at such consensus.

CHAIRMAN

I address myself to the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

May I make a point. You have heard the statements that have been made by Grenada, Senegal and the Philippines. I have to say that I do not think it is practicable at this stage of our proceedings to start to propose changes to the Resolution. As has been said by other speakers, and as I have said myself, this is the outcome of long, protracted and difficult negotiations. I ask you, in a spirit of consensus, to withdraw your proposal and to accept that your observations will appear in the record.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

First of all, I would like to stress that we are also aiming and have aimed at a consensus and we were very happy that this consensus has been reached. However, it is the first time that we could have a look at the different amounts mentioned in that Resolution and, as I have said, we are in favour of strengthening the technical and economic programmes of FAO in order to ensure a good future, a good outcome of the activities of FAO.

You have asked me to withdraw our proposal. However, I would like to stress also that we can accept the total amount of US\$ 650 million, but it is just a matter of shift between Chapters of the Budget of FAO.

As far as our proposal of B.2. is concerned, we have the feeling that B.2. does not belong in a Resolution which deals with the budget of this Organization. However, we are prepared to drop our request for deletion if after "invites", "interested" is going to be inserted. So B.2. reads then "invites interested Members".

To conclude, I am not entitled to withdraw the proposals I have just mentioned. I have to consult the Member States of the European Union about it. So I would like to ask you to adjourn the meeting for a short moment.

Mame BALLA SY (Sénégal)

Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie et je remercie également le Représentant des Pays-Bas au nom de l'Union européenne de sa sage proposition de suspendre, que nous appuyons, mais avant cela, il convient d'être assez précis et clair.

Quant au second amendement, qu'ils aient encore réamendé cela, cela nous met encore beaucoup plus mal à l'aise. Il faudrait qu'ils en tiennent compte dans leur consultation, parce que je ne vois pas dans une Organisation qu'on prenne une disposition pour dire ce que cela intéresse. Je ne crois pas qu'il y ait quelque chose ici même si nous ne sommes pas d'accord, mais si nous nous rallions au consensus, cela devrait nous intéresser. On ne peut pas accepter des formulations de ce genre qui risquent de créer un esprit sans précédent dans une Organisation internationale. C'est une chose à considérer ou à ne pas considérer.

Mais il faut qu'ils sachent que, le Groupe des 77 peut-être ne l'a pas dit, notre position est assez ferme sur un compromis qui, hélas, ne nous satisfait même pas, comme nous l'aurions souhaité, et qu'on ne devrait pas déranger si vraiment l'esprit de consensus qu'on nous avait présenté est tel qu'il ne faudrait pas qu'on nous engage dans une voie jusqu'au dernier moment pour nous créer des difficultés, parce qu'il n'y avait alors même pas besoin de perdre du temps.

Puisqu'on ne peut pas avoir un consensus, il faut pouvoir en avoir. Je vous remercie. Mais nous espérons que la raison sera entendue et qu'on respectera quand même l'esprit dans lequel on nous a toujours engagés.

Paul PAREDES PORTELLA (Perú)

Hay una cuestión que no entiendo bien y es que, de lo que comprendí, el documento había sido aprobado - tanto el Informe cuanto el Proyecto de Resolución. Creo que es una cuestión de procedimiento, deberíamos todos respetar al señor Representante de los Países Bajos. Le insisto en ese aspecto porque tenemos el riesgo de abrir el debate y no terminar. Más aún, le diría, yo estaría en favor incluso de los elementos que él ha señalado, pero el problema es comenzar a discutir ahora un asunto que debió haberse visto antes, no en este momento.

Señor Presidente, creo que hay un aspecto también que deberíamos todos destacar y que usted indudablemente por modestia no lo ha hecho y es que, en el caso de mi delegación, somos testigos de todo el esfuerzo que usted ha desplegado en estos días, sin escatimar ningún esfuerzo, dispuesto en todo instante a encontrarse con todas las delegaciones. Es así como hemos llegado a este punto de delicado equilibrio. Creo que también, en homenaje a su esfuerzo y en aras del consenso, los aquí presentes hemos hecho una serie de concesiones. Ya lo tuvo a bien señalar el señor Embajador de Senegal cuanto nos cuesta a nosotros también llegar a este punto, de ahí que quisiera decir sólomente lo siguiente: a juicio de mi delegación esto está sanjado ya, está terminado - el Proyecto de Resolución así como el Informe. Dos: en aras del consenso deberíamos señirnos a eso y tres, consecuentemente solicitar al representante de los Países Bajos que retire su propuesta por más que sea constructiva y hecha con la mejor intención.

CHAIRMAN

Peru, thank you for your kind and helpful words.

As to your first point, I think there is a genuine difficulty about whether the Report had been adopted. The difficulty relates to whether I have seen the Netherlands raising its flag. I would like to try to settle this issue as a matter of substance, rather than as a Point of Order.

Australia has asked for the floor but, before I give Australia the floor, I would like to ask Mr Wade to explain a point of fact about which, I believe, the Netherlands is under a misapprehension. That is to say, whether the proposed breakdown of expenditure, which appears in paragraph 2(a) of the Resolution, is being seen here for the first time.

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

I have to clarify that the statement of the Netherlands on this point is, I regret to say, incorrect. The Programme of Work and Budget document contains two scenarios, both of which are fully detailed right down to the lowest level of programme detail in the budget.

I would refer the distinguished delegate to Table 5, which follows page 53. It is a landscape form table. On the right-hand side, there is a column entitled "1998-99 ZNG with Cost Increases", and the last column is entitled "Appropriation". You will find that each of the figures in the "Appropriation" column match the Appropriation Resolution you have before you. You will also find that each of the figures in the "Appropriation" column are matched by detailed figures which are shown throughout the document in the Programme Budget.

The problem I have is that to change the figures on the surface means that you would have a Programme of Work which does not match the budget figures that you would have in the Appropriation. I think we have a little bit of a problem with both the statement and the proposal.

Andrew Keith PEARSON (Australia)

I was also wanting to raise this point. I think it is a very crucial point about the fact that Table 5 in the Programme of Work and Budget, that we have had for a number of months now, is in fact reflected accurately in the Draft Resolution.

This is, in fact, of great relief to Australia. We have concentrated through tortuous meetings of the Programme and Finance Committees, and through the Councils, to look at the Programme of Work. Australia has set a great deal of store by understanding what the implications of a Budget Level of US\$ 650 million would be in terms of a Programme of Work.

As has been said before, by the Australian delegation, we are firmly of the opinion that the Programme of Work as outlined at the US\$ 650 million level will be most satisfactory to this Organization in delivering its priorities that it needs for the next biennium.

We would echo the point also made by Mr Wade. We would be concerned, at this stage, at changes in a Programme of Work which have been carefully analyzed and understood, and have been available for a considerable time now. I would also encourage my colleagues in the EU to reflect upon this point. I think it is very important that we do not precipitate, as we did in 1995, a position where approval at the Conference leaves us unsure of what the implications for that Programme of Work are.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

I would ask for a break as I have to consult the Member States of the Union.

CHAIRMAN

With some reluctance, I should make that clear, I suspend this Session for 15 minutes.

The meeting was suspended from 20.15 to 20.30 hours.

La séance est suspendue de 20 h 15 à 20 h 30.

Se suspende la sesión de las 20.15 horas a las 20.30 horas.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

We are very grateful that we could consult each other on our proposals.

We have shown our concern about the future of Technical and Economic Programmes. However, we will not block consensus with regard to the Report, including the Draft Resolution.

We withdraw our proposals in order to reach consensus on that Report.

We are still concerned and I also have to express that we are concerned about Part B of the Resolution. Once more, we withdraw our proposal, in order to reach consensus in the meeting of this Commission.

CHAIRMAN

I note your concern about Part B. I am very grateful for your constructive approach to the Resolution as a whole.

I now invite this Commission to adopt Part IV of its Report, *en bloc*.

The Draft Report of Commission II, Part IV (C 97/11/REP-4 Rev.1, including Draft Resolution .../97), was adopted.

Le Projet de rapport de la Commission II, Quatrième Partie (C 97/11/REP-4 Rev.1, y inclus le Projet de résolution .../97), est adopté

El Proyecto de Informe de la Comisión II, Parte IV (C 97/11/REP-4 Rev.1, incluido el Proyecto de Resolución .../97), es aprobado

The meeting rose at 21.35 hours.

La séance est levée à 21 h 35.

Se levanta la sesión a las 21.35 horas.

ADOPTION OF REPORT (continued)
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT (suite)
APROBACION DEL INFORME (continuación)

DRAFT REPORT OF COMMISSION II - PART III (C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)
PROJET DE RAPPORT DE LA COMMISSION II - TROISIEME PARTIE
(C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)
PROYECTO DE INFORME DE LA COMISION II - PARTE III (C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1)

14. Medium-Term Plan 1998-2003 (paras 1-12)
14. Plan à moyen terme 1998-2003 (pars 1-12)
14. Plan a plazo medio, 1998-2003 (párr 1-12)

Draft Resolution: Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)
Projet de résolution: Renforcement du projet FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)
Proyecto de resolución: Fortalecimiento del proyecto FAO 2000 (C 97/CG/1-Rev.1)

CHAIRMAN

We have one outstanding Item of business, Item 14, which is the Medium-Term Plan which will form Part III of our Report. This is a subject to which we have devoted a lot of time. I believe productively. We talked about it so far on 3 days, on the 8th, the 10th and the 12th of November. Unfortunately, we ground to a halt on the 12th, because we lacked a quorum and today, we are resuming discussion of it.

If you recall the position we found ourselves in on the 12th, we had two pieces of paper in front of us, one was a Draft Report which had been presented to us by the Drafting Committee and the other was a Draft Resolution, FAO 2000, which had come directly to the Commission.

The relevant documents for consideration here today are as follows: the Draft Report now has an extremely long number, that is to say C 97/II/REP/3-Rev.1. It is headed Draft Report of Commission II, Part III, Medium-Term Plan, Item 14, paragraphs 1 to 12. So, that is one of our documents. The second is C 97/CG/1/Rev.-1. The Seventh Report of the Resolutions Committee, Agenda Item 14, Draft Resolution - Strengthening the FAO 2000 Project.

As I understand it, the Draft Resolution has been further considered informally, since we last discussed inclusively, on Thursday night. What I suggest we do, with your agreement, is to look first at the Draft Resolution and then having taken a view on that, consider the Draft Report and the implications in the Draft Report of the Resolution. May we, therefore, begin with the latest text of FAO 2000, C 97/CG/1-Rev.1, and may I invite one of its sponsors to bring us up to date and to explain the document we now have before us. Would someone care to speak on that?

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

I speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. We are very grateful to those who have contributed to the text of this Draft Resolution and as a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that this text does not need any further introduction. We can go along with this, apart from one remark regarding paragraph 3, which makes mention in the second line "...to monitor the outcomes...". We would like to see that the word "outcomes" is in line with the text of the Plan of Action which makes mention of "implementation" instead of "outcomes". Therefore, we propose to delete "outcomes" and include "implementation" instead.

CHAIRMAN

May I just clarify that point. As I understand it, you wish the language to be exactly in line with previous language and your belief is that the word "implementation" is fully in line. Am I correct? Thank you very much.

Roberto VILLAMBROSA (Argentina)

Como usted sabe y la sala también, yo fui designado Presidente del Comité de Redacción de esta Comisión que tuvo una larga tarea presentando dos partes del Informe, esas dos partes fueron aprobadas y luego de eso hubo en esta Comisión una cantidad de errores de fondo y de forma que yo quiero informar a la sala porque la posición en la que yo fui elegido fue institucional, no personal. Estos errores determinaron que la Comisión, el Comité de Redacción no se dedicara a esta Resolución que, por otra parte, contó luego con la presencia de mi propia delegación para llegar a un texto que creo que es aceptable para todos, sino que, en la Comisión II justo antes del Plenario, se terminó aprobando la Parte IV de este Informe en la cual tampoco hubo una participación del Presidente del Comité de Redacción, tal como hubiera sido requerido de acuerdo a las reglas de esta Organización y de acuerdo a las costumbres también.

De todos modos y a pesar de esto, fue presentado por usted, señor Presidente, la Parte IV de este Informe, del Informe de un Comité y el Informe de una Resolución en la que usted no participó en su calidad de Presidente, bien creo yo que usted puede también presentar la parte del Plan a Plazo Medio de este documento en la cual usted tampoco participó, y en la que creo que tampoco existen inconvenientes. El único inconveniente que existe es el párrafo 5, entiendo que la propia Resolución tampoco tiene problemas, pero lamentablemente me veo obligado a señalar este tipo de cosas que hubiera preferido evitar, pero mi posición no es ni personal ni de delegación, ni de grupo, es una posición institucional y creo que tenía que señalarlo. No obstante, señor Presidente, quiero que sepa usted que todos cuando llegamos a este lugar encontramos que existen una serie de reglas que son complicadas, largas y creo que esto ha sido un *accident de parcours* como tal lo tomo y creo que para brevedad de la sesión podríamos seguramente aprobar estos documentos *en bloc*.

Créame, señor Presidente, que tanto a mi delegación como a mi mismo, el único espíritu que nos ha animado ha sido el de cooperar para llegar a una adecuada solución de los problemas que tenemos frente a nosotros, a una adecuada solución del resultado final de la Conferencia que nos compromete a todos y además de los objetivos de la Organización en lo que creo que todos creemos y que podremos en el futuro demostrar una vez más nuestra cooperación.

Dicho esto, señor Presidente, le reitero que hago la propuesta de aprobar estos documentos *en bloc* puesto que no veo que exista en ellos, en ninguno de los Grupos, ningún tipo de inconvenientes en este estado y todos los Grupos demostraron un gran espíritu de flexibilidad y de cooperación en este aspecto.

CHAIRMAN

The proposal is being made that these documents should be adopted *en bloc*.

Fernando José MARRONI de ABREU (Brazil)

I would prefer to delete the last sentence in paragraph 5. However, if I am the only one to have this wish I would accept it, under the understanding that this draft, presented by the Secretariat is just a draft, that we are just taking note of here. That this draft will have to be considered by the six different Regional Commissions on Forest and by COFO. This is, I repeat, a very very preliminary draft.

CHAIRMAN

So that we all understand what we are being invited to do, may I just explain where I think we have got to.

We have two texts in front of us. We have a Draft Resolution on FAO 2000, which as I understand, meets with general assent.

We then have to consider the text of the Report. The text of the Report includes a paragraph which is currently in square brackets. We have to be sure that the text of the Report -- which as I mentioned earlier on and which the Chairman of the Drafting Committee has reiterated -- the text of the draft Report was cleared through the Drafting Committee last week. We have to be sure that paragraph 5 is consistent with the view we are going to take of the FAO 2000 Resolution.

It is being proposed by the representative of Brazil that the final sentence in paragraph 5, that is the one beginning "at the sectoral level..." is not essential to the point that is being made and would be better deleted. That is the proposition that is in front of us.

Yohannes TENSUE (Eritrea)

I also support the proposal made by Brazil since it reflects that by keeping and opening the bracket only to the first sentence and deleting the remaining can it cover and address the issue, because the Strategic Vision has been discussed in the other paper but the other examples and reference noted are not necessary. Therefore, just open the bracket and keep only the first sentence which was in general.

CHAIRMAN

Well to take these points in order: as I understand it, the Commission is content with the text of the FAO 2000 Resolution. That being so, the question is how we ensure that the Report on this Agenda Item is fully consistent with it, and the proposal before us relates to paragraph 5 currently in square brackets. The proposal is that paragraph 5 should stand, except for the deletion of the final sentence beginning "at the sectoral level". If that is generally acceptable, may I invite the Commission -- as suggested by the representative of Argentina -- to adopt the Resolution and the Report *en bloc*.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

Yes, of course, apart from my proposal to change the text in paragraph 3, "implementation" instead of "outcomes". Has this been taken on board?

CHAIRMAN

You are right to draw my attention and through me the attention of the Commission II on that point. Let me go back over this again.

The proposal is that the text of the Resolution on FAO 2000 should be adopted subject to a change in operative paragraph 3, which is on page 4 of the document. The proposal is that the word "outcomes" at the end of the second line, should be deleted and that the word "implementation" should be substituted. And the reason for making that change is to bring the text fully into line with existing agreed language. That is the text on the Resolution which we are being invited to approve.

We then have the text of the Report on the Medium-Term Plan where it is proposed to delete the final sentence of paragraph 5. Are we content?

Would we be content to adopt these texts on the basis I have just proposed? I would be more than happy to explain it again. I think it is very important that we should all understand what we are being invited to agree.

Gebrehiwot REDAI (Ethiopia)

I have a slight question on the strategic paper, namely C 97/CG/1-Rev 1. Paragraph 2, last part of the sentence. I could not understand why the phrase after "...but also the full membership of FAO," is indicated there.

CHAIRMAN

May I invite a sponsor of the Resolution to put the mind of our colleague from Ethiopia at rest on that point. May I invite a sponsor.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

I am sorry Mr Chairman, through you I would like to ask Ethiopia to repeat his question and his remark please.

CHAIRMAN

May I, with your permission, try on your behalf and you can tell me if I have got it wrong. As I understand the question, the question is why is it necessary to say, why is it necessary to include a reference to the full membership of FAO? Why do the words "...but also the full membership of FAO" need to be put? Are you content Ethiopia? In operative paragraph 2, I beg your pardon.

J.B. PIETERS (Netherlands)

We are of the opinion that this is the core of paragraph 2. Stating that not only the Secretariat is involved but it can be said to be an inter-governmental approach, also involving the Member Nations of FAO because this process is so important. Of course the Secretariat can do its job, and they are doing their job very very well, but attach so much importance to this issue that we would like to see that the membership, the Member Nations, we all are involved in this process. And this is, once more, the very core of this paragraph.

CHAIRMAN

I must resist the temptation to try to express people's words for them but if it would help, as I understand it, the point that is being made is in some sense obvious but, nevertheless, is a point which the sponsors of the Resolution feel should be made explicitly on the record. May I ask the representative of Ethiopia whether he is content?

Gebrehiwot REDAI (Ethiopia)

I can live with it, but why I posed this question is because, while the Strategic Framework was discussed, there were Member Nations in both the Programme and the Finance Committees and my understanding is that Members are participating. Therefore I thought would it be feasible for all the Members to be involved in such tasks, would it not be difficult and at the same time are they not represented? If the Members of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee are represented by regimes, that means the Secretariat and the Member Nations are there. That was my understanding, but I can leave it as it is stated to the satisfaction of the distinguished delegate of the Netherlands.

CHAIRMAN

May I pounce upon your statement that you can live with the text. Your point is, I think, well taken.

May I invite the Commission to adopt this text *en bloc*.

***The Draft Report of Commission II, Part III, including Draft Resolution, was adopted
Le Projet de rapport de la Commission II, Troisième Partie, y compris le Projet de résolution,
sont approuvés***

El Proyecto de Informe de la Comisión II, Parte III, incluido el Proyecto de Resolución, es aprobado

CHAIRMAN

We have now completed our business. Our Report, that is to say, Parts I, II and III, so far unconsidered by the Conference in Plenary, will be taken by the Conference in Plenary tomorrow morning in the Session beginning at 10.00 hrs. I am not yet sure when this Item will be taken.

It therefore remains for me to close the Commission. I have a number of thanks to make. First of all to you, the Commission Members. Everyone has worked extremely hard, constructively and cooperatively. I think we have had more than a week of very useful and productive discussions which I, for my part, have much enjoyed. I am better informed as a result and I hope that everyone else feels the same too. We have transacted a very large amount of business which is important to the future of this Organization, not only in terms of its Programme of Work and Budget for the next biennium but also in terms of the longer-term processes which, indeed, we have just been discussing. I am very grateful to you for the part you have all played in that.

I owe thanks to the Vice-Chairmen, Mr Paul Paredes Portella and Mr Igor Marincek. I am grateful to those of you who have taken part in the Friends of the Chair process. I am enormously grateful to the Drafting Committee and particularly to its Chairman. All Drafting Committees had a very difficult task to do and, if I may say so, I think it is a great tribute to the work of the Drafting Committee and its Chairman that we have been able to adopt the results of their work *en bloc*. If there is one test of the quality and skill of the Drafting Committee and of its Chairman, that, in my view, is it and we are extremely grateful to them.

I thank the Secretariat who have provided magnificent support throughout, some of it visible to you, much of it invisible. I have seen at least some of the invisible parts, and I admire and thank them for what they have done.

Finally my thanks to the interpreters, who served us conscientiously and well throughout our deliberations.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

The meeting rose at 15.30 hours.

La séance est levée à 15 h 30.

Se levanta la sesión a las 15.30 horas.