

Rome, Roma, 2001



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

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

Hundred and Twenty-first Session • Cent vingt et unième session • 121º período de sesiones

Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001
VERBATIM RECORDS OF PLENARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL

Rome, 30 octobre – 1er novembre 2001
PROCÈS-VERBAUX DES SÉANCES PLÉNIÈRES DU CONSEIL

Roma, 30 de octubre - 1º de noviembre de 2001
ACTAS TAQUIGRÁFICAS DE LAS SESIONES PLENARIAS DEL CONSEJO

TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE DES MATIÈRES - INDICE

**FIRST PLENARY MEETING
PREMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA
(30 October 2001)**

I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION	
I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE	
I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO	3
1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)	
1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)	
1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)	3
2. Election of three Vice-Chairpersons, and Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee: (CL 121/INF/9)	
2. Élection de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction: (CL 121/INF/9)	
2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción: (CL 121/INF/9)	3
IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS	
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES	
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS	4
11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters	
11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques	
11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos	4
<i>11.2 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to Attend FAO Sessions:</i> (CL 121/LIM/2)	
<i>11.2 Invitation d' tats non Membres assister des e unions de la FAO:</i> (CL 121/LIM/2)	
<i>11.2 Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO:</i> (CL 121/LIM/2)	4

10. Report of the 72nd Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, October 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (English only))	
10. Rapport de la soixante-douzième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, octobre 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement))	
10. Informe del 72º período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las comisiones (Roma, octubre de 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (inglés solamente))	5
II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO	
II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO	
II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO	6
3. Preparations for the Thirty-first Session of the FAO Conference (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	
3. Préparatifs de la trente et unième session de la Conférence de la FAO (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	
3. Preparativos para el 31º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	6
<i>3.1 Nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference):</i> (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	
<i>3.1 Nomination du Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (recommandations à la Conférence):</i> (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	
<i>3.1 Propuestas de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las comisiones de la Conferencia (recomendaciones a la Conferencia):</i> (C 2001/12-Rev.1)	6
<i>3.2 Nominations of three Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference</i>	
<i>3.2 Nomination de trois Vice-Présidents de la Conférence</i>	
<i>3.2 Propuestas de candidaturas para las tres Vicepresidencias de la Conferencia</i>	6
<i>3.3 Nominations of seven Members of the General Committee</i>	
<i>3.3 Nomination de sept Membres du Bureau de la Conférence</i>	
<i>3.3 Propuestas de candidaturas para siete puestos en el Comité General</i>	7
4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: five years later: (CL 121/LIM/3)	
4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: cinq ans après: (CL 121/LIM/3)	
4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: cinco años después: (CL 21/LIM/3)	7

**SECOND PLENARY MEETING
DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA
(30 October 2001)**

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)	
II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)	24
4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: five years later (CL 121/LIM/3) (continued)	
4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: cinq ans après (CL 121/LIM/3) (suite)	
4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: cinco años después (CL 121/LIM/3) (continuación)	24
III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	
III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION	
III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS	29
7. Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee (Rome, September 2001) (CL 121/2)	
7. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier (Rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/2)	
7. Informe de la reunión conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas (Roma, septiembre de 2001) (CL 121/2)	29
8. Report of the 86th Session of the Programme Committee (Rome, September 2001) (CL 121/3)	
8. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-sixième session du Comité du Programme (Rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/3)	
8. Informe del 86º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa (Roma, septiembre de 2001) (CL 121/3)	33
9. Report of the 97th Session of the Finance Committee (Rome, September 2001) (CL 121/4)	
9. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-dix-septième session du Comité financier (Rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/4)	
9. Informe del 97º período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, septiembre de 2001) (CL 121/4)	34
9.1 <i>Financial Position of the Organization</i> (CL 121/LIM/1)	
9.1 <i>Situation financière de l'Organisation</i> (CL 121/LIM/1)	
9.1 <i>Situación financiera de la Organización</i> (CL 121/LIM/1)	34
9.2 <i>Scale of Contributions 2002-2003</i>	
9.2 <i>Barème des contributions 2002-2003</i>	
9.2 <i>Escala de cuotas para 2002-2003</i>	34

<i>9.3 Liabilities for After Service Medical Coverage</i>	
<i>9.3 Couverture médicale après cessation de service</i>	
<i>9.3 Pasivo del seguro médico después de la separación del servicio</i>	34
<i>9.4 General Service Salary Survey</i>	
<i>9.4 Enquête sur les conditions d'emploi des agents des services généraux</i>	
<i>9.4 Encuesta sobre los sueldos del personal de servicios generales</i>	34
<i>9.5 Other Matters Arising Out of the Report</i>	
<i>9.5 Autres questions découlant du rapport</i>	
<i>9.5 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe</i>	34
5. Programme Evaluation Report 2001 (C 2001/4)	
5. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2001 (C 2001/4)	
5. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 2001 (C 2001/4)	45

**THIRD PLENARY MEETING
TROISIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA
(31 October 2001)**

**III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE
MATTERS** (continued)

**III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX
FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION** (suite)

**III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS,
FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS** (continuación)

54

6. Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003:(C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1;
C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (Spanish and French only); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1;
C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (espagnol et français seulement); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2002-2003: (C 2001/3
C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (español y francés solamente);
C 2001/LIM/15)

54

**FOURTH PLENARY MEETING
QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
CUARTA SESION PLENARIA
(31 October 2001)**

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN INAUGURATION DU PORTRAIT DU PRESIDENT INDEPENDENT DESCUBRIMIENTO DEL RETRATO DEL PRESIDENT INDEPENDIENTE	84
III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (continued)	
III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)	
III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)	86
6. Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (Spanish and French only); C 2001/LIM/15) (continued)	
6. Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (espagnol et français seulement); C 2001/LIM/15) (suite)	
6. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (español y francés solamente); C 2001/LIM/15) (continuación)	86
II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)	
II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO (suite)	
II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)	92
4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: five years later: (CL 121/LIM/3) (continued)	
4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: cinq ans après: (CL 121/LIM/3) (suite)	
4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: cinco años después: (CL 121/LIM/3) (continuación)	92
V. OTHER MATTERS	
V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES	
V. OTROS ASUNTOS	96
12. Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and other Main Sessions 2001-2002: (CL 121/INF/8)	
12. Calendrier révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des autres réunions principales de la FAO 2001-2002: (CL 121/INF/8)	
12. Calendario revisado para 2001-2002 de los períodos de sesiones de los órganos rectores y de otras reuniones importantes de la FAO: (CL 121/INF/8)	96
IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS	
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES	
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS	96
11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters	
11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques	
11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos	96

<i>11.1 Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources:</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (English only))	
<i>11.1Projet d'Engagement international sur les ressources phyto g e tiques:</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement))	
<i>11.1Proyecto de Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitog neticos:</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (inglés solamente))	96
<i>11.3 Applications for Membership in the Organization: (C 2001/10)</i>	
<i>11.3 Demandes d'admission la quali e de Membre de l'Organisation:</i> (C 2001/10)	
<i>11.3 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organizaci n: (C 2001/10)</i>	98
V. OTHER MATTERS (continued)	
V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES (suite)	
V. OTROS ASUNTOS (continuación)	99
13. Any Other Matters	
13. Autres questions	
13. Otros asuntos	99
<i>Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem</i> (Reykjavik, Iceland, 1- 4 October 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)	
<i>Conf rence de Reykjavik sur une p che responsable dans le cosyst me marin</i> (Reykjavik, Islande, 1er-4 octobre 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)	
<i>Conferencia de Reykjavik sobre la Pesca Responsable en el Ecosistema Marino</i> (Reykjavik, Islandia, 1-4 de octubre de 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)	99

**FIFTH PLENARY MEETING
CINQUIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA
(1 November 2001)**

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS (continued)	
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES (suite)	
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS (continuación)	104
11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters (continued)	
11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (suite)	
11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos (continuación)	104
<i>11.1 Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (English only)) (continued)	
<i>11.1 Projet d'Engagement international sur les ressources phytogétiques</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement)) (suite)	
<i>11.1 Proyecto de Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogeneticos</i> (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (inglés solamente)) (continuación)	
	104

**SIXTH PLENARY SESSION
SIXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
SEXTA SESIÓN PLENARIA
(1 November 2001)**

ADOPTION OF REPORT ADOPTION DU RAPPORT APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME	122
DRAFT REPORT - PARTS 1 -10 LE PROJET DE RAPPORT – PARTIES 1 - 10 EL PROYECTO DE INFORME, PARTES 1 - 10	122

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<p>Hundred and Twenty-first Session Cent vingt et unième session 121^o período de sesiones</p>
<p>Rome, 30 October–1 November 2001 Rome, 30 octobre-1 novembre 2001 Roma, 30 de octubre-1^o de noviembre de 2001</p>
<p>FIRST PLENARY MEETING PREMIÈRE SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE PRIMERA SESIÓN PLENARIA</p>
<p>30 October 2001</p>

The First Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.30 hours
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La première séance plénière est ouverte à 10.30 h
sous la présidence de M.Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la primera sesión plenaria a las 10.30 horas
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

CHAIRMAN

I call the first meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-first FAO Council Session to order.

Before proceeding, I would like to make a short announcement. The European Community is participating in this meeting in accordance with paragraphs 8 and 9 of Article II of the FAO Constitution. I have been asked to inform you that the declaration made by the European Community and its Member States is contained in information document CL 121/INF/6 which has already been distributed to all Members of the Council. I would draw the attention of the meeting to this declaration.

Before we move to the agenda, allow me to extend a warm welcome to the Director-General and all the delegates and observers, and I am particularly pleased to see a number of Ministers in the room.

I would like now to give the floor to the Director-General.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL

Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, for giving me the floor.

Excellencies, honourable Ministers, honourable Heads of Delegations, honourable participants from Member Nations, from international organizations and NGOs, I would like, on behalf of the Secretariat, to welcome you to the Headquarters of your Organization and express our appreciation for the large attendance that we see at this important meeting of the Council.

This meeting is being held at a very difficult moment, what we could call turbulent times, after the tragic events which saw so many innocent lives lost on 11 September and all the political and economic consequences that we have seen since then: the situation of conflict and all the attention of public opinion and media on the follow-up actions that resulted from such situations. This is naturally affecting the atmosphere in which the United Nations in general, and FAO in particular, are working. We hope that, despite this difficult environment, we will still be able to find ways and means of addressing some of the critical problems of this world and, among those problems, the issue of poverty and the issue of hunger. Despite what has happened, we still face the reality of a world in which there are 800 million people who do not have access to adequate food, and they need us, they need you, through your different individual actions, the actions of your Governments, the collective actions of the Organization, to be able to improve their conditions of life and to be able to ensure the most basic of human rights, the right to food.

I therefore have a lot of hope and I am convinced that, through your work in this Council and later on in the Conference, we will make more progress in the fight to achieve the goals of World Food Summit of 1996, we will make more progress in addressing the issues of sustainable development of agriculture, and all these in the spirit of the United Nations, which is the spirit of cooperation and understanding among nations of this world to solve the problems of humanity.

I welcome you one again here at the Headquarters of your Organization.

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

I. INTRODUCTION - PROCEDURE OF THE SESSION**I. INTRODUCTION - QUESTIONS DE PROCÉDURE****I. INTRODUCCIÓN - CUESTIONES DE PROCEDIMIENTO**

1. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)

1. Adoption de l'ordre du jour et du calendrier: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)

1. Aprobación del programa y el calendario: (CL 121/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1; CL 121/INF/6)

CHAIRMAN

Our first item is the Adoption of the Agenda and timetable as set out in documents CL 121/1-Rev.1, CL 121/INF/1-Rev.1 and CL 121/INF/3. The document CL 121/1-Rev.1 contains the Provisional Agenda which has been revised to reflect the fact that the World Food Summit: *five years later* is no longer an item on the agenda of the forthcoming Conference.

I should like to draw your attention to an erroneous reference under Item 13, Any Other Matters. The correct reference is to be found in C 2001/INF/25 and not CL 21/INF/10.

Are there any comments on the Provisional Agenda? If there are none, the Agenda is adopted.

With respect to the timetable you have in document CL 121/INF/1 Rev.1, Provisional Draft, does this timetable meet with the approval of Council? Thank you. The timetable as amended is adopted.

May I also take this opportunity to call upon your cooperation in keeping the Timetable and enabling us to start our meetings on time. We have a demanding Timetable and effectively only two days to get through it.

2. Election of three Vice-Chairpersons, and Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee: (CL 121/INF/9)

2. Élection de trois Vice-Présidents et nomination du Président et des membres du Comité de rédaction: (CL 121/INF/9)

2. Elección de tres Vicepresidentes y nombramiento del Presidente y los miembros del Comité de Redacción: (CL 121/INF/9)

CHAIRMAN

We now proceed to Item 2: Election of three Vice-Chairpersons and Designation of the Chairperson and Members of the Drafting Committee.

Following consultations among the regional groups, we have the following proposals for the three posts of Vice-Chairpersons of the Council - Mr Murray Cobban of Australia, Mr Tourad Ould Mohamed Ahid from Mauritania and Mr Philippe J. Lhuillier of the Philippines. If there are no objections, I wish to congratulate the three Vice-Chairpersons on their election.

For the Drafting Committee, the regional groups propose Mr Al-Shibani from Syria as Chairperson and the following delegations as Members of the Drafting Committee: Australia, Burkina Faso, Canada, Germany, Guatemala, Iceland, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Madagascar, Peru, Sri Lanka and Syria. Are there any objections?

It was so decided.

Il en est ainsi décidé.

Así se acuerda.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS

11. OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS
11. AUTRES QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES
11. OTROS ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS

11.2 Invitations to Non-Member Nations to Attend FAO Sessions: (CL 121/LIM/2)

11.2 Invitation d' tats non Membres assister des e unions de la FAO: (CL 121/LIM/2)

11.2 Invitaciones a Estados no miembros para asistir a reuniones de la FAO: (CL 121/LIM/2)

CHAIRMAN

We now come to Item 11, Other Constitutional and Legal Matters, Invitations to Non-Member Nations to attend FAO sessions. The relevant document is CL 121/LIM/2. I give the floor to the Secretary-General.

SECRETARY-GENERAL

A request was received from the Russian Federation to attend this Council Session in an Observer capacity and an invitation was issued on 1 October 2001, subject to approval by the Council. Formal Council approval is now sought to admit the Russian Federation as an Observer to the Hundred and Twenty-first Session of the Council.

CHAIRMAN

Can I take it that the Council agrees that the Russian Federation attend the present session as an Observer?

It was so decided.

Il en est ainsi décidé.

Así se acuerda.

CHAIRMAN

Before starting the debate on the CCLM Report, I would like to suggest that an open-ended Working Group be established by Council in order to remove the remaining brackets in the text of the Convention to enable Council to forward it to Conference for approval. Does Council agree to this proposal?

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

The United States has a concern regarding the terms of reference of the Open-ended Working Group to be established to consider the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources.

In our comments to the FAO Secretariat, submitted 21 September, on the text of the Undertaking, the United States made it clear that we desired to propose new text in certain areas, not to renegotiate existing unbracketed text but rather to add language. We request an opportunity to present these recommendations to the Open-ended Working Group so that the issues can be discussed before the Group reports back to Council. I must emphasize that these issues are of the utmost importance to the United States. We hope that the text of the Undertaking can be finalized this week in a manner that will permit our Government to support adoption of the instrument at the Conference. This may not be possible if our concerns are not satisfactorily addressed.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you for the comments of the United States of America and I ask again, does Council agree to setting up an Open-ended Working Group? It is so decided.

Can I also take it that Ambassador Gerbasi will chair the Working Group? It is so decided.

The first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group will be held at 14.30 hours in the Green Room this afternoon.

10. Report of the 72nd Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (Rome, October 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (English only))

10. Rapport de la soixante-douzième session du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (Rome, octobre 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement))

10. Informe del 72º período de sesiones del Comité de Asuntos Constitucionales y Jurídicos Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las comisiones (Roma, octubre de 2001): (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (inglés solamente))

CHAIRMAN

We now go to Item 10, Report of the Seventy-second Session of the Committee on Constitutional and Legal Matters (CCLM), Rome, October 2001.

I should like to draw conscious attention to the Amendments to the Agreement for the Establishment of a Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Eastern Region of its Distribution Area in South-West Asia, which is submitted to Council for approval; the Agreement with the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development (AOAD), which is also submitted to Council for approval and on-forwarding to Conference for confirmation: the question of arrears for the Former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, which requires a decision by Council; and the International Undertaking of Plant Genetic Resources which I trust Council will be able to finalize and submit to Conference for approval.

I should like to ask Mr Ly, Chairman of the CCLM, to introduce the Report .

Moussa Bocar LY (Président du Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques)

Le Comité des questions constitutionnelles et juridiques a tenu sa 72ème session à Rome les 8, 9 et 10 octobre. Le document CL 121/15, dont vous êtes saisis, traduit les résultats de cette session.

Sur le premier point qui concernait les amendements à l'accord portant création d'une Commission de lutte contre le criquet pèlerin dans la partie orientale de l'aire de répartition de cet acridien en Asie du sud-ouest, le CQCJ a examiné les amendements à l'accord, tels que proposés par les parties à cet accord, à savoir Afghanistan, Inde, la République islamique d'Iran et le Pakistan, et les a trouvés conformes aux textes fondamentaux de la FAO et présentés sous la forme juridique appropriée. Le CQCJ a donc recommandé que ces amendements soient soumis à votre Conseil, à sa présente session, pour approbation.

S'agissant du deuxième point, le Comité a examiné le texte du projet d'accord entre l'Organisation arabe de développement agricole et la FAO, négocié par ces deux organisations. Le CQCJ, lors de son examen, a proposé la suppression du paragraphe 3, redondant et confus, ne figurant d'ailleurs pas dans les accords habituels de ce genre de la FAO. Il nous a d'ailleurs été signalé que l'Organisation arabe de développement agricole est d'accord sur cette suppression. Pour le reste du texte du projet d'accord, le Comité l'a jugé conforme à l'Acte Constitutif de la FAO et à la Résolution 69/59 sur les principes directeurs applicables aux relations entre la FAO et les Organisations intergouvernementales. Il a donc décidé de le communiquer à votre Conseil pour approbation à sa présente session, puis à la Conférence de la FAO pour confirmation, à sa 131ème session en novembre.

Quant au troisième point, le CQCJ a évoqué la question des arriérés de l'ex-République fédérale socialiste de Yougoslavie, en rappelant que pour les questions de succession et de reconnaissance des États, la FAO avait toujours suivi la pratique adoptée par les Nations Unies et qu'elle avait fait de même pour la Yougoslavie. Comme aucune décision n'avait encore été prise à l'ONU sur cette question complexe des arriérés de l'ex-République fédérale socialiste de Yougoslavie, le Comité a recommandé au Conseil que la FAO, conformément à sa pratique bien établie, s'aligne, le moment venu, sur la décision qu'aura prise à ce sujet l'ONU à New York.

Je voudrais signaler à votre auguste assemblée que le point qui a été longuement examiné de l'engagement international sur les ressources phylogénétiques, tel qu'arrêté par la Commission des

ressources génétiques pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, sera examiné au titre d'un autre point, le point 11, et nous reviendrons à ce moment-là sur cette question.

Voilà la substance des recommandations que le CQCJ présente à votre session et je voudrais saisir l'occasion, puisque c'est la dernière occasion qui m'est donnée de présenter le rapport du Comité, car je quitterai ce Comité comme Président, pour remercier vivement votre Conseil pour m'avoir fait confiance, avoir fait confiance à mon pays et à la région d'où je viens, en m'élisant tour à tour Vice-Président et Président de ce Comité. J'espère avoir été à la hauteur.

CHAIRMAN

Do we have interventions please? Since there are no delegates that ask for the floor, I take it that we approve the Report by the CCLM as reported by Mr Ly. This concludes Item 10.

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO

II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO

II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO

3. Preparations for the Thirty-first Session of the FAO Conference (C 2001/12-Rev.1)

3. Préparatifs de la trente et unième session de la Conférence de la FAO (C 2001/12-Rev.1)

3. Preparativos para el 31º período de sesiones de la Conferencia de la FAO

(C 2001/12-Rev.1)

3.1 Nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference, and of the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference (Recommendations to the Conference): (C 2001/12-Rev.1)

3.1 Nomination du Président de la Conférence et des Présidents des Commissions de la Conférence (recommandations à la Conférence): (C 2001/12-Rev.1)

3.1 Propuestas de candidaturas para la Presidencia de la Conferencia y de las comisiones de la Conferencia (recomendaciones a la Conferencia): (C 2001/12-Rev.1)

CHAIRMAN

We go on now to Item 3, Preparations for the Thirty-first Session of the Conference. Item 3.1, Nominations for the Chairperson of the Conference and the Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference. Rule XXIV, 5(b) of the General Rules of the Organization provides that the Council shall confirm the nominations of the Chairperson of the Conference and Chairpersons of the Commissions of the Conference. Following consultations during, and following our last Session in June, it is proposed that His Excellency Saed bin Mohammed Al Rakabani, Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries of the United Arab Emirates, be Chairperson of the FAO Conference, Mr Acisclo Valladares Molina, Guatemala, to Chair Commission I and Mr Carl-Josef Weiers of Germany, to Chair Commission II.

Can I take it that Council endorses the proposals?

It was so decided.

Il en est ainsi décidé.

Así se acuerda.

3.2 Nominations of three Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference

3.2 Nomination de trois Vice-Présidents de la Conférence

3.2 Propuestas de candidaturas para las tres Vicepresidencias de la Conferencia

CHAIRMAN

Item 3.2, Nominations of Three Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference. Following consultations among the Regional Groups, the following three Vice-Chairpersons of the Conference have been proposed. Malta, then Mr Maloof Kalif Ahmad of Sudan and another gentleman from Asia. I still need the names from Malta and Asia. I am sure that we can certainly decide on the Member Nations and, in the course of our Session, I hope that we will receive the names.

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

We already mentioned this morning that during the course of the week we will be introducing the name of the Member Nation and the person. I am sorry but I am not able to provide the name immediately.

CHAIRMAN

In the meantime I do have a name from Malta. Ambassador Francis Montanaro Mifsud.

3.3 Nominations of seven Members of the General Committee

3.3 Nomination de sept Membres du Bureau de la Conférence

3.3 Propuestas de candidaturas para siete puestos en el Comité General

CHAIRMAN

Nominations of seven Members of the General Committee. Again after consultations with the Regional Groups we have the following proposal for the General Committee: Bulgaria, China, Republic of Congo, Cuba, Islamic Republic of Iran, Sweden and the United States of America. Any comments from the floor please?

4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later*: (CL 121/LIM/3)

4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*: (CL 121/LIM/3)

4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: *cinco años después*: (CL 121/LIM/3)

CHAIRMAN

We now come to Item 4, Arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later*. The document is CL 121/LIM/3.

I would like to ask Ms Killingsworth, Assistant Director-General and Special Adviser on the World Food Summit Follow-up, to introduce this Item.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Assistant Director-General/Special Adviser, World Food Summit Follow-up)

I would like to introduce, in particular, the document which the Council has received yesterday and today, which is CL 121/LIM/3. We hope that everyone has had a chance to look at this document which, as you will understand, it has only been possible to produce very recently. The reason, I think, is known to everyone.

Two weeks ago, on 16 October 2001, the Director-General, with a great deal of regret and because of *force majeure*, felt obliged to propose to the Members of the Council the postponement of the World Food Summit: *five years later*. Members were notified on 26 October 2001 that the Council Members had agreed to the postponement.

The Director-General had, at the time, also indicated that he would be presenting to this Session of the Council his proposal for new dates for the World Food Summit: *five years later* in June 2002, with the rationale for his proposal and the financial implications of it. These are the issues which are covered in document CL 121/LIM/3.

In reviewing those issues very briefly before your discussion, I would first of all like to deal with the reasoning behind the proposal for the new dates. As everyone is aware, the early part of the year already sees some major meetings, both of other Bodies and of FAO. In addition to the March meeting in Monterrey Mexico – the UN Conference on Financing for Development – FAO's own Regional Conferences are scheduled between February and June, as is normally the case in the first year of a new biennium.

For the second half of the year we have a major holiday period starting in mid-July, and before that there is normally a Summit of the OAU. A number of other Summits generally take place in

the second half of each year. Ramadan in 2002 begins on 6 November. All of these considerations brought the Director-General to conclude that the month of June would be the very best of possible proposals from the standpoint of the international calendar. There are major meetings of the European Union and the G-8 in the second half of June, and it seemed that the week of 10-14 June would be the best window in that period.

The document also describes to you the process which he is proposing to prepare for the World Food Summit: *five years later* and to hold it in conjunction with already scheduled and budgeted meetings. As you know, that was one of the major reasons underlying the original proposal for the World Food Summit: *five years later*, which was supported very strongly by the Membership.

The proposal, therefore, is advance the dates of the Committee on World Food Security – which had been scheduled for September – to June and to also reschedule the one Regional Conference, the Asia and Pacific Regional Conference, which was scheduled later in June, to ensure both of these bodies could meet immediately prior to the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

As a result, we would have a scheduled event which would be taking place soon after the preparatory activities which have been carried out during the year 2001, including those in countries preparing for participation in the event. At the same time, it gives a further half year to obtain the input from the FAO Regional Conferences which, as you know, already have the follow-up to the World Food Summit as an item on their agendas and also to obtain the results of the initial assessment by the Committee on World Food Security which in 2002 will have completed its first full reporting cycle on the implementation of the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit, originally agreed as part of its on-going monitoring process.

The dates of the CFS and the Summit are indicated in the document. The proposal is that the CFS would meet on 6-8 June 2002. For that purpose, it would limit its agenda to the two substantive items: assessment of the world food security situation and the progress report on implementation of the Plan of Action.

At the same time, the Open-ended Working Group which has been established by the Council to negotiate the draft outcome document for the World Food Summit: *five years later* could meet during those two to three days. On Monday, 10 June 2002 the World Food Summit: *five years later* could begin.

Experience in planning the event this year has indicated to us that it would be possible to keep the event to four days rather than the originally scheduled five. When you come to paragraphs 17-21 in the document, covering the financial implications, I would like to clarify that the costings given there are for a four-day event, rather than the originally budgeted five-day event which would have taken place during the forthcoming Conference.

A few more words on the whole question of financial implications. Delegates will note that the original costs of the event which were given in CL 121/LIM/3 presented to the last Council, have been picked up here in the table after paragraph 19 and from that you will see that a considerable proportion of these costs has already been incurred during this year. So what we have estimated as costs which would need to be incurred in 2002 is the cost of the final meeting of the Open-ended Working Group and the cost, as I said, of a four-day plenary debate in June.

The holding of the meeting, as an integral part of the Conference had, of course, as originally clarified, permitted a great deal of cost absorption, because the budget of the Council and Conference has a great deal of absorptive capacity. The budget of the Committee on World Food Security has somewhat less. However, by reducing the length of its session we do expect to generate some savings and, as you will notice, the other costs may also be covered to a certain extent from redirection of resources within the overall budget.

In conclusion, the approval of the Council is sought for the proposal to convene the World Food Summit: *five years later* from 10-13 June 2002, according to the arrangements which are outlined in the paper. As a consequence there is also a recommendation that the Council, at its Session following the Conference, may wish to consider the modifications to the dates of the two sessions

I mentioned, those of the Committee on World Food Security and that of the Asia and Pacific Regional Conference.

Finally, the question arises of the Open-ended Working Group which the Council had decided in its Session in June to reconvene at this Session to discuss the draft of the outcome document. It is up now to the Members of the Council to decide how they wish to proceed. The Secretariat is prepared to service such a meeting if you decide to have it, but it is entirely a matter for the members to decide.

With that I will conclude and I stand ready to provide any further clarifications you or the Council Members may require.

Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)

En primer lugar queremos agradecer la presentación del tema así como destacar lo completo del documento de referencia que, por razones explicadas recientemente, resulta muy ilustrativo. Permítame, en nombre del Grupo de los 77, algunos comentarios sobre este importante tema de los preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: *cinco a os despue s*.

La posición de los países en desarrollo ha sido clara, argumentada y firme, desde el inicio de la propuesta del Director General, partiendo de la evidente necesidad de llevar a cabo una Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: *cinco a os despue s*.

Este evento no puede constituir una reunión más, sino la realización de lo que en su momento fue un hito: la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación en 1996, tanto en la historia de la FAO como en el sistema de las Naciones Unidas en el campo de la seguridad alimentaria, así como una esperanza global, fundamentalmente en los que fueron sus acuerdos, agrupados en sus textos, la Declaración Política y el Plan de Acción bajo el principio de la voluntad política de su cumplimiento.

Hemos repetido siempre que un aspecto fundamental de estos acuerdos fue su credibilidad. Es conocido por todos que estos acuerdos no se estaban cumpliendo y que sus metas no se alcanzaban, razones evidentes y necesarias para efectuar un evento de esta magnitud.

La reunión fijada precisamente para esa fecha se vio afectada por toda una serie de circunstancias que coincidieron en el ámbito local e internacional sobre la realización de este evento, ajenas a los propósitos de la FAO. Primero, el cambio de sede, que por primera vez en la historia de la FAO se planteaba la necesidad de realizar este magno evento fuera de la misma. Después, agudizada por la situación internacional generada por los actos terroristas cometidos en las ciudades norteamericanas que todos condenamos, así como la situación de guerra que aún tiene lugar en acciones bélicas como los bombardeos a Afganistán, ocasionando ambas situaciones víctimas inocentes.

Debido a estas circunstancias, correctamente se pensó en posponer el evento de sus fechas originales. Hoy tenemos ante nosotros una nueva propuesta para celebrar esta indispensable reunión y llevar a cabo la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: *cinco a os despue s* en junio del año 2002, propuesta realizada luego de un análisis objetivo de la situación que nos brinda el tiempo necesario para su preparación y organización, en la que prevemos se brindará la oportunidad de condiciones necesarias para llevar a cabo este importante encuentro.

En el documento de referencia, tal como se dijo en la presentación del CL 121/LIM/3, se dice en su parte final: " de convocar la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación del 10 al 13 de junio conforme a las disposiciones expuestas anteriormente ", y termina: " en consecuencia se recomienda también que el Consejo examine el calendario provisional de los órganos rectores y otras reuniones importantes para el 2002-2003 en su 122º período de sesiones, inmediatamente después de la Conferencia, y acuerde también el calendario para las reuniones siguientes: el 28º período de sesiones del Comité de Seguridad Alimentaria y la Conferencia Regional de Asia y el Pacífico."

Podemos decir, como Presidencia del Grupo de los 77, que apoyamos esa propuesta del Director General de la FAO.

El hambre no puede esperar; este ejercicio al que nos convoca el Director General es impostergable y el Grupo de los 77 apoya esta lógica y argumentada propuesta que nos brinda la oportunidad, dentro de su análisis, de reafirmar los compromisos contraídos en 1996.

Ante este nuevo reto, y como siempre el Grupo de los 77 abierto al diálogo amplio, sincero, apela a los Miembros del Consejo a que hagan de esta propuesta una posición de consenso en este plenario, pues de estas circunstancias no pueden ser olvidados ni el hambre ni la pobreza, y estableciera la necesidad de su análisis como una verdadera prioridad.

Estas son nuestras primeras consideraciones sobre este tema, fundamentalmente de la fecha, porque de esto se deriva toda una serie de circunstancias que los que estamos aquí reunidos comprenderemos.

Guntram VON SCHENCK (Germany)

I would like to ask the floor for Belgium, as the Presidency of the European Union.

Christian MONNOYER (Observer for Belgium)

I speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. The European Community and its Member States remain strongly committed to the full implementation of the World Food Summit Plan of Action and the achievement of the 1996 Summit Target. We have worked hard to participate constructively in the preparation for the World Food Summit: *five years later* because we believe that the issue of political will is indeed central to the fight against hunger, malnutrition and poverty. Although we understand the reasons for postponement, we hope that the momentum we have built during the last year will not be diminished.

The rearranging of this event must now be very carefully considered in order to truly achieve the goal we, the Member Nations of FAO, have set ourselves, that is to achieve preparations and a meeting at the very highest level to secure a lasting political commitment to the goals of the World Food Summit and a meeting which can deliver a substantial input to the international process, since FAO is but one of United Nations and other international agencies and organizations concerned by the World Food Summit.

We would like to mention the implementation of the Millennium Declaration, in particular the Road Map, which is an essential benchmark, especially as regards the fight against poverty.

This question will be debated at this Hundred and Twenty-first FAO Council. The discussions, in our opinion, need to take account of previous decisions and concerns.

One: the monitoring of the World Food Summit, as decided in 1996, takes place at the Committee for Food Security. Its Session of September 2002 shall assess the implementation of a second set of objectives of the 1996 Action Plan; the first one was examined at the September 2000 Session. The Medium-Term Review shall take place in 2006, when the entire Plan of Action will be examined.

Two: 2002 will be significant year for development in the United Nations system. We already have two summits planned: Financing for Development, in March in Monterey, and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September, in Johannesburg. They represent a general framework for the implementation of the Plan of Action of the World Food Summit and, therefore, for the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

It is clear for Financing for Development, besides the recommitment of the political will, mobilizing resources is the principle objective of World Food Summit: *five years later*. This is also true for the Summit on Sustainable Development, whose main topics are: making globalization work for sustainable development and the sustainable use of natural and environmental resources. The Child Summit will be scheduled between May and June 2002 and the World Assembly on Ageing will be held in Madrid from 8 to 12 April 2002.

Three: the budgetary implications have to be seriously considered when deciding on when to hold the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

Four: the Hundred and Nineteenth Council in November 2000 decided to include the World Food Summit: *five years later* as a high-level segment at the Thirty-first Conference, in order to take advantage of a meeting already on the agenda. These parameters should be kept in mind during the discussion of this issue at the Council. Different options should be presented to the membership and discussed without prejudice and on their own merits. As stated above, to achieve the desired political will, discussions need to be broadly based, thorough and leave participants with the feeling that a true consensus has been reached. The European Union is ready to take part constructively in this debate. A decision by consensus would be an important step towards a success of the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

Meetings between the regional chairs, enlarged to two delegates of two other countries, to representatives of G-77 and OECD, at this Council, would be very useful by allowing informal discussions of the issue at stake, and the diverse options facilitating the debate and also ultimately a consensus decision.

Finally, the European Union feels that the Open-ended Working Group established at the June Council, should temporarily suspend its discussions until it is clear when the World Food Summit: *five years later* will take place, at which time it could be decided when the Group could most usefully meet again.

Mrs Mantho MOTSELEBANE (Lesotho)

I would like to request that the United Republic of Tanzania, as Chairman of the Africa Group, be given the floor to address Item 4.

Costa Ricky MAHALU (Observer for Tanzania, United Republic of)

I will be talking on behalf of the Africa Group.

My colleague and friend, the Ambassador of Cuba, has already expressed opposition and support of document CL 121/LIM/3. The Africa Group, therefore, supports the proposed dates for holding the Summit, that is 10 to 14 June 2002.

The Group wishes to emphasize the fact that the plight of the 800 million hungry people cannot be a subject of delays and indefinite postponements. It has to be given top priority status. That is why we support the dates proposed because, for us, the developing countries, the Summit is a matter of priority for the year 2002. The sooner it is convened, the better for us. As far as the Open-ended Working Group, established by the Council, is concerned, the Group supports the proposal put forward by the Secretariat.

Sra. Marcela LÓPEZ BRAVO DE RUIZ (Perú)

Le pido, por favor, dé la palabra a Bolivia quién hablará por el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

David BLANCO ZABALA (Observador de Bolivia)

En nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe, quiero transmitirle nuestro apoyo a la realización de la CMA: cad en la fecha propuesta por el Director General.

Este tema ha sido particularmente el más importante en nuestros debates recientes por la trascendencia que tiene para la FAO y para los más pobres del planeta. Esta responsabilidad descubre un nuevo mundo solidario y efectivo. Reconocemos que hemos deliberado intensamente sobre este tema con los representantes de los países desarrollados y, particularmente, hemos llegado a un consenso en el caso de los países del Grupo de los 77, al cual se ha referido el distinguido Representante de Cuba y que apoyamos plenamente. Estamos de acuerdo en desarrollar todos los mecanismos de diálogo entre los distintos grupos de países para encontrar soluciones de compromiso que vayan precisamente a fortalecer las ventajas comparativas de la FAO en el campo del desarrollo agrícola y la alimentación. Particularmente nos alienta la reciente

Declaración del Grupo de los Ocho en su reciente reunión de Génova, incluyendo por primera vez el tema de la agricultura y la alimentación y, en especial, el rol de la FAO.

La historia de los últimos veinte años ha mostrado una realidad que nos preocupa, unida a la continuación de las políticas proteccionistas y de subsidios de países desarrollados que impiden el ingreso de los productos de los países en desarrollo en condiciones de competencia en línea con las características del mundo globalizado que vivimos.

Vivimos en una época de este milenio difícil para la humanidad, los acontecimientos recientes mundiales, que todos deploramos, nos llevan a una realidad lacerante: que todos los países compiten por mercados y recursos. Sin embargo, el sector agrícola, donde está concentrada la mayor parte de la población, es el que no está recibiendo la atención que merece. Las tendencias en materia de disminución del financiamiento de los organismos multilaterales es del 43 por ciento en el sector agrícola. En muchos casos, como en el del Banco Mundial y el de algunos bancos Regionales, muestran la necesidad de fortalecer la FAO. Por estas razones, consideramos que posponer este tema, en las circunstancias actuales, sería una mala indicación para la comunidad internacional.

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

On behalf of the developing countries of Asia, we would like to support the statement by the Chairperson of the G77 on the arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the Director-General for providing the information requested by the Membership on the cost implications and the rationale for decision on a date. The suggestions in the paper on the probable date, as well as the proposal to combine the event with the CFS, seem to be quite acceptable to us. As most of the preparatory action has already been taken, we hope that the cost can be contained to a great extent, especially if the event is held in conjunction with the CFS.

On the Open-ended Working Group, we would like to go along with the proposal in the paper that the Open-ended Working Group be reconvened during the CFS Session, that seems to be more practical.

Let me just conclude by also wishing, like many others here, that we would very much welcome a consensus decision on this issue.

Blair HANKEY (Canada)

I would like to join my colleagues here in thanking the Director-General and the members of the Secretariat for this paper, which I think is an important contribution to our work in setting a date for and organizing the Summit. Canada is fully in agreement with the other colleagues who have spoken, that the Summit will be an important event. It is a necessary event that we have in the calendar of meetings and we believe that it should be held next year and not delayed indefinitely, given the great importance of the issue that will be addressed.

We also share the view expressed by a number of other delegations that it is very important that, in order to mobilize political will, which is identified by the Director-General as one of the key objectives of the meeting, that in order to engender such political will it is essential that the decisions on the dates, and other matters related to the Summit, be the subject of a consensus decision. This will ensure, we believe, a sense of common ownership of the meeting by the Members of FAO and, therefore, promote their active and enthusiastic participation in the preparations for the event and then in the event itself.

We only received this paper this morning. I am sorry we are not as efficient as the Group of 77, and we are unable to coordinate ourselves as quickly as they are able to do. I must congratulate them on the great efficiency with which they are able to organize their consultations among themselves. I think it might be useful for us if the G-77 would give us a little technical assistance because we, on our side, seem less able to react so quickly to documents issued only a few hours ago. But, again, given the very fact that the document has only been available to us within really

the last hour, I would appreciate it if we do not move to a decision on this matter right away. Rather, taking account of this very constructive proposal by the Secretariat, I do believe it would be useful if we could set up some mechanism in order to hold consultations over the next two days, so that we could facilitate a consensus agreement on the matters addressed in this document.

Jón Erlingur JÓNASSON (Iceland)

I would like you to give the floor to Norway who will speak on behalf of the European Group. Thank you.

Dag BRISEID (Observer for Norway)

I would like to take the floor on behalf of the European Regional Group. We welcome the CL 121/LIM/3 document that has been presented to us which we think is a very useful contribution. I would like to say that the European Region wants to reach a consensus on this, and we shall do our utmost to reach consensus. However, taking into consideration that this is a very new document to us, we think we need a vehicle, a mechanism, to study the document during this Council meeting.

I would like to associate myself with the EU when saying that we might be setting up a group consisting of the regional chairs, that is, with an addition of two Members from each Region plus the Chair of the OECD and the Chair of the G-77 - the purpose being to go through the document, reach a consensus and bring the result back to this Council.

Masato ITO (Japan)

My delegation would like to join other delegations in thanking the Secretariat for providing us the detailed information. However, as my previous speakers said, I only received the document yesterday evening and many of my colleagues received it this morning. I fully understand the situation briefed by the Secretariat. However, I would like to have a bit more time to consider the document. Having said that, I would like to support the proposal made by the European Union and supported by the European Regional Group to have some mechanism to discuss in a detailed manner this issue.

I would like to have some clarification in relation to this issue - firstly, as regards the timing of the Asia Pacific Regional Conference. In paragraph 14 of this document, it is proposed to reschedule the Regional Conference. Actually it is scheduled for 24 to 28 June in Nepal.

As you know, Japan was the Host Country of the regional conference last year and because of the other international meetings, my Government had the smallest flexibility on the timing of the Regional Conference and it was held very late in August. I would like to know the position of the host country of the next Asia Pacific Regional Conference, namely, the Government of Nepal.

We would also like to have a clarification on the security issues during the World Food Summit: *five years later* in Rome. We understand that the first change in venue from Rome to Rimini was due to the request from the Host Country and later the change was made again for the reason that the world situation had changed. Therefore, in order not to repeat the confusion, my delegation would like to have a clarification on the security issues either from FAO or from the Host Country.

Ms Fatimah Hasan J. HAJAT (Kuwait) (Original language Arabic)

Kuwait is speaking on behalf of the Near East Group. This morning the Heads of Delegations and the Chairman of the Group of 77, had a meeting to prepare for the World Food Summit: *five years later*. At that time, we did not have that document CL 121/LIM/3. Therefore we, as a group, said that we would have to tell this Council to give us an opportunity to scrutinize and to think in-depth about this issue before taking a position. However, the Secretariat actually, has, as usual, submitted this document which is not something surprising to us. It is a convincing document and it contains a wealth of information. I shall not comment on all details contained in this document and on this issue because during the last two weeks we had ample time to consult among ourselves at the level of chairman and below.

Therefore, I believe that what is contained in this document should urge us to ask who submitted this document. We really envy, those who prepared it with the cost assessment and all the details contained in this document. If we have to wait until all Members of this Organization comment and study and reach a decision, then we will have to wait *ad infinitum*. Therefore, I believe that this document, particularly in paragraph 14, refers to the fact that the various reports of the various conferences shall be submitted by that time. I believe that on this basis, as we said previously, we shall join the majority; we shall always join the majority in order to achieve consensus.

As for the Open-ended Working Group, we do not object to that mechanism. The Chairmanship and Vice Chairmanship should be two of the members of this group. However, we have to set the dates for this event.

Finally Sir, I should like to thank the Secretariat for this document which is an exhaustive one and I do hope that we shall reach a consensus, at least in principle. We hope that we shall reach a consensus on the principle of holding this Summit, and we do hope that we shall avoid the problems we faced in the past.

Finally, with respect to the Open-ended Working Group, I would like to support the idea of the European Union and the European Regional Group.

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

The United States associates itself with the comments of Canada, Japan and Norway regarding the need for further consultations, given the recent availability of this document. We would like to reserve the right for additional substantive comments following these consultations.

Simon HEARN (Australia)

My delegation would like to speak on behalf of the Southwest Pacific Group. We would like to make a few points without being repetitive of other delegations but in principle, of course, holding a Summit is very appropriate and to be encouraged. However, we are concerned to ensure that the Summit is successful. In this regard, the timing must be considered closely in order to ascertain the very best chance we can have of having a successful Summit. We stand ready as a group to contribute to that success and to participate actively in ensuring that success.

On some of the other points that have been raised, we would like for the Summit, we think, to be held in Rome. We can see a lot of advantages in that location, and we would like to ensure that we have a thorough preparatory process in which we can engage all parties very actively.

With regards to the documents, certainly, they do represent a very useful contribution in going forward towards the Summit but we do need further time to fully consider all the aspects in that documentation, including, of course, other events which may happen next year. We would like to add our view that a broad consensus approach to addressing this Summit would be essential, in order to get the fullest possible enthusiasm from all parties which is essential to success. We equally do not see a need for an Open-ended Working Group that would be premature at this juncture.

Finally, we would like to support the proposition made earlier by Norway convene regional chairs or other small groups in carrying this forward in a very reasonable and enthusiastic way.

Sitdhi BOONYARATPALIN (Thailand)

I would like to associate myself with the Chairman of G-77 and other Member Nations on supporting the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

The World Food Summit: *five years later* cannot any longer be postponed to a later stage. It is indeed, an urgent agenda for the FAO Members. We support the World Food Summit: *five years later* as proposed from June 10 to 13, 2002. However, it is important for Members of Asia and the Pacific to know in advance as to the change in dates of the Asia and Pacific Regional Conference.

I would appreciate it very much if you could provide an explanation as to how the decision will be made regarding the Regional Conference.

Adnan Bashir KHAN (Pakistan)

We welcome this paper and thank Ms Killingsworth for her extremely clear and comprehensive briefing on the Director-General's proposal in connection with the arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

Most of the points that we have been covered by the Chairman of the G-77 and the Chairperson of Asia Group. We support the points that have been made by them.

Nevertheless, we have the following to state. The Director-General invited the Rome-based Permanent Representatives earlier this month and had extensive consultation with them, individually, to propose the postponement of the World Food Summit; *five years later* segment of the conference, given the events of 11 September and the global political environment.

On that occasion, I recollect that a vast majority of speakers who took the floor from all regions welcomed the Director-General's proposal for postponement principally on two accounts. Firstly, that in the prevalent circumstances the Summit would not be able to achieve its purpose. Secondly, that the subject of food security had become all the more relevant. Therefore, the proposal does not envisage a *sine die* postponement, rather a short postponement is to be proposed in order not to lose the momentum.

The second point has also been emphasized by colleagues from Canada and from European Union that we need not lose momentum.

Now we see that firm dates, well researched with regard to the international calendar have been proposed. For our delegation, the proposal meets the wishes of the many who took the floor that day and as such have our support.

That day there was another concern raised which was the legal requirement of presenting cost estimates in considering the fresh proposal. The present document also provides the membership with these estimates. In analyzing these, we must note that the postponement, as clearly expressed by Ms Killingsworth and the Director-General was a result of *force majeure* and therefore, some increase in the cost estimates should be acceptable.

We note that bringing forward and shortening the CFS is a most appropriate element in the proposal. We also welcome the shortening of length of the Summit. We also favour bringing forward the date of the Asian Regional Conference.

We also agree to the option of convening the Open-ended Working Group during the period 6 to 8 June 2002.

On the question of building consensus, we welcome each and every initiative in this direction and as such, have no objection to the proposal of organizing a small group. However, we are not sure whether the purpose of this working group would be to suggest fresh dates for the Summit or to discuss other aspects. As far as we understand, the dates were mentioned by the DG almost a month back and were known to almost every member here. We also believe, as we have stated earlier, that these dates are well researched and take care of all other international commitments. Therefore, it is not clear to me whether those who propose holding this Open-ended or this smaller Working Group have in mind proposing fresh dates because that can open a Pandora's box in discussing just the dates. But, if the intention is to discuss other arrangements, I am sure that such a working group would be a useful input.

KIM KYEONG-KIU (Korea, Republic of)

My delegation received this excellent document just before we started discussions so it needs more time to understand it carefully. In this regard, I would like to support Canada, Japan and other Members in this line.

I have just one request to the Secretariat through you. For the benefit of the Members, I ask the Secretariat to circulate the last November decision, that we would have the World Food Summit: *five years later* on the occasion of the Thirty-first Session of the Conference.

Zacharie PÉREVET (Cameroun)

Nous nous rappelons que, depuis que le Directeur général a proposé la tenue du Sommet mondial pour l'agriculture: *cinq ans après*, le Groupe africain, le Cameroun a soutenu entièrement cette proposition, parce que nous pensions que c'était indispensable pour évaluer les chemins parcourus. A cause de beaucoup d'événements, cette réunion n'a pas pu se tenir comme prévu. La Direction générale propose maintenant la tenue de cette réunion en juin. En fait, à travers notre Groupe africain, le Groupe des 77, le Cameroun a fait connaître sa position et a soutenu la proposition du Directeur général.

Il s'avère quand même, après avoir écouté d'autres groupes, qu'il est nécessaire, comme certains proposent, d'approfondir l'examen. Ma délégation pense qu'il ne faut pas fermer la discussion, et si c'est possible d'en discuter, pour autant que la réussite du Sommet en dépende, la délégation camerounaise ne s'oppose pas à ce dialogue. Mais il faut que cette réunion se tienne le plus rapidement possible. Nous sommes donc d'accord pour le dialogue, mais nous tenons à préciser qu'en fait nous avons déjà voulu approuver la décision du Directeur général, mais comme le dialogue s'impose encore, nous soutenons également le processus de consensus.

Júlio Cesar GOMES DOS SANTOS (Brasil)

No hablo en nombre de ningún grupo, tampoco de ninguna región, lo hago solamente en nombre de mi delegación.

El Banco Mundial ya previó que el cuadro mundial del hambre se ampliará a partir de la actual situación internacional. La historia contemporánea de nuestros días registra tres marcos fundamentales: el primero es el fin de la Segunda Guerra Mundial que determinó la reordenación política con la creación de las Naciones Unidas y la reordenación económica con los acuerdos de Bretton Woods; en segundo lugar, el fin de la Guerra Fría, de la bipolarización y la consecuente reorganización económica mundial que nos lleva a la globalización; en tercer lugar son los trágicos acontecimientos del 11 de septiembre en Estados Unidos y sus consecuencias en el plan internacional. En cada una de esas ocasiones los temas sensibles de ellas resultantes provocaron y provocan cumbres. Las más notables de 1945 en adelante son el resultado de la discusión sobre el desarme. Desde 1991 las reuniones sobre la reorganización económica, más notablemente las reuniones del G-8, G-7 más uno. Ahora debemos más que nunca promover este encuentro en el nivel más alto porque es más grave que la carrera armamentística de los años que siguieron al armisticio del 45, más importante que la reorganización económica, financiera y comercial de pos Guerra Fría. La situación actual es sumamente grave porque el incremento del hambre es fundamental y es el más peligroso de los ingredientes que actúan en la crisis de nuestros días, que es el odio.

Lo que hasta hace muy poco tiempo podía ser objeto de dudas y me refiero a la necesidad misma de una CMA: *cad*, es ahora una necesidad que se impone.

Reuniones se suceden todos los años, muchas veces intercaladas por cumbres de emergencia fuera de cualquier programación. El calendario propuesto por el Director General no es absurdo y los documentos básicos ya fueron estudiados desde el Consejo de junio; estamos viviendo una emergencia, por lo tanto, el asunto exige urgencia.

Gabriel G. LOMBIN (Nigeria)

Before I say anything let me state from the onset that I associate myself with the statement issued by the Chairman of G-77 and the Chairman of the Africa Group.

As my good friend and colleague the delegate from Pakistan said, this issue has been under dialogue and discussion at various fora for the last month or thereabouts. The only thing that has not been under discussion is this paper, this beautiful paper, until this morning.

I do have sympathy for those who are expressing fears that they have not had time to look at it. I have browsed through it very quickly too and I wonder whether I would have had any more thoughts than I have had so far on the paper since reading it. But be that as it may, I would like to say on behalf of my country that we are particularly encouraged this morning by the way in which the discussion of this paper has proceeded. We are encouraged in the sense that we had some fears initially, but these fears appeared to be giving way this morning.

Having listened fairly carefully to the various voices that have emerged, it is very clear that this Council has re-endorsed the idea of holding this Summit again. I have not heard any clear dissension as to the question of holding it next year. I have not heard any clear statement of delegates opposing it as such. I also have not heard anything that anybody has said with respect to the element that was most worrying to many Members of this Council, that is the element of cost. I must congratulate Ms Killingsworth for taking time to tell us that, at the end of the day, we are probably talking about something like maybe US\$ 40 000 or some increase ultimately. Surely, for an event of that magnitude that kind of increase, as my Pakistani colleague has said, can reasonably be absorbed, in my humble submission.

What then is the issue on the floor? I guess some people still feel that there ought to be some further discussion before the date is firmed up.

The issues that were raised at the time the Summit was postponed a few weeks back have, in all humility, been adequately covered in this paper - the issue of cost, the issue of timing, and how to fit it in. I understand that most of the international events that are coming up had been considered before the suggestion was made. Now if that is the correct position, and if I am to take it that the cost element is not an issue because I do not honestly think it is an issue based on this submission, I would like to think that the basic issues of fear have been removed. Maybe this is why we are having these nice smooth margins of consensus; quite frankly, I think the consensus is already a margin. Nigeria, as many other delegates, would like to see a strong consensus emerge in order to ensure that we promote this Summit with all the rigour we can measure.

I therefore would like to endorse the view that we should allow a consensus to emerge but in pursuing the principle of consensus, let me plead with this distinguished Council, that having accepted and having spent some resources on the preparation of this Summit, as many delegates have said this morning, we should not allow the momentum to fizzle out. I am glad that point had been made by more than three delegates here. If that is the position, while respecting the view expressed by the United States that we will still probably want to raise some substantial issues, I would like to plead with the International Community that we should join hands in allowing this issue to go forward and let us put it behind us in the next eight months.

Of course, for us in the developing world, and particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, the issue of food security is a life and death affair. So anything that can be done to assist us, we will welcome it, obviously, but we would like to plead with our brothers and sisters in the International Community. The developing world is in dire need and I would like to urge you kindly to be your brothers' keepers. This is the time to demonstrate international global solidarity to us; this is the time to ask you to come to our aid directly. I am not talking about bilateral aid.

I have listened to the debate on this Summit for the last three months and it is the same issues that appear to be coming up - resources, timing, logistics - and I am pleased that the Secretariat has been very meticulous in listening to the Council and taking the views of the Council into consideration in preparing what is now before us.

I would like to congratulate the Secretariat and plead literally, plead very dispassionately, with my colleagues for whatever mechanism they would advise in order to arrive at a consensus. We should endeavour to achieve, first, to let this Summit go on since we have already initiated it and spent so much time on it, and secondly, the sooner we put it behind us the better because, after all, it is supposed to re-energize a Plan of Action, it is not the action itself but to re-energize it. The sooner we get it done the better.

Finally, I honestly would like to congratulate the Secretariat for the intelligent presentation of this document I have read it with some interest.

Aciselo VALLADARES MOLINA (Guatemala)

Nuestro pleno respaldo al Presidente del Grupo de los 77, expresión de todos y de cada uno de los estados que lo conformamos.

Hago más las palabras del señor Embajador de los Estados Unidos del Brasil. La Cumbre, sumamente importante cuando fue originalmente convocada hoy a la luz de los últimos trágicos acontecimientos vividos y que persisten, insisto importante cuando fue originalmente convocada, hoy se hace impostergable. Quienes tengan oídos para oír que oigan. Hago así más las reflexiones expresadas por el señor Representante de Pakistán y el Representante de Nigeria, como siempre sabias y conciliatorias.

Finalmente, me permito señalar que lo que en verdad es importante de la Cumbre serán sus resultados y que el éxito de la Cumbre depende del amplio consenso otorgado. En tal sentido respaldamos toda iniciativa que garantice el consenso más amplio y comprometa a todos sin excepción en garantizar sus resultados. La concurrencia al más alto nivel para esta Cumbre es importante, así deber ser, pero finalmente es instrumental, el fortalecimiento de la voluntad política y la adecuada movilización de recursos deben ser los resultados. Necesaria respuesta a la situación internacional que impera, si en verdad queremos establecer bases para que pueda haber paz entre nosotros. La paz que finalmente es un don de Dios Nuestro Señor, pero que el ser humano está obligado a crear las condiciones para hacerla posible.

CHAIRMAN

I do have here on my list seven delegates that want to intervene but I think we should look at what we have achieved so far in the debate. In order to move on constructively I think there is a consensus still on the need for a World Food Summit: *five years later*. There is no intervention here that is contrary to that opinion. There is still a need, very much so. There is also a consensus that we should not lose any momentum. It is very important. There are several things that I think should be clarified by Ms Killingsworth. There are several points that have been asked, even though, like our delegate from Nigeria said, some very basic things have not been argued upon, cost and things like that.

There is a proposal for setting up a small committee consisting of representatives of regions. I also heard from the delegate of Pakistan that actually such a meeting had been convened with the Secretariat or the leadership of the FAO. Now, I think we are very close to reaching a consensus on this matter. I certainly emphasize on the fear that if we begin to talk about the dates while, at the same time, we have a consensus that we should not lose any momentum. We know very well that these dates have been researched by the Secretariat, I hope that before lunch we really reach a consensus on this because we are very pressed for time.

Ms Killingsworth do you wish to go ahead before we invite the other Member States? There are several things that have been questioned or asked for further deliberation.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Assistant Director-General/Special Adviser, World Food Summit Follow-up)

I can certainly deal with the questions that have been raised already during the debate. The delegate of the Republic of Korea asked us to circulate the results of Council decision on the World Food Summit: *five years later* last year. I would simply ask if it would be sufficient to signal to you that those decisions are contained in para 18 to 26 of the Report of the Hundred Nineteenth Session of the Council and the report is available, I am sure, at the Documents Desk. If that would be sufficient to satisfy the delegate of the Republic of Korea we can certainly get him a copy.

Several other questions were raised. One was the question of the dates of the Regional Conference for Asia and the Pacific. Obviously, as the Council will appreciate, it has not been possible to

consult the Government of Nepal, the Host Country, yet. The proposal is first submitted to you. If the Council agrees we will, of course, follow the normal procedure of consulting the host country. In the meantime we already do have ten days or so, maybe even more, until the Council meets again on 14 November. It would be at that point that it would normally approve the provisional calendar of meetings for next year, so we have a little time. Therefore, at this point I believe the Council could recommend that the dates be advanced to a suitable time and the Director-General could then set the exact dates in consultation with the host country.

Another question asked was with regard to the venue. I would just point out that before it became necessary to propose postponement of the World Food Summit: *five years later* from the date in November, the host country had already agreed that the situation had changed and that it would be possible to hold the event in Rome and to ensure all the security that would have been necessary for the event. Therefore, it had not seemed to us a problem at this point to envisage that the event would be held, as I believe the delegate of Australia also suggested, at FAO Headquarters.

Finally, I think the issue of costs was not really questioned. I think the point which was made was that a postponement to later than June 2002, in the end could have a greater cost, in the sense that the investment already made in this year's preparations for the World Food Summit: *five years later* would be capitalized more effectively the earlier the event takes place in 2002.

Those were, I think, the only questions I have noted.

Mme Béatrice DAMIBA (Burkina Faso)

Après la synthèse que vous venez de faire ainsi que l'intervention de Madame Killingsworth, je crois que notre tâche est facilitée. D'abord je voudrais dire que le Burkina Faso, évidemment, souscrit aux déclarations du Groupe des 77 et à celles du Président du Groupe africain, par rapport à l'appréciation du document qui nous est soumis. Je voudrais faire observer que dans l'ensemble, j'ai l'impression que tous les orateurs qui se sont succédés avant moi étaient fondamentalement d'accord sur la tenue de ce Sommet qui avait déjà été mis en route avec un certain enthousiasme. Donc je n'ai pas l'impression effectivement que quelqu'un dans cette salle ne soit pas d'accord pour la tenue de ce Sommet courant 2002, et je pense que si le Directeur général a proposé le mois de juin 2002, ce n'était pas un hasard non plus. Il a examiné le calendrier des différents Sommets, des différentes Conférences de l'année, et je crois que c'est la meilleure période qui a été trouvée.

On n'a jamais parlé de Sommet plus six, ni Sommet plus sept, ni Sommet plus huit, on a bien parlé de Sommet plus cinq; cela fait déjà cinq ans en novembre de cette année et il ne serait pas souhaitable que nous excédions encore de plus de six mois la convocation d'un tel Sommet. Evidemment, je souscris également l'ensemble des aménagements qui sont proposés, c'est-à-dire réduire la durée du Sommet à quatre jours au lieu de cinq, déplacer la tenue du Comité de la Sécurité alimentaire pour la faire coïncider également avec le Sommet, réaménager aussi la Conférence régionale de l'Asie pacifique afin qu'elle puisse se tenir avant le Sommet.

Il me semble également que la question des coûts, qui était une des questions les plus préoccupantes, trouve ici aussi une certaine réponse dans la mesure où le document nous présente des coûts qui ne sont pas sensiblement trop élevés par rapport à ce qui était initialement prévu, c'est-à-dire qu'ils me semblent assez contenus.

En résumé, je crois que ce document qui nous est présenté ce matin est bien fait et répond à l'ensemble des questions que l'on se posait. Mais si certains le pensent et que vous décidiez qu'un dialogue s'avère absolument nécessaire - Madame Killingsworth nous a également dit que cela était encore possible jusqu'à la prochaine session du Conseil, après la Conférence - je souhaiterais que ces dialogues ne s'enlisent pas indéfiniment et qu'ils ne soient pas une certaine manière d'enterrer notre projet, le projet auquel chacun de nous tient absolument.

Moussa Bocar LY (Sénégal)

Vous avez facilité ma tâche, tout comme Madame Killingsworth et l'Ambassadrice du Burkina Faso. Je commencerai par me rallier bien sûr à l'Ambassadeur de Cuba qui a fait connaître la

position du Groupe des 77, et également à l'Ambassadeur de la République unie de Tanzanie, celle du Groupe africain qui épouse la position du Groupe des 77, appuyée également par l'Asie, le GRULAC et le Proche-Orient. Je crois qu'il y a un consensus. En effet, lorsque le Directeur général a réuni les Représentants permanents, il a évoqué sa proposition de report et de date, et conformément à ce qui avait été décidé il a soumis à la présente session du Conseil de nouvelles dates, et donc il me semble qu'il y a un consensus au moins sur une chose, c'est-à-dire que nous sommes tous d'accord sur le fait que c'est à cette présente session du Conseil que nous devons décider de ces dates. Le Directeur général nous a proposé et a mis par écrit la date du 10 au 13 et je crois que nous sommes tous d'accord sur le fait que c'est à cette session, d'ici le premier novembre, que nous devons décider sur ces nouvelles dates. C'est un point important que nous devons partager ensemble.

Ceci dit, je suis d'accord avec le Représentant du Pakistan. En effet, on nous a proposé de continuer le dialogue et il est difficile de s'opposer à un dialogue quand on recherche le consensus. Donc, cela va de soi, mais cela doit être circonscrit dans des limites précises. Ces limites sont d'abord le consensus que nous sommes tous d'accord pour que la présente session délibère et prenne des décisions sur des dates, celles proposées par le Directeur général, premièrement. Deuxièmement, comme l'a dit l'Ambassadrice du Burkina Faso, nous avons dit Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation plus cinq, cinq ans après. Donc cela doit se tenir dans des délais précis, et cela est une autre limite. Et je pense que lors de l'examen auquel nous avait conviés le Directeur général avec tous les Représentants permanents, la question soulevée était celle des incidences financières. On a exigé un document écrit sur les incidences financières; ce document existe, il est là sous nos yeux, et donc nous devons l'examiner et décider. Et l'on voit que nous passerions, si le Sommet devait se tenir dans les conditions proposées par le Directeur général, de 222 000 dollars à 182 300 dollars, étant entendu que la durée serait ramenée de 5 à 4 jours également, et surtout que cela se ferait dans le cadre du Comité de la Sécurité alimentaire mondiale. Nous devons nous rappeler que lors du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation en 1996, c'est ce Comité qui a été désigné comme structure de suivi et d'évaluation des progrès réalisés dans le cadre de l'application du Plan d'action. Je crois donc que c'est heureux que le Comité de la Sécurité alimentaire mondiale soit remis à la place qui lui sied.

Ce préalable étant fait, dans ce que nous propose ceux qui veulent continuer le dialogue, il y a quelque chose qui m'étonne, parce qu'on nous dit qu'il faut que nous puissions étudier ce document qui a été soumis entre hier et aujourd'hui, de façon à pouvoir faire des commentaires. Or à qui sont adressés ces commentaires ? Peut-être sont-ils adressés au Secrétariat, comme nous avons eu à l'expérimenter aujourd'hui même ? Si ces commentaires sont adressés au Secrétariat, je crois qu'il doit s'agir maintenant de consultation, pour que le Secrétariat puisse clarifier les points d'ombre qui existeraient à la suite de l'examen de ce document. Il ne s'agirait plus de négocier, car que faut-il négocier ? Qu'y a-t-il à négocier maintenant ? Il s'agit d'étudier ce document. La plupart avait demandé un document écrit sur les incidences financières, donc, de se prononcer sur ces incidences financières, et je crois qu'il n'y a rien à négocier. Un groupe de travail qui serait, en principe, chargé de négocier n'a donc pas son lieu ici. Je crois que si nous nous mettons tous d'accord, si nous avons les idées claires, nous sommes pratiquement au bout du chemin comme vous l'avez vous-même dit, et vous avez la sagesse voulue pour tirer les conclusions d'un débat fort nourri, fort riche mais plein de consensus. Nous devons toujours nous souvenir que le G8 de juillet à Gênes a endossé ce Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*. La Reine Fabiola de Belgique, dont le pays préside l'Union européenne, tout comme le Président de la République fédérale d'Allemagne ont dit la nécessité urgente de tenir ce Sommet mondial cinq ans après pour reprendre l'élan et conserver l'objectif qui est de réduire de moitié, d'ici 2015, le nombre des personnes sous-alimentées dans le monde. Je crois que vraiment nous sommes au bout du tunnel et que vous avez la sagesse voulue pour nous mettre tous d'accord par la synthèse que nous attendons.

Angel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)

En aras del tiempo quiero ser muy breve; sin embargo, quiero puntualizar algunas cosas que para nuestra delegación son importantes.

En primer término permítame augurarle éxito en la dirección de nuestros trabajos.

Como ésta es la primera intervención de mi país, quisiera subrayar las palabras que ha pronunciado el Director General a raíz de la difícil situación internacional que hoy impera. Mi delegación desea llamar la atención de este Consejo sobre la urgente necesidad de reforzar el multilateralismo, fortalecer la cooperación internacional y recrear un clima de entendimiento y comprensión intercultural.

Chile, al igual que el resto del mundo, se ha visto afectado por la nueva situación internacional. Chile necesita un comercio libre respecto al derecho internacional, un clima de estabilidad y paz. Los atentados terroristas nos ponen en el campo de los países dañados, pues se ha visto afectado el consumo de nuestros principales mercados. El costo de los seguros aumentará, el turismo ha declinado, enfrentamos de manera cierta un panorama sombrío. Por ello, esta nueva realidad internacional debe incorporarse en los trabajos de la Organización, tanto en el presupuesto como en sus actividades. En adelante el sistema multilateral y, en particular, esta agencia especializada deberá dedicar esfuerzos prioritarios a la salud, la educación, la seguridad alimentaria y el desarrollo sostenible. Si queremos atender las necesidades de los más desposeídos, hoy más que nunca se debe promover una aplicación efectiva de los compromisos de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación. Para ello se debe fomentar una activa participación de los líderes mundiales. Estamos convencidos que de este factor dependerá la fecha en la cual se reúna la CMA: *cad*. Si no se asegura esta participación creemos que no será efectiva verdaderamente la concreción de la urgente solidaridad internacional.

Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)

Allow me on behalf of my country to lend my weight to the remarks that have been put forward by the G-77, Africa and other regions from the developing world.

That we all agree to redouble our efforts in the fight against hunger is commendable. It is the timing, costs and logistical issues that seem to remain in question. Our main focus remains being the eradication of hunger. For us in the G-77, this is a very topical subject for which we require urgent attention.

Together we are all being challenged to reaffirm our commitment to the review of the progress we have registered so far, since we agreed on the World Food Summit Plan of Action. Eradicating hunger is an urgent issue. Morally, we cannot continue to procrastinate in discussing the inevitable. The current Conference offers us an opportunity to engage each other meaningfully in order to reach a consensus on how we can convene the next World Food Summit: *five years later*. Therefore, this proposal by the Secretariat offers all a good base on which to build our consensus.

I endorse the position put forward by our G-77 Chairperson. He has put forward such a position because as G-77 he knows his constituency cannot continue to wait once we procrastinate in taking this decision. I therefore appeal to our partners, and especially to our partners in the OECD Group, to see the Secretariat proposal as the starting point for us all and be confident that, through engagement, our concerns will be given full consideration and we can resolve some of the challenges which we see before us.

Seeing that the Secretariat has already done some research for us with regard to the major issues such as the timing, costs and other logistical preparations, I hope that, with all this taken together, we should be able to reach a meaningful decision in the end.

Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)

No teníamos intención de intervenir por segunda vez, pero entiendo necesario realizar algunas breves aclaraciones.

En primer lugar, conocimos el documento CL 121/LIM/3 en la mañana de hoy. Tengo la peculiaridad leer muy rápido, fundamentalmente en español, si otros tienen esta dificultad lo lamento mucho.

Quiero aclarar que en las reiteradas reuniones del Grupo de los 77 se ha analizado fundamentalmente la fecha propuesta por el Director General realizadas en Plenaria en la Sala Verde, cuestión debatida con profundidad, argumentada y estudiada que defendemos y, de acuerdo con sus palabras que creo son de consenso, no quisimos postergar la fecha ni perder el impulso. Hay que analizar procedimientos y, si se hace necesario, realizar un ejercicio sobre este examen que la Secretaría ha tenido a bien poner a nuestra disposición en la mañana de hoy con aspectos que hay que debatir con espíritu constructivo, haciendo gala de flexibilidad pero teniendo en cuenta más los argumentos que las posiciones.

Finalmente, con mucho gusto, disposición y gentileza, le podríamos dar ayuda técnica al distinguido Representante de Canadá, no al país; le podemos brindar ayuda técnica en cuanto a responsabilidad y a cómo enfrentar nuestro deber que tenemos con los hombres y mujeres que pasan hambre en el mundo. Estamos en la mejor disposición de darles ayuda técnica al Representante de Canadá.

Ould Mohamed Ahid TOURAD (Mauritanie)

Ma délégation félicite Madame Killingsworth pour les différents éclaircissements qu'elle a bien voulu nous apporter sur des documents qui nous ont effectivement été transmis depuis peu.

Ma délégation pense que la réussite du Sommet dépend de la participation de toutes les délégations d'une façon effective, positive, avec une présentation maximum de haut niveau. Pour cela, nous devons préparer le Sommet avec le maximum d'union, en s'écoutant, et non en ordre dispersé, c'est à dire sans se référer chaque fois à son appartenance à un groupe ou à un autre. Le problème de la faim auquel nous devons faire face est un problème réel et grave et qui nous concerne tous, pays développés ou non. Ses solutions ne doivent pas souffrir de divergences de points de vue des uns et des autres. Ma délégation pense qu'il faut se réunir pour s'entendre beaucoup plus sur les moyens et les méthodes à mettre en place pour la réussite de ce Sommet, mais avant il faut établir une date acceptable pour tous.

The meeting rose at 13 hours

La séance est levée à 13 h

Se levanta la sesión a las 13 horas

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

**Hundred and Twenty-first Session
Cent vingt et unième session
121^o período de sesiones**

**Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001
Rome, 30 octobre 1 novembre 2001
Roma, 30 de octubre - 1^o de noviembre de 2001**

**SECOND PLENARY MEETING
DEUXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
SEGUNDA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

30 October 2001

The Second Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.50 hours
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La deuxième séance plénière est ouverte à 14.50 h
sous la présidence de M.Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la segunda sesión plenaria a las 14.50 horas
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

CHAIRMAN

I call the Second Meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-first FAO Council Session to order.

We will continue this afternoon with Item 4, namely arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)**II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO (suite)****II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)****4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later* (CL 121/LIM/3) (continued)****4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après* (CL 121/LIM/3) (suite)****4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: *cinco años después* (CL 121/LIM/3) (continuación)****Acisclo VALLADARES MOLINA (Guatemala)**

Es una intervención sumamente breve. Me alegro que esta vez se haya hecho un espacio para el almuerzo, porque es importante este tipo de espacio para la búsqueda de consensos. En este caso particular debo insistir, una vez más, si queremos que la Cumbre tenga el éxito y los resultados que esperamos, solo los resultados son sinónimo de éxito, que es necesario, es preciso que se logre un consenso amplio, muy amplio. Un consenso que en verdad nos permita a todos sentirnos cómodos. La delegación de Guatemala abogará en todo momento para que ese consenso se produzca y las iniciativas a este respecto merecen nuestro respaldo.

Georges RUPHIN (Madagascar)

Mon désir est tout simplement de prendre la parole pour exprimer la position de mon pays et apporter sa contribution au débat concernant la tenue du Sommet mondial plus cinq. A la lumière des débats sur la tenue du Sommet mondial plus cinq il apparaît, en entendant justement des interventions de différentes délégations qui ont pris la parole avant moi, que sur le principe du Sommet toutes les déclarations n'ont pas émis une position de nature à rejeter la Conférence, car toutes les délégations ici présentes sont pleinement conscientes de la nécessité d'éliminer la faim, de réduire le nombre des affamés et arriver à une conclusion favorable aux décisions qui ont été prises par le Sommet de 1996. Il apparaît aussi que certains problèmes, à savoir l'impact financier, nous amènent à considérer que les dépenses qui nécessitent la tenue de la Conférence à la date envisagée par le Secrétariat ne constitue plus un obstacle majeur, compte tenu du montant réduit par rapport au montant initial. Lors de la dernière réunion, qui a eu lieu il y a un mois, nous avons pris rendez-vous pour la présente session du Conseil, organe habilité au report de la date, pour nous prononcer.

A mon sens il semble donc que toutes les conditions sont réunies pour trancher d'une manière définitive, après avoir effectué des consultations, et ces consultations qui auraient dû être menées aussi bien avec les capitales qu'entre les groupes présents à Rome. Certaines délégations ont émis le souhait d'examiner à fond les documents du Secrétariat pendant la dernière réunion que je viens d'évoquer et d'avoir quelques délais de réflexion pour se prononcer. Cela est tout à fait compréhensible dans la mesure où nous ne sommes qu'au premier jour de la session et qu'en plus des délégations de la capitale qui auront à se prononcer de manière plus éclatante ne sont pas encore présentes à Rome en ce moment. Pour ce faire, nous disposerons donc de plus de temps pour consolider le dialogue et arriver à une décision de consensus sur la date du Sommet telle qu'elle est proposée au Conseil, et dans ces conditions ma délégation souhaite que les délais impartis pour y arriver soient mis à profit par les délégations qui ont exprimé le désir d'harmoniser leur point de vue et j'en appelle à leur sens aigu de responsabilité pour confirmer la date proposée par le Secrétariat.

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

We have a number of concerns regarding the World Food Summit: *five years later* proposal, as contained in CL 121/LIM/3.

Ideally the World Food Summit follow-up high-level event would be held in conjunction with the FAO Conference in 2003. Another possibility which would be interesting to discuss is holding a Special Session on Hunger at the United Nations General Assembly, thereby bringing together the many players with a role in reducing hunger through poverty alleviation.

The Programme and Budget for 2002-2003, already a trimmed-down version of previous drafts, does not envisage funding for a summit-type event in the next biennium. Additional funding required should not, under any circumstances, come at the expense of activities in the regular budget.

The event, as proposed in CL 121/LIM/3, should be held in Rome, rather than an alternate venue. We recognize that concerns over violent street demonstrations resulted in the proposed move to Rimini. We seek assurances that FAO, in conjunction with Italian authorities, will have thought through the possible security issues including, but not limited to, this particular problem, so that Members will not be faced with another last-minute move to an alternate venue.

If an event is held in 2002, it should be carefully designed to complement the plethora of high-level events that will be held before and after that, as others have already noted. Any high-level event should not be more than three days. This is consistent with other summit-level international meetings and, additionally, if the meeting is held in conjunction with any other FAO meetings, such as the CFS, it should be an integral part of that meeting, albeit at a high level, but not a separate meeting, with direct decision-making powers that appropriately belong to the Council and the Conference of FAO.

The World Food Summit follow-up event should take careful stock of the new challenges and the new opportunities for addressing hunger and do so recognizing that FAO is not the only organization addressing poverty. FAO's unique resources and authority in the field of agriculture and nutrition need to be show-cased alongside of a recognition of the contribution of the other players, particularly the other Rome-based funds and programmes to poverty alleviation. We believe these various issues should be discussed in an informal working group before we take a decision.

Ahmed HACHEMI (Observateur de l'Algérie)

Nous sommes heureux de constater que nous nous approchons sensiblement d'un consensus autour de ce point de l'ordre du jour et c'est en fait, et nous devons le dire, grâce à votre clairvoyante manière de mener les débats de notre auguste assemblée, que nous avons franchi une nouvelle étape vers la préparation de cette grande réunion au Sommet. Nous voilà donc saisis de nouveau de la question dont nous avons été saisis en novembre 2000, qui est celle relative à la préparation de la Conférence au Sommet, en fait du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans plus tard*. Mais nous voudrions apporter une précision.

Ma délégation voudrait au nom de notre pays s'inscrire, comme l'ont déjà fait bien d'autres délégations avant nous, dans le cadre de la position exprimée par le Président du Groupe des 77 et celle exprimée par le Président du Groupe Afrique, pour marquer notre plein appui et notre ferme soutien aux propositions contenues dans le document que Madame Killingsworth a eu l'amabilité de nous présenter. A cet égard, nous voudrions rappeler, que cette fois-ci nous ne sommes nullement interpellés pour déterminer l'opportunité ou bien pour statuer sur l'opportunité de tenir ou non un Sommet, car cet exercice nous l'avons déjà fait en novembre 2000 et c'était la session précédente du Conseil de la FAO, et avec un prix fort, qui a nécessité tant d'efforts et de temps et qui a fort heureusement abouti à une position consensuelle sur l'opportunité et l'importance, voire même l'urgence, de tenir cette Conférence au Sommet. Donc, nous apportons notre plein appui aux propositions qui ont été avancées par le Secrétariat, s'agissant de ce point de l'ordre du jour.

Une dernière clarification; nous nous interrogeons sur l'utilité de créer un nouveau comité pour s'attuer sur les propositions du Secrétariat concernant les retombées notamment financières et autres, de cette Conférence au Sommet mais s'il y a consensus qui se dégage autour de cette question, ce n'est pas l'Algérie qui a pour habitude de casser un consensus et donc elle se ralliera à la position consensuelle qui va se dégager au terme de ce débat.

Ms Francesca RONCHI PROJA (Observer for AHG/NGOs)

I speak on behalf of my organization, the International Federation for Home Economics, and as coordinator of a group of representatives of 30 international NGOs.

We have participated in the World Food Summit. We have supported the Plan of Action and we have followed up on its implementation through our vast memberships.

The postponement of the World Food Summit: *five years later* may give more time to NGOs to prepare and participate, although a report for our Group has already been prepared and may need only updating. This indicates the extent of our interest and involvement.

We recognize the Member Governments have the main responsibility for the implementation of the Plan but, according to its text, they are also committed to include NGOs/CSOs at the national level. We know that some governments have done so, and we trust that all will do so, reporting on action taken at a suitable time, presumably at the next session of the CFS.

We would appreciate the advice of the Council concerning the Draft Resolution under preparation by the Open-ended Working Group. Since this is the most important document expected to be approved by heads of states, is there any plan to introduce the views of the NGOs/CSOs in time, before it goes for final approval? We consider it very important that this is done, that the work carried out during this period by the NGOs/CSOs is not lost in other documents which may be less carefully considered at political levels.

János KOVÁCS (Hungary)

I think that the Summit is a very important event and its success depends very much on the quality of the preparation work. This is why Hungary fully supports the proposal of the United States delegation.

Abdul Razak AYAZI (Observer for Afghanistan)

I will be very brief. First, we all want the World Food Summit and we want it to succeed. We also want that the momentum should not be lost. There is also agreement that an open-ended postponement is undesirable. We have before us a clear paper, CL 121/LIM/3, and the presentation by Ms Killingsworth was excellent. Delegates need time to study this paper and such time should be allowed to them. A working group to reach consensus is being proposed; this is a good idea, subject to consensus. However, to facilitate reaching a consensus, it is necessary to ensure that the working group is not a mechanism for an open-ended exercise, nor a Pandora's box. Obviously, the working group should not attempt to reopen the rationale of the World Food Summit: *five years later* nor propose new issues. Political will and resource mobilization must remain the two main objectives of the World Food Summit: *five years later*.

Also, the working arrangements for the World Food Summit: *five years later* have already been agreed upon, so that is a closed issue as far as I am concerned. If the Member Nations were to refrain from reopening the rationale and purpose of the World Food Summit: *five years later*, the question of timing is primarily a matter of convenience from the point of view of security, avoiding additional costs and taking into consideration other international events planned for the year 2002. The justification for the dates of 10 to 13 June 2002 is convincingly spelled out in the Secretariat paper.

CHAIRMAN

I think there is a general feeling that we are quite near to reaching a consensus but there is also the need for consultation. I would like to suggest that we facilitate and give time for consultations,

informal ones, but with the Secretariat prepared to facilitate and act as resource persons. I am also convinced that the Group of 77 and OECD are willing to be consulted. I suggest that tomorrow we will hopefully have a consensus on this matter. Will that be agreeable?

If this is agreeable, then I can take it as a decision by the Council, that we will give the opportunity for more consultations and by tomorrow morning we hopefully will have reached a consensus on this matter.

Carl-Josef WEIERS (Germany)

I think this is a very good conclusion. However, I think we would possibly facilitate this matter much better if we allow 24 hours, up to the start of tomorrow afternoon, because not all people are very enthusiastic about working the whole night.

CHAIRMAN

As long as it is not exceeding the time given to the Council, because the Council will have to decide on this, I see no reason why we should not have it until tomorrow afternoon.

Ould Mohamed Ahid TOURAD (Mauritanie)

A partir du moment où il y a un consensus sur le fait de faire ce Comité, de tenir cette réunion, je crois qu'on peut y aller tout de suite. Je ne vois pas pourquoi on doit attendre demain, parce qu'attendre demain, on risque des négociations, ce qui pourrait repousser, éloigner le consensus. On est arrivé à un consensus, pratiquement toutes les délégations sont pour la tenue de ce Comité. Organisons donc ce Comité, consultons des membres, laissons leur le temps pendant deux ou trois jours pour discuter. Je crois que le fait de reporter à demain permettra peut-être de faire revenir des délégations avec des idées contraires. Mon pays est pour le consensus. Il faut partir du principe qu'on est des Etats qui sont là pour discuter des problèmes de la faim, et qu'il faut absolument arriver à des consensus et s'éloigner du Groupe. Je ne suis pas d'accord avec cette vision de trancher les Membres du pays s'ils sont ici pour discuter des problèmes pour lutter contre la faim, d'enrayer la faim.

C'est une Organisation mondiale de l'alimentation, il n'y a pas de place pour des positions politiques déterminées. Tous les pays ici sont d'accord pour lutter contre la faim. Nous avons un Sommet. Nous nous sommes mis d'accord pour le tenir. Le problème qui se pose aujourd'hui est apparemment un problème de date. Il semble qu'il y a un consensus, apparemment tous les états se sont prononcés pour la création du Comité, créons le Comité tout de suite. Mettons-y quelques pays, quitte à négocier en parallèle pendant le temps voulu. Ce n'est pas la peine de reporter demain. C'est une idée tout-à-fait personnelle.

Acisclo VALLADARES MOLINA (Guatemala)

Creo que ha sabido usted verdaderamente interpretar el consenso que se ha dado en la sala pero es necesario un esfuerzo adicional para que en verdad el sustento consensuado sea total, absoluto. Creo que su propuesta es correcta y nos sumamos a las propuestas de Alemania, coordinadora de la Secretaría y, como lo ha dispuesto usted en la misma propuesta, que el plazo máximo sea de 24 horas; en otras palabras: si es posible que esto lo veamos mañana en la mañana perfecto, pero en todo caso no más tarde del primer tema a tratar mañana en la tarde, cuando se cumplirán las 24 horas. Y en este sentido creo que estaríamos llegando a un consenso total sobre el tema.

Miguel BARRETO (Perú)

Nosotros también concordamos con la conclusión que usted ha dado. No somos muy amigos de los tiempos límites pero sí creemos que este tipo de consultas deben ser orientadas en el sentido de que debido a que el tema trasciende el interés de todos los países y de todas las delegaciones, debería establecerse un mecanismo de consultas informales en el cual todos los países estén representados de una u otra manera. En algún momento se mencionó la posibilidad de que sean los presidentes de los Grupos Regionales, con algunas delegaciones de cada grupo; podría ser una alternativa, pero en todo caso para nuestra delegación es muy importante que esas consultas informales sean representativas de todos los países.

Ms Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Assistant Director-General/Special Adviser, World Food Summit Follow-up)

A few responses and additional information that actually may be useful to members in going on to the next phase which you, I believe, have just agreed to.

The spokesperson for the International Group of NGOs supporting the World Food Summit has just brought to the attention of the Council the interest that the NGO International Group has paid to this process during the entire year. I would like, on behalf of the Secretariat, to pay tribute to the work they have done; it has been very serious, very enthusiastic and very committed. The question that this spokesperson raised, that is, what provisions could be made for taking this into account, is something that I think the Secretariat would like to help with. The Group is meeting, it has come up with some ideas and I think that we probably could find ways of bringing that to your attention. As you know, the Open-ended Working Group was a group set up by the Council to draft the final outcome of the World Food Summit: *five years later*. I think that, in the coming months, we could find ways of feeding into the process the very interesting work that the NGOs have been doing. I know that a number of Members would find that very useful.

Going back to the experience of five years ago, the NGO participation at the regional conferences, preparing the World Food Summit, was also very constructive and I am sure that, through that regional conference process and then the CFS work, ways can be found to ensure that the NGO/CSO input is brought to the attention of Members before the final draft of the outcome is agreed upon.

Mentioning the question of participation of NGOs and CSOs in the process, and also the point raised by the delegate of the United States with regard to other United Nations agencies, raises two issues that I wanted to bring to your attention. The first, perhaps, is the question of involvement of Rome-based agencies. We had, before we were obliged to interrupt preparations for the World Food Summit: *five years later* as part of the Conference next week, had a number of initiatives underway to ensure full participation of the Rome-based agencies and also of other United Nations Specialized Agencies, those in particular with which we work most closely, as part of the World Food Summit: *five years later* proceedings. I am sure that everyone would want the same approach to be taken in 2002.

The suggestion made to cut the Summit proceedings in 2002 to three days, however, might create a slight conflict with that objective. As the delegate of the USA mentioned, some summits, including the UN Millennium Summit, have been limited to three days. The experience, however, with big UN conferences with memberships of between 180 and 190 countries, is that you literally cannot hear everybody in less than three days. The Millennium Summit did not allow any interventions from any international organizations or any non-governmental organizations. The World Food Summit precedent that we were following did give space for our partner organizations, both from the UN system and the big intergovernmental organizations outside the system, to address the Plenary and it also gave some scope for the representatives of civil society. That is really why we had made the proposal for four days rather than three. It was an attempt to be a little more open and give a little more scope for other partners and actors in this whole process to be heard by the official event.

So that is something that I wanted to make sure we had made clear, since it was not treated in any detail in the document before you, CL 121/LIM 3.

The other point, with regards to the dates, is that I omitted to mention this morning in my introduction, that the major Rio Plus 10 Summit is scheduled for Johannesburg. It is from 2 to 11 September, the high level segment from 9 to 11 September. This is, of course, an event which FAO's Secretariat expects to participate actively in preparing through the CSD process. FAO played a major role in preparing what became Agenda 21, not only the Chapter 14, but big inputs to other chapters as well, and we have been hoping and still hope that the whole World Food Summit process would be seen as part of our input to the Rio Plus 10 preparatory process.

Finally, the question of a special session of the UNGA on Hunger and Poverty, which is a very interesting idea. Our experience has been that the best way in which we can make inputs to such discussions at the UN System-wide level is through taking to that other forum the outcome, the results of what we do in our FAO fora. I do not think that it is too immodest to say, on behalf of our Governing Bodies, that the FAO Conference, Council and CFS work and, of course, specifically the World Food Summit, have been a major input to making sure that hunger and food security stay on the international agenda of the intergovernmental bodies which gravitate around the United Nations itself.

We would, however, argue that it is important that the World Food Summit: *five years later* take place at the level we had proposed, at the level of the FAO Conference, but, if not, at the level of a separate high-level event, because it does need to have that capacity to take decisions, to represent the views of Members so that we can carry them on your behalf to the central intergovernmental fora in New York, which deal with a wider aspects of poverty but which too often have not, perhaps, paid sufficient attention to the interactions between poverty and hunger and to the importance of addressing the problem of hunger as a major input in the fight against poverty.

CHAIRMAN

We can therefore decide that we will allow more time for informal consultation on the matter of the World Food Summit: *five years later* which will involve the Chair of the Regional Groups, the Group of 77 and OECD. I am sure that the Secretariat will do everything that is needed to facilitate this consultation.

Following the suggestion by Germany, we hope that at tomorrow afternoon's session the first item will be that we have reached a consensus on this matter. If this is agreed, we can move on to the next item on our agenda.

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS

**7. Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee
(Rome, September 2001) (CL 121/2)**

**7. Rapport de la Réunion conjointe du Comité du Programme et du Comité financier
(Rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/2)**

**7. Informe de la reunión conjunta de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas
(Roma, septiembre de 2001) (CL 121/2)**

CHAIRMAN

We now move on to Item 7, Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee as set out in document CL 121/2.

I would like to give the floor to Mr Rose, the Chairman of the Joint Meeting's last Session. However, before doing so, I am sure Council joins me in expressing our appreciation of the work carried out by Mr Rose as Chairman of the Programme Committee and Sessions of the Joint Meeting.

I should like to ask Mr Rose to defer his introduction to the section related to the Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003 until later this afternoon when Council will consider this under agenda Item 6.

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

The Programme and Finance Committees met in joint session on 29 September, and the report of our meeting is contained in document CL 121/2. We reviewed a number of important items, not least of which was the draft Programme of Work and Budget. Before our joint meeting, each of

our Committees had separately examined aspects of the Joint Programme of Work and Budget – the Programme Committee looking at the programme aspects, and the Finance Committee examining the financial and administrative aspects.

My specific comments on our findings of the Programme of Work and Budget will be deferred until we come to that spot on our agenda.

The Joint Committee also reviewed recent developments in the FAO Field Programme. Recent reports of the Programme Committee have kept Council aware of the decline in resources available for the non-emergency field activities of FAO. The September meeting of the Joint Committees reviewed the steps being taken by the Secretariat to address this decline. These steps are outlined in paragraphs 15 through 19 of document CL 121/2. However, I wish to draw your attention to the advice of the Joint Committees that the Organization concentrate its efforts to develop the Field Programme in those areas where it had comparative advantages. We felt it necessary that the Organization become more active in the development negotiations which take place in the field, in the capitals of the countries requesting FAO technical assistance. The Committees therefore recommended that the FAO Representatives in the field become more involved with discussions with donors at the field level. We welcomed the Director-General's initiative to join the United Nations Development Group, which should lead to an enhanced role for FAO in the programming exercises at the country level, including in the preparation of poverty reduction strategy papers. This will place an increased burden on the FAO Representatives, and we underlined the importance of providing resources to the offices which were expected to carry out these operational activities. We recognized that there is a need to restore donors' confidence in the ability of FAO to undertake field projects, and we welcomed the moves to improve the Field Programme and increase efficiencies in the hopes that these measures will halt the decline in non-emergency resources available to the Field Programme.

We also received a useful update on the process of decentralization of operational activities to the country level. We were advised that decentralization is essentially complete, although the new arrangements required to support this decentralization still need to be tested and modified as required. Members interested in the steps taken in the decentralization process should consult document CL 121/INF/3, which is a useful summary of the steps taken in the decentralization process.

The final item on our agenda was a review of savings and efficiencies in governance. The Committees recalled the mandate which Council had given to them at its Hundred and Tenth Session in November of 1995, to seek measures for savings and efficiencies in governance, including a review of the Basic Texts to streamline those provisions which may obstruct the smooth functioning of meetings. The Committees agreed that there was some uncertainty as to whether this mandate had been discharged. The topic of savings and efficiencies in governance does remain a standing item on the agenda, of the Joint Committees and it will be up to Council to determine how to deal with that identified uncertainty.

That concludes the report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

Alain PIERRET (France)

Je voudrais, au nom de la délégation française, que vous puissiez donner la parole à la délégation de la Belgique, représentant de l'Union Européenne.

Christian MONNOYER (Observer for Belgium)

On behalf of the European Community and its Member States, I would like to make some comments on the issues raised in the Report of the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees.

Generally, we support the important work of the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee. We appreciate the useful work of these Committees that have helped the Council in the last two years effectively in their own deliberations.

I will not comment on the position of the European Community and its Member States on the Programme of Work and Budget, which we will refer to under Item 6.

The second substantive item discussed by the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee together was an update of FAO's Field Activities, together with FAO's decentralization process. It is high time to discuss that item in relation to the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget.

Documentation before the Committees was highly interesting, informing Members about developments in the past and expectations for the future.

We welcome the important restructuring of the TC Department, emphasizing competitiveness and increased efficiency. The Programme of Work and Budget gives indications on expected extra-budgetary resources, giving a first insight of the relationship between activities funded by the regular budget and by extra-budgetary resources. However, to our minds, more transparency, more information and, if possible, more predictability on the side of donors are still needed, and a clearer relationship has to appear with the aims of the Organization as laid out in the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme of Work and Budget. The European Community and its Member States is prepared to participate in a process to bring this along.

Important decisions have been taken over the last biennia to decentralize the FAO structure. The European Community and its Member States support this approach, but accompanying measures are not yet sufficient, in particular in regard to staff and computer software. It is essential to make decentralization effective.

The UN system is operating more and more on a country level. Too often, we hear that FAO is not sufficiently participating in Poverty Reduction Strategy consultations, in UN Development Assistance Framework discussions and other forms of consultations with potential donors. FAO Representatives should play a much more proactive role. FAO Management agrees, gives the right instructions, but it does not sufficiently happen in the field.

We welcome the decision of FAO to participate in the UN Development Group.

Finally, FAO should make every effort to fulfil normal demands like reporting. Negative consequences of problems relating to the introduction of Oracle may have long-term effects.

Mohammad Saeed NOURI-NAEENI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)

I would also like to thank the Chairpersons of the Programme Committee and Finance Committee and the Members of both Committees for an excellent Report.

I have a few observations to make. I will start with paragraph 9 of the Report which states that many Members supported the real growth proposal. My delegation joins these Members and supports the real growth proposals.

In the same paragraph, we read of the need to redouble efforts to reduce the number of chronically undernourished people by half by no later than 2015. If redoubling means increasing twice, it is insufficient, because according to reports from FAO we are now reducing the number of undernourished by six million per year. If we redouble it, it would be 12 million while the goal was set at 20 million per year. So it is not sufficient to redouble it. We should triple it if we can or even more than that. The new estimate is that we have to reduce it by more than 20 million per year, 22.5 million or something like that, so the problem is much graver than has been seen.

In paragraph 10, we see that some others reiterated their government's policy to seek zero nominal growth throughout the UN system. In our last Conference, some countries argued that since WHO has a Zero Nominal Growth, FAO should have the same. So the argument was since they have less health, let them give less bread. Now they say it should be followed in the whole UN System. I can interpret it as phasing out the whole UN System because it goes down by the trend of inflation. It might take a few years but finally there would be no budget for the UN System as a whole if we follow this advice.

In paragraph 10, some members suggested that the proposed increase in TCP and the FAO country offices could be reduced. My delegation has the opposite view, because TCP is the most appropriate form of assistance to developing countries because, firstly, the TCP projects are tailor-made to the needs of countries and they are very efficient because of that. Secondly, these projects are replicable. When there is a donor country, they could serve as models and can be replicated by the national budget, having a very positive effect on development.

In addition to that, TCP projects usually bring new technology and new knowledge to the developing countries, which is not replaceable by any other kind of assistance. For these reasons, we fully support an increase in the TCP budget in our coming budget.

We fully support the proposal made in paragraph 13. I congratulate FAO on the fact mentioned in paragraph 15, that efficiency in the Organization has increased.

LI ZHENG DONG (China) (Original language Chinese)

First of all, I would like to express my thanks for the Report provided by the Programme and Finance Committee. The Chinese delegation would like to suggest that the Council adopt this Report. The Chinese delegation would like to comment on Item 3 of the Report.

Firstly, the Chinese delegation supports the methods adopted by FAO to improve the Field Programme situation and give our special support to the facts mentioned in para 15 and 16 the new emphasis on competitiveness and the increased efficiency as well as concentrated efforts to develop the Field Programme in those areas where the Organization has a comparative advantage. We hope that FAO can intensify the relations through various channels; relations with donors to publicize the successful results of the Field Programme and to reach more resources for their Field Programme.

Secondly, the Chinese delegation hopes that when we publicize the successful results to the donors we give special attention to evaluating and summarizing the successful experience in some areas where we have taken to implement the Field Security Programme under the Special Programme for Food Security. In this way, we can help to increase the confidence of the donors to attract more resources. Also it would be good for the developing countries to learn from each other's experience in the programme implementation, so as to solve the difficulties and problems they have encountered.

Adnan Bashir KHAN (Pakistan)

I thank Mr Rose for presenting this Report. I reserve to your instructions to comments on the Programme of Work and Budget when we discussed the Programme of Work and Budget. At this point in time, I just have one question. My question is: when does the Programme Committee anticipate concluding its discussion on Item 5?

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

I believe there was only one direct question proposed by the delegate of Pakistan, who always makes me very concerned when he starts to ask questions. Before I turn to that, I do require some clarification on that. Just a comment on the comment made by the Honourable Ambassador Nouri of UN in terms of the fact that we require more than redoubling. I know I tax the interpreters when I start to ask questions such as, how would you say tripling or quadrupling in other languages, but I think in this case I will leave it to Ambassador Nouri and others from his Region who invented the concept of modern mathematics to come up with an appropriate phrase for us.

For the question from Pakistan, Item 5 of the Agenda of the Programme Committee or of the Joint Committee, that is the Savings and Efficiencies in governance, it is up to the Council to determine. The Item was placed on the Agenda of the Joint Committees approximately six years ago as a standing item, so it is considered at each meeting of the Joint Committees. We report occasionally on steps that have been taken to increase savings and efficiencies and it is really up to Council to determine whether Council is satisfied with the work that has been done or whether

Council requires additional work to be done by the Joint Committees. We work under a mandate given by Council at the Hundred and Tenth Session.

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

There were a couple of comments from the distinguished delegate of Belgium on behalf of the European Community. The first one concerned the need for more transparency and more information and clearer links between the extrabudgetary programmes and the Strategic Framework. I think I have to accept that that is something we have to do more about. The reality is that the links are very strong and, in fact, the more recent programmes that have been developed in conjunction with major donors have been very much on a strategic basis. That is, the programmes have specifically been cross-referenced to strategic objectives in the Strategic Framework. What we have failed to do, I fear, is to demonstrate that in the Programme of Work and Budget. We will take that on board as something that needs to be improved for the next version.

On the point that you hear that FAO is not properly involved in poverty reduction strategy papers and the UNDAF process - as you know from the Strategic Framework, we have a very clear policy that we should be involved, so I think we have got to get rather specific feedback on where that is occurring. I can imagine there are problems in countries where we do not have FAO representatives. I can also imagine there are problems in countries where the FAOR post itself is vacant even where we normally have a representative because we are very thin on the ground at the field level. It certainly goes against the Director-General's instructions so I would ask anybody who hears of this problem to bring it to our attention so that we can take corrective action.

CHAIRMAN

I think that concludes our debate on Item No. 7. Now we should move on to Item No. 8, Report of the Eighty-sixth Session of the Programme Committee.

8. Report of the 86th Session of the Programme Committee (Rome, September 2001)

(CL 121/3)

8. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-sixième session du Comité du Programme

(Rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/3)

8. Informe del 86º período de sesiones del Comité del Programa (Roma, septiembre de 2001)

(CL 121/3)

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

I understand that you wish to cover our debate on the Programme of Work and Budget under that particular Item and might I suggest that we discuss the Committee's findings on evaluation under the Agenda Item covering the Programme Evaluation Report. Those were in fact the two major items of discussion by the Programme Committee. The remaining items were essentially housekeeping, follow-ups of the recommendations that we have already made, planning our next meeting. So I think I can save you a considerable amount of time at this point in your meeting anyway by suggesting that it is not necessary to have a report of the Programme Committee. I will cover the important items of our discussion under the Programme of Work and Budget and the Programme Evaluation Report and that will allow you to turn to Ambassador Mekouar.

CHAIRMAN

Have some delegations comments on the very short report by Mr Rose? Then we can go on with the Report of the Finance Committee. I see none so I think we should go on with Item No. 9.

9. Report of the 97th session of the finance committee (rome, september 2001) (CL 121/4)

9. Rapport de la quatre-vingt-dix-septième session du Comité financier

(rome, septembre 2001) (CL 121/4)

9. Informe del 97º período de sesiones del Comité de Finanzas (Roma, septiembre de 2001)

(CL 121/4)

9.1 Financial Position of the Organization (CL 121/LIM/1)

9.1 Situation financière de l'Organisation (CL 121/LIM/1)

9.1 Situación financiera de la Organización (CL 121/LIM/1)

9.2 Scale of Contributions 2002-2003

9.2 Barème des contributions 2002-2003

9.2 Escala de cuotas para 2002-2003

9.3 Liabilities for After Service Medical Coverage

9.3 Couverture médicale après cessation de service

9.3 Pasivo del seguro médico después de la separación del servicio

9.4 General Service Salary Survey

9.4 Enquête sur les conditions d'emploi des agents des services généraux

9.4 Encuesta sobre los sueldos del personal de servicios generales

9.5 Other Matters Arising Out of the Report

9.5 Autres questions découlant du rapport

9.5 Otros asuntos planteados en el informe

CHAIRMAN

We are discussing the Report of the Ninety-seventh Session of the Finance Committee, Document CL 121/4. I would like to draw your attention to matters requiring attention by the Council which are listed in the table at the front of the Report, while CL 121/LIM/1 gives the updated status on the contributions to FAO at 23 October 2001. Before giving the floor to the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Aziz Mekouar, allow me to express Council's appreciation of Mr Mekouar's contribution to the Finance and Joint Programme and Finance Committee Meetings over the past biennium.

Aziz MEKOUAR (Président, Comité financier)

J'ai aujourd'hui le plaisir de vous présenter le rapport de la 97ème session du Comité financier qui s'est tenue en septembre de cette année. L'ordre du jour de la session ouvrait une large gamme de questions budgétaires, financières et administratives concernant et affectant la situation générale de l'Organisation. Outre son examen des questions financières et budgétaires, le Comité a également passé en revue un rapport sur les questions de gestion des ressources humaines. Comme d'habitude, le Comité financier a aussi tenu une réunion conjointe avec le Comité du Programme. Je souhaite par la présente introduction mettre en évidence les questions qui revêtent un intérêt pour le Conseil et qui appellent une décision de sa part.

Tout d'abord, la situation financière de l'Organisation. Le Comité a examiné la situation financière de l'Organisation au 12 septembre 2001 et a noté que 57,61 pour cent des contributions mises au recouvrement, avaient été reçues. Le Comité a noté que le taux de recouvrement des contributions était à peu près identique à ce qu'il avait été les quatre dernières années à la même date. Vous pouvez vous référer au document CL 121/LIM/1. Le Comité a noté en outre que 86 Etats Membres étaient encore redevables d'arriérés pour 2000 et les années précédentes et que 53 Etats Membres avaient accumulé des arriérés de contributions tels qu'ils risquaient de perdre leur droit de vote en vertu des dispositions de l'Article 3.4 de l'Acte constitutif.

Je passe maintenant au barème des contributions 2002-2003. Le Comité a examiné les critères utilisés pour établir le barème des quotes-parts de l'ONU. Le Comité a convenu que cette information devrait être transmise aux Représentants permanents à Rome et que le Secrétariat devrait organiser une séance d'information sur cette question à l'intention des Représentants

intéressés comme le Conseil l'avait également demandé à sa 120^{ème} session en juin 2001. Certains Membres ont exprimé l'opinion que si à l'avenir la Conférence devait décider d'adopter un barème de contributions fondé sur un barème de quotes-parts de l'ONU inconnues au moment de l'adoption du barème des contributions de la FAO, la Conférence devrait organiser un débat avant son application. A cet égard, il faut rappeler qu'à sa 95^{ème} session le Comité a examiné le barème proposé des contributions pour 2002-2003 et a noté qu'il dérivait directement du barème des quotes-parts des Nations Unies approuvé pour ces années tel qu'établi par l'Assemblée générale dans sa Résolution 55/5b du 22 décembre 2000. Le Comité a approuvé le projet de Résolution figurant au paragraphe 36 du rapport de cette session, document CL 120/15, que le Conseil est invité à transmettre à la Conférence pour adoption.

Passons maintenant à la couverture médicale après cessation de service. Afin de faciliter l'examen des propositions ci-dessus, le Secrétariat a présenté un projet de Résolution de la Conférence, visant à étendre le mécanisme de financement de l'assurance médicale après cessation de service aux indemnités de départ. Le Comité a noté, qu'au 31 décembre 2000, la situation de financement de l'assurance médicale après cessation de service était satisfaisante, à savoir que sur une évaluation actuarielle estimative des obligations au titre de l'assurance maladies après cessation de service de 187,7 millions de dollars, 85,2 millions de dollars étaient financés conformément aux mécanismes visés dans la Résolution 10/99 de la Conférence. Le Comité a approuvé la proposition du Directeur général de maintenir les arrangements actuels pour l'assurance médicale après cessation de service. Bien que cette solution ne permette pas de résoudre plus rapidement le problème des obligations non financées au titre de l'assurance médicale après cessation de service, il s'agissait d'un arrangement qui avait l'avantage d'avoir fait ses preuves. Le Comité s'est demandé s'il valait la peine d'étendre le mécanisme de financement de l'assurance médicale après cessation de service au fonds des indemnités de départ et a demandé au Commissaire aux comptes son avis sur la nature et l'urgence de la proposition de Résolution de la Conférence. Le Commissaire aux comptes a expliqué qu'il avait recommandé que les fonds pour les indemnités de départ soient inclus dans la comptabilité de financement de prestation, en faveur du personnel, dans ses rapports de vérification des comptes biennaux pour 1996-97 et 1998-99. Si cette mesure ne constituait pas une solution immédiate pour le financement de ce fonds, il était impératif en revanche d'établir un mécanisme unifié de financement de toutes les obligations de dépenses reconnues au titre des indemnités de départ du personnel. Le Comité a accepté la proposition du Secrétariat et a approuvé le projet de Résolution, paragraphe 48, qui serait transmis au Conseil et à la Conférence.

Point 4 - Enquête sur les conditions d'emploi des agents des services généraux. Le Comité a été informé que la CFPI avait examiné les conclusions de l'enquête sur les salaires, organisée à Rome en novembre 2000, et que sur cette base elle avait recommandé au Directeur général un barème révisé des traitements des agents des services généraux, faisant apparaître une augmentation générale de 4,25 pour cent des traitements nets. Le Directeur général ayant examiné les recommandations formulées par la Commission, souscrit aux conclusions de la Commission de la Fonction Publique Internationale et recommande leur adoption par le Comité financé par le Conseil. Le Comité a approuvé la recommandation du Directeur général. Le Conseil est invité à examiner la proposition conformément à l'alinéa 3j de l'Article 24 du Règlement général de l'Organisation. Le barème des traitements est joint au présent rapport et présenté au Conseil avec recommandation de l'appliquer à compter du 1^{er} novembre 2000.

Rapport sur la mise en valeur des ressources humaines. Le Comité s'est vivement félicité du rapport et a déclaré que vu son importance, il devait être présenté aux Membres de l'Organisation sous la forme d'un document du Conseil, voir le document CL 121/4 Annexe 1. Le Comité a noté qu'il importait de suivre un processus de recrutement rapide et transparent, et de conserver le personnel au service de l'Organisation, compte tenu de la situation démographique de la FAO. Il a examiné la nécessité d'améliorer la compétitivité des traitements et indemnités offerts au personnel. Il a également noté que la CFPI avait entrepris un examen exhaustif du système de traitements et indemnités. Le Comité s'est félicité de ce que l'Organisation a décidé de réexaminer la politique de l'emploi des conjoints, et a noté l'importance dans ce contexte de la position du

pays hôte. Il a souligné également la nécessité de respecter des normes strictes de transparence et de compétence pour le recrutement. Le Comité a noté l'importance cruciale des liens qui doivent exister entre un système efficace et fonctionnel de gestion de l'information sur les ressources humaines et les stratégies présentées dans le document. A ce sujet, il a souligné qu'il importait d'allouer des ressources adéquates au projet Oracle - Ressources humaines. Le Secrétariat a souligné qu'en matière de recrutement le Directeur général s'inspirait des principes de l'Acte constitutif notamment de l'Article 8, alinéa 3, tout en soulignant que le critère primordial pour la FAO était les connaissances et les compétences techniques des candidats. Le Secrétariat a déclaré que l'équilibre hommes/femmes et la représentation géographique était également importante. Aucune mesure spécifique n'est attendue du Conseil, mais celui-ci pourrait souhaiter noter que le Comité financier a demandé qu'un rapport d'avancement sur les questions de gestion des ressources humaines lui soit soumis à la prochaine session.

Renforcement de la capacité de la FAO à réagir aux situations d'urgence. Le Secrétariat a présenté au Comité la proposition visant à transformer le Service des opérations spéciales de secours en une nouvelle Division des opérations d'urgence et du relèvement et à créer un poste de Directeur de division (D-2) et un poste de Chef de service (D-1) pour les programmes réalisés en Iraq. La proposition qui n'exigeait aucune ressource supplémentaire du Programme ordinaire, a été approuvée par le Comité et a été transmise au Conseil pour examen et approbation. En conclusion, dans l'ensemble cette session du Comité financier a été très fructueuse et je crois qu'elle a pu examiner un certain nombre de questions financières et budgétaires importantes auxquelles était confrontée la FAO. Au nom des membres du Comité, je tiens à remercier le Secrétariat pour son appui à nos délibérations, ainsi que les États Membres de la FAO, qui nous ont donné la possibilité de contribuer aux importants travaux de l'Organisation. Je me ferai un plaisir de répondre à toute demande d'information supplémentaire concernant ce rapport.

Sra. Lilia ROMERO PEREIRA (Paraguay)

Pido la palabra para el Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

David BLANCO ZABALA (Observador de Bolivia)

En primer lugar quiero felicitar al distinguido Embajador de Marruecos por el excelente informe que nos ha presentado referente a los trabajos realizados en el Comité de Finanzas, teniendo en cuenta que ha sido un año particularmente difícil.

Seré muy breve en aras del tiempo: quisiera resaltar un tema que nos preocupa profundamente, el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe manifiesta su preocupación por el alto impacto de la escala de cuotas previstas para la gestión 2002-2003: esto en razón del impacto que crea en los países de nuestra región. En tal sentido, creemos que la misma implique una distribución sumamente injusta de las cargas financieras de la Organización. Es cierto que hemos tenido discusiones en un comité con la parte financiera de la FAO pero estas discusiones no han sido satisfactorias, sobretudo en los impactos que se han generado. Es evidente que algunos países han disminuido sus contribuciones por variaciones en su producto interno bruto, pero hay otras explicaciones que no son del todo convincentes en el tema de gastos generales que están implicando a su vez estos reajustes en las contribuciones de algunos países.

Por ello solicitamos que la próxima Conferencia establezca un grupo de trabajo que analice posibles soluciones, teniendo en cuenta que cuando las Naciones Unidas adoptó la escala de cuotas 2002-2003, la misma fue consensuada por nuestros países, en el entendimiento que serían aplicadas medidas para atenuar el impacto del aumento de la cuota: se debe considerar que al adoptar dichos medidas se tuvieran en cuenta las situaciones económicas de los países que ya no son válidas; actualmente la economía mundial enfrenta problemas económicos de recesión, hay problemas de ingreso a los mercados y restricciones en los flujos de inversión. En consecuencia, se tiene una situación muy difícil, agravada por programas de autoridad que se siguen bajo las condiciones del Fondo Monetario Internacional.

Sin embargo, nuevamente, la Región de América Latina señala que asocia esta cuestión a la eventual aprobación del presupuesto en la próxima Conferencia.

Alain PIERRET (France)

Pouvez-vous donner la parole à la Belgique qui souhaite intervenir au nom des pays de l'Union européenne.

Christian MONNOYER (Observer for Belgium)

I am speaking, indeed, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

I recall that the position of the European Community and its Member States on the Programme of Work and Budget will be covered under item 6.

The European Community and its Member States have noted that an important forward purchase of Euros took place last July. This has a substantial effect on the budgetary position of the Organization. We will return to this in our statement on the Programme of Work and Budget but we want to emphasize that this kind of financial operations have to be carried out with the greatest care and according to the relevant regulations, in order to minimize the risks for the Organization. We would appreciate a report from the Legal Counsel as to the base for this operation. A report of the Secretariat to the Finance Committee on these operations would also be opportune.

The issue of exchange risk has to be considered taking another very important element into account. At least 50 percent of the payments of the Organization will be done in Euros. In order to reduce the risks connected to the fluctuations of the exchange rate, it is more and more relevant to consider the Euro as the account unit for FAO. We wish to ask the Secretariat, for the next Finance Committee, for a detailed appraisal of the option of switching to the Euro as functional accounting currency.

Under discussion of Financial Highlights, we note the warning in paragraph 28 that the cash flow of the Organization is threatened by faster expenditure under the Technical Cooperation Programme. It is important for the Membership to understand that unless the Member States pay their assessments promptly, they will either have to make contributions to the Working Capital Fund or bear the costs of external borrowing.

The European Community and its Member States note with concern that 86 countries have arrears that threaten their right to vote when the Finance Committee met in September. We continue to believe, as we stated at the Council in June, that the Organization's rule should be strictly applied in such cases. Any member which feels this to be unfair should appeal to the membership at large by moving a Resolution at the Conference.

We are following with close interest the Committee's discussion of the Organization's investment policy and management. Some US \$420 million are involved, of which around half belongs to trust fund donors. We welcome and endorse the Finance Committee's decision to call for an Action Plan to put matters on to proper footing. Can we ask the Secretariat what progress it may report on the appointment of the Senior Treasury Officer, reference being made to paragraph 37 of the report?

We endorse the proposed Conference Resolution to extend – to the currently unfunded Termination Payments Liability – the funding arrangements applied to After Service Medical Costs.

We will take up the Progress Report on recommendations of the External Auditor when the Audited Accounts come before the Conference for approval next week.

We reaffirm the position that the European Community and its Member States has taken at the June Council on the proposed Scale of Contributions for 2002-2003 and this for decision by the Conference next week.

The European Community and its Member States applaud the Finance Committee initiative in calling for a report on Human Resources Management Issues and congratulate the Secretariat on the quality of the document. The report reveals that FAO confronts important and difficult challenges in handling massive retirements in the next few years, in remaining competitive in

market for professional skills and in bringing performance management systems up to scratch. The subject needs wider consideration by the Membership. We propose that human resource management should become a standard item on the Council agenda, starting in 2002.

We agree to the proposal in paragraph 74 to implement recommendations of the International Civil Servant Commission on General Service salary scales.

We also agree with the proposals discussed on paragraphs 89-90 to strengthen the capacity to handle work on emergencies.

We finally want to repeat a satisfaction that we already expressed in June with the longer and more informative reports we receive from the Finance Committee but we also would like to re-echo our concerns that the Committee is not being allowed sufficient time for its work.

Flavio Celio GOLDMAN (Brazil)

We thank the distinguished Ambassador of Morocco for presenting the Report of the Finance Committee.

Brazil would like to support the statement delivered by Bolivia, on behalf of GRULAC. Brazil will be, in absolute terms, the country most severely hit by the changes proposed in the new scale of contributions. Our contribution will increase almost US \$2.5 million. It is needless to say that my country would face tremendous difficulties to keep paying its contributions to FAO if this increase is eventually approved.

We are aware that other international organizations, which also derive their scale of contributions from the one approved in New York – such as the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency – have adopted measures that minimize the impact of the increase for a number of countries, most of them developing countries.

It is, therefore, very difficult to accept and to understand that in FAO we try to simply adopt the scale from the UN without taking into account the difficulties which will certainly be faced by the countries whose contributions would sharply increase.

This is a question of justice and equity and we hope that we can reach, in the Conference, a solution that will not impose financial sacrifices to countries that are not in a position to bear them.

Adnan Bashir KHAN (Pakistan)

Allow me to thank the Chairman of the Finance Committee for presenting this comprehensive report.

We reserve our comments on the Programme of Work and Budget until we take up the discussion on that item.

Our observation on the rest of the report are as follows.

In endorsing the report, paragraph 17, on Programme and Budgetary Transfer in 2000-2001 biennium, we wish to underscore the need to minimize transfers from the Technical Programmes, Chapter 2. We further wish to underscore the importance of the Oracle development project and emphasize the need for its early completion.

In terms of protection of the Programme of Work and Budget against exchange rate fluctuations, we believe paragraph 12 of document FC 97/4 aptly describes the situation which is that the option exercised proves feasible because the strength of the US Dollar and the interest rates spread between the Euro and Dollar. As the matter of protecting the Programme of Work and Budget in the long-term continues the need to be addressed.

We appreciate the reasoning given by the Secretariat regarding slow delivery of TCP, including the use of its appropriation to manage the cash flow. Be that as it may, we emphasize the importance of TCP for the Member Nations and the need for its prompt delivery. In this regard, we note the assurance contained in paragraph 27, that several of the issues involved are temporary

in nature and will be resolved soon. We propose that the Committee may wish to undertake a review, on the basis of an issues and options paper, to improve the TCP delivery.

In terms of investments, we laud the initiative taken by the Committee to have an outline of an action plan for improvement in investment in cash management prepared, discussed and reported on in future. We also endorse the Committee's actions within the Implementation of the External Auditor's recommendations.

We are thankful for the Secretariat to have adequately briefed the Membership on the issue of Scale of Contributions. Though we are satisfied with the briefings, it would certainly have been helpful to provide the Membership some possibility or some options to mitigate the effects of drastic increases in their contributions.

We welcome and laud the initiative taken by the Committee to discuss the Human Resource Management issues of the Organization. We concur with most of the observations contained in paragraphs 62 to 71. We particularly emphasize the last sentence of paragraph 65, in terms of Spouse Employment, that strict standards of transparency and competence must be adhered to in recruitment. In paragraph 69, regarding the paramountcy of technical skills and competence in recruitment to be judicially used, other factors like gender balance and geographic distribution should be kept in view.

Whereas we have lauded many of the initiatives of the Finance Committee we, with reference to matters pertaining to the World Food Programme, propose that the Finance Committee explore ways and means to make its report more meaningful for the Membership, since the Membership is guided by the views of the Committee in formulating its opinion regarding issues of financial nature. In this regard, it may be advisable to examine the handling of such matters by ACABQ. We do recognize in this matter, of course, that the Finance Committee has a very heavy agenda to deal with regarding FAO matters and this could be one of the reasons for the way WFP matters are handled.

Finally, we endorse the recommendation of the Finance Committee contained in paragraph 90. We once again thank the Chairman of the Finance Committee for presenting an excellent report.

Víctor Hugo MORALES MÉLENDEZ (México)

Para mi Delegación es un gusto verlo presidir esta reunión. Agradecemos, también, el informe presentado por el Presidente del Comité de Finanzas.

México apoya con firmeza la declaración de Bolivia a nombre del GRULAC, así como lo dicho por el Representante de Brasil.

Analizamos con preocupación el documento CL 121/LIM/1 relativo al estado de las cuotas y los atrasos y digo que fue con preocupación, porque refleja que varios países en desarrollo han tenido lamentablemente dificultades nacionales entendibles y justificadas para cubrir sus compromisos; por ello me da la impresión que pretender aprobar la nueva escala de cuotas no sería sensible a esta situación y, en consecuencia, atentaría aún más contra el estado financiero de la Organización, ya que varios de estos países se verían seriamente afectados al aplicar esta nueva escala de cuotas.

México hace un llamado para que este Consejo acoja la propuesta hecha por el GRULAC, es decir que la próxima Conferencia establezca un grupo de trabajo que analice posibles soluciones.

Oswaldo DEL AGUILA RAMÍREZ (Perú)

Agradecemos el informe presentado por el Presidente del Comité de Finanzas. En primer lugar, la delegación de Perú desea expresar su plena concordancia con la declaración del Grupo Latinoamericano y el Caribe realizada por la Delegación de Bolivia, respecto a la escala de cuotas para el período 2002-2003. En este sentido, nos preocupa la falta de equilibrio entre las cuotas que se proponen para una serie de países en desarrollo, que implican importantes incrementos, entre los que se encuentran países de nuestra región y, sobre las cuotas de otras naciones desarrolladas que se ven beneficiadas con reducciones. Esta reducción, obviamente, no nos parece justa

considerando las distintas realidades socio-económicas entre los Miembros de la FAO. Los países en desarrollo hacemos grandes esfuerzos para honrar nuestros compromisos económicos con la Organización y, por ello, demandamos equidad.

La propuesta de la conformación de un grupo de trabajo que analice opciones para solucionar esta situación, nos parece muy pertinente para elaborar una escala de cuotas justa y equilibrada que asegure el normal flujo de recursos a la Organización.

Sitdhi BOONYARATPALIN (Thailand)

Let me express my thanks to the Chairman of the Finance Committee. My major concern is paragraph 60 under the topic, Scale of Contribution 2002 and 2003. The last sentence of paragraph 60 says, "The Conference should provide for a forum for discussion before its implementation". I would appreciate it, if you kindly explain the phrase "before its implementation". I understand it should have read "before its adoption of a scale of contribution" instead of "its implementation". Please do correct me if my understanding is wrong.

In addition, I also would like to join Brazil's concern on the increase of contributions while my country is still facing a financial crisis.

Ms Carolee HEILEMAN (United States of America)

As a member of the Finance Committee, I would like to endorse the remarks made by the European Union representative about the heavy workload and the need for additional time for this Committee.

I think it is evident just from the table of contents of the many issues that are before the Committee. I regret that Pakistan thinks we did not do an adequate job on the World Food Programme but I would say that there are many other very important and complex issues that were before this Committee. Without being given additional time we do not have time to do the kind of job that we might like on other issues, including the budget for the World Food Programme we were considering. As has been noted already, with the revised Scale of Assessments issue and, the forward purchase, very little attention has been devoted thus far to some of the other issues like the investment policy, which is extremely complicated, and arrears. This was the first time that we had looked at any document on the Human Resource Management Policies of this Organization.

I would like to thank the Secretariat for the quality of the documents that we were presented with which outline the issues, some very complex issues, not easily understandable to someone like me who is not trained in these matters as they may be. I do think that, in the short time I have been here, there is an improvement also in the Report of the Finance Committee. It is more detailed than it used to be and, I think, is more revealing to the Membership in general should you care to read this without having to plough through all the documents that we did in six days of work on the Committee. I think it is a good resumé. That being said I just would very briefly like to say we also will reserve our comments on the Programme of Work and Budget until that item is taken up separately.

On the Forward Purchase Contract, I understand that represents a savings of nearly US\$ 50 million to the Organization and removes a certain amount of uncertainty, we hope, from the discussion of the Programme of Work and Budget. I hope that we can do as well in the future in guessing the right time to execute such a contract. There is a tendency, I think it was noted already by the European Union also, that we should however bear in mind the regulations concerning this and not be tempted to go perhaps beyond the regulations when we see a good opportunity. It worked very well this time and the Secretariat should be commended for that.

We looked at the Investment Policy and, I think, here there are a couple problems that came out and I would just like to highlight them for other Members of the Organization, that is, the Organization is not meeting even the benchmarks that it has set for itself. These benchmarks are not even a negative return. You will notice in paragraph 33 that we see targets of negative 8.6 percent and negative 10.7 percent. This is very distressing when you look at how the very

sizeable investments of the Organization are being managed in a time when others have already commented that it is difficult to Members to pay their assessments. We need to do a good job of managing the resources. It has been noted that disbursement, for example, of TCPs is used as a cushion because the Organization does have cash flow problems. We need to keep an eye on the investments and I, personally, think we are headed for, or are already in, a period of considerable volatility.

This brings me to the other point where the Secretariat, in mentioning the reasons behind the, if I can bluntly say, poor performance in this area — you can correct me if you wish on my terminology — but the performance in this area was because of vacancies in that part of the Organization that were caused because the Organization was not competitive salary-wise and could not attract the kind of candidate that is needed to manage this very important resource for the Organization. It was brought up several times in the Committee Meeting and I would endorse the desire of many Members to find the adequate personnel for this very important Division and we should not overlook this issue.

I endorse the proposal that was made for covering After-Service Medical liability so I will not belabour that with you. We did go through the External Auditors' recommendations which were, I would point out, submitted late because of the delays of implementation of the Oracle project. The Oracle project never had enough resources. We were asked a couple of times to make transfers, as Pakistan noted, from the technical programmes of the Organization and I believe that will be necessary in the future if we continue with the upgrade that is foreseen, because the Organization has not created a contingency fund or provided adequately for this particular project. We regret, like many people have stated their regret as well, for having to transfer funds from the technical programmes but we believe that among the reforms in the Organization should be adequate provision for this kind of project. I know the Director-General explained to us how he believed that situation developed but, at this point, we should be learning from past experience.

I will not go into detail on the Scale of Contributions. I was involved in the working group. I think that there is not an alternative to adopting the United Nations Scale, other than devising our own and I think that was pointed out would be a rather lengthy process. I appreciate the information and the briefing that the Secretariat provided on this very very complicated subject to the Membership.

The Organization does face a certain crisis in a way in the Human Resource Management Policy because many of the very experienced people we see before us will be retiring in the near future. There will be a certain loss of expertise, understandably, to the Organization. It was very striking when we talked to the Executive Director of World Food Programme about the Human Resource Management Policies in that organization and her attitude toward specifically gender and geographic distribution issues. She is extremely committed in her attitudes in a way that I did not perceive in the Secretariat. I found that they explained why it was such a difficult task and yet, I think, that we need to look at results increasingly for FAO. We have talked about going to a system of results-based management and the results on gender and geographic balance are not achieved by finding excuses about why it is difficult. We must do better and the statistics are evident here.

I already mentioned the World Food Programme. We do not have enough time, we were not privy to the report of the consultations World Food Programme had made in New York, a video conference actually, with the ACABQ the Committee on Budget questions in New York. I think that would be helpful to our consultations and our deliberations.

We did support the strengthening in the response to emergencies. We did not want the same difficulties to occur in what we were told the largest programme that FAO has these days. We did not want the same kind of personnel problems to plague that programme. Therefore, we did recommend that the Organization, this Council, agree to create someone at an appropriate level to manage that very very important programme.

I have already commented on the ORACLE project and I just would close, with your indulgence, and ask you to give the hard-working Finance Committee more time if at all possible for its deliberations or, alternatively, less work.

Sra Lilia ROMERO PEREIRA (Paraguay)

En primer lugar estamos totalmente de acuerdo con lo expresado por el Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. Dicho esto, permítame mencionar algunos aspectos que mi Delegación considera fundamentales para la adopción de la próxima escala de cuotas. Hay Estados que, en algunos períodos, cruzan el umbral de bajos ingresos *per capita* y, otros que están justo por encima del mismo. Por ello se han elaborado propuestas que van desde la fijación de un período de gracia para aquellos países que cruzan el umbral, hasta fórmulas nuevas para calcular las cifras del umbral de bajos ingresos *per capita*.

Un simple recordatorio: para todos de los más de 180 Países Miembros de la FAO, que están aquí representados, 46 están actualmente calificados como altamente endeudados, porque hay algo que uno se pregunta: ¿es que acaso los países desarrollados bajaron su crecimiento económico de una manera importante y América Latina tuvo un crecimiento económico en términos exagerados de más de un 50 por ciento, como para justificar los resultados de las propuestas? No, no es el caso. Aparte, quisiera recordar a todos que en la década de los 90 se vieron las peores crisis de América Latina, desde el efecto Tequila hasta la devaluación del Real, que son las dos más conocidas por la importancia de ambos países y que nos afectó a todos. También en nuestra región aún se viven los efectos devastadores climáticos como el Huracán Mitch, "El Niño", etc. Por ello, creo que a resultas de todo ello deberíamos dedicar todos nuestros esfuerzos par alcanzar un consenso y reglamentar adecuadamente todo lo que los Estados Miembros puedan aceptar, pero también, honrar.

Sra Hilda Graciela GABARDINI (Argentina)

Quiero unirme al agradecimiento formulado por otras delegaciones, por la exhaustiva presentación que hiciera el Presidente del Comité de Finanzas.

Mi delegación se adhiere totalmente y hace suya la declaración que el señor Representante de Bolivia efectuara en nombre del GRULAC y apoya también lo manifestado por los colegas de Brasil, México y Perú en lo relativo a la Escala de Cuotas.

Estamos convencidos que debe haber una discusión política y que debe encontrarse una solución política para esta cuestión. De lo contrario será una ecuación perversa. La Organización tiene problemas financieros por el atraso en el pago de las cuotas y aquellos países que quieren cumplir con sus compromisos, repito que quieren cumplir con sus compromisos pero no pueden por el contexto financiero en el que están inmersos y por las permanentes políticas de ajuste que deben aplicar, no pueden cumplir con dichos compromisos sino que además con este aumento de cuotas se endeudan cada vez más.

Mi país estuvo entre los que prestaron su consenso cuando en las Naciones Unidas se adoptó la Resolución 55/5, pero lo hizo en base a un entendimiento de que este aumento en la escala de cuotas no implicaría un traslado automático a las otras agencias del sistema. Por eso insisto en que consideremos importante es constitución de un grupo de trabajo que pueda discutir esta cuestión que nos afecta tan seriamente.

LI ZHENG DONG (China) (Original language Chinese)

We of the Chinese delegation endorse the adoption of this report by the Council.

However, regarding the contribution scale we hope to have more specific deliberations during the conference next week. Another explanation I would like to make is about the contributions in arrears by the Chinese Government. We would like to express with regret that FAO has not adopted the transition policy in terms of the contributions in arrears, in 2001. As according to the scale of the United Nations, the members should have submitted their contributions in the scales. For this decision, in the last conference, the Chinese delegation made its reservations. Of course,

in order to support the FAO works, the Chinese Government has to make active efforts so as to follow the FAO revelations to submit our due contributions.

Angel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)

En primer lugar quisiéramos también, como han hecho otros colegas, apoyar la declaración del Embajador de Bolivia en nombre del GRULAC, con relación a la seria preocupación que nos asiste respecto de la situación de la escala de cuotas para el período 2002-2003.

No quiero ahondar en detalles, ni hacer una declaración redundante respecto a lo que han dicho otras delegaciones, pero estamos convencidos de que la próxima Conferencia es un buen lugar para el propósito de establecer un grupo de trabajo que analice diferentes alternativas para modificar los incrementos que han significado las cuotas para algunos países. En esta situación estamos nosotros y varios países en desarrollo, y creemos sea oportuno hacer un análisis de lo mismo.

CHAIRMAN

Any other requests for the floor? I see none. I would like to invite Mr Mekouar to respond and also, later on, the Secretariat.

Aziz MEKOUAR (Président, Comité financier)

Je crois qu'il n'y a pas beaucoup de questions qui m'ont été adressées. La seule question à laquelle je pourrais répondre, c'est celle de Monsieur le Représentant de la Thaïlande, qui a posé une question sur le paragraphe 60, pour lequel la Conférence devrait organiser un débat avant son application. Il s'agit de l'avis de certains Membres et je crois que c'était une proposition pour l'avenir et non pas pour la situation actuelle. Il s'agissait d'une simple proposition. Et d'un avis de certains Membres. Si vous voulez maintenant passer la parole au Secrétariat, je crois qu'il n'y avait pas d'autres questions qui m'étaient adressées.

Michael RUDDY (Consultant/Interim Director, Finance Division)

There were quite a number of questions having to do with the Scale of Contributions, mostly dissatisfied with the way in which the adoption of the UN Scale as applied by FAO through its own scale, redistributed the shares of or the burden of financing the institution.

Over the last two weeks, we briefed probably something in excess of a hundred of you on how this process was worked out. We explained the procedure used by the United Nations to arrive at its scale and we noted that that scale had been applied, more or less, as it has always been applied by the United Nations, using lots of economic data about the relative strength of countries, adjusting the economic data for LDCs, high debt and other statistical adjustments. The result of all that was probably a scale that is no better, no worse than all the other Scales that have come out of the United Nations process. The only difference being that in the final resolution, the UN did provide for some absorption of the impact of the changes in the Scale by virtue of the fact that a private US citizen donated a substantial amount of money to help deal with that particular problem. We explained how FAO had taken the UN Scale and applied it to its own Scale and we mentioned that the net effect of all of that was a redistribution in FAO of some US\$ 15 million worth of contributions. Of that US\$ 15 million to be redistributed, approximately US\$ nine million has to do with the UN ceiling being reduced from 25 to 22 percent and the remaining US\$ six million of the adjustment had to do with time series economic changes in the basic data the UN uses to derive its own scale.

We explained what the scale meant to individual countries; we provided tables that showed how the impact was for each country in terms of these two components and finally we explained what other United Nations Organizations had tried to do in adopting the UN scale to their own contributions. There were, in fact, seven organizations, United Nations Specialized Agencies that follow the UN Scale, including FAO, and about half of them adopted the scale as approved by the UN without any provisions for adjustments or lessening the impact of change on particular countries. Two organizations did, however, try to absorb some or all of the impact that was

coming from the adoption of the UN Scale. WHO did this essentially by agreeing to absorb 100 percent of the change in the year 2002 and 75 percent of the change in 2003. The way they are going to do this is to fund it out of their own administrative budget, that is, the budget will be agreed, the Scale will be applied and then some of the funds that would have been used from the receipts of that Scale will be directed not to the budget, but to offsetting the contributions of countries that are impacted by that change.

This is the process that we have followed. I think my own sense of the discussions was that a decision was made in the UN which was largely or substantially a political decision and the arithmetic that followed from that decision was not something that a lot of people appreciated. But, I do not know that we can do very much about that. It is after all a zero-sum game. If something goes down, something has to go up to offset it. So that essentially was the story. You are quite right; it may well be appropriate to have the conference look at alternative ways to solve this puzzle and it is not an easy problem to solve because either you cut the budget or you redistribute the cost or you find some other way to generate the funds necessary to close the circle.

There were a few questions with respect to the forward Euro purchase that we did in July and also the question of whether FAO's functional currency for accounting purposes should shift from the dollar to the Euro, given what is probably going to be the increasing importance of the Euro.

On the forward purchase, it seemed to us in late June, early July that the Euro movement against the dollar was quite favourable in the sense that the dollar had appreciated substantially. We consulted with all of the advisers of the Investment Committee, and these are gentlemen, the treasure of the EBRD in London, the treasure of the International Monetary Fund, senior officials from the Bank of International Settlements and other experts in the investment field, and all of them advised us that this was an opportune moment to place our requirement for purchasing Euros forward. It is hard to go into a Euro or any foreign currency purchase forward with the idea that you are going to speculate and make money. That is not the basis for doing this. The basis is to ensure that you do not absorb a gain or a loss subsequently, given the exchange rates at the moment when you are trying to make a financial decision. It is always true that as time goes on and you second-guess what you could have done with certain knowledge, that is a different proposition. But as far as from bookkeeping standpoint is concerned, we are trying to relieve of taking an exposure in the two currencies.

The idea of converting FAO's functional currency to the Euro is under discussion. We have no intellectual disagreement with that as possibly a good idea. We did want to wait for the Euro to become a real currency before we went too far and it does require a fair amount of work because you have got a lot of re-evaluation problems and a lot of technical accounting work to do in order to make the conversion. So, it is just a matter really of picking the opportune time and when we have the staff to do the work.

On the investment side, several speakers asked about the difficulty we were having in recruiting a senior treasury officer, and that is true. About a year ago we tried very hard to fill this position by selecting a couple of individuals we thought highly of who could do this job. We had to get permission from the Director-General to recruit them outside of normal policy. We got that permission, we spent then some time negotiating with these individuals; in fact, it took probably between the two of them, nine months and in the end we lost them both because the job was not graded at a D-1 level; we could offer a P-5. When that avenue was shut down we then went through normal recruiting procedures. The advertisement closed, the posting closed on 15 October. We have 127 candidates and we are now in the process of trying to sort through all of that process.

There was also a question on investment returns and I think that we, like most investors in the equity market today, our long-term portfolio is 65 percent equities, 35 percent fixed income securities. But all of us in the long-term market with equities are suffering quite a bit when compared to the market value of those securities one year ago. It does not mean that we have suffered all of these losses. What it means is that the value of the portfolio in September -- and the

Finance Committee reviewed this information -- had dropped significantly from where it was the September before. We had not sold all these securities, we had not turned these losses into realized losses and since this is a long-term portfolio, having to do with termination costs and other grants when people retire, we are very confident that much of this market will recover in time and that we are looking at a very unfortunate low situation. But, we are not alone in the world in this position. In fact, I do not know of very many people smiling who are in the investment management business these days.

On the other hand, our short-term portfolio which is not in equities but in fixed income, also representing approximately US\$ 200 million is doing all right. It is earning very close to the US Treasury bill rate on the international markets and it is roughly around 5.5 percent as I recall the figure.

I think those are the main points or questions that I picked up.

CHAIRMAN

Any other comments from the Secretariat? Any response? I think while we have a general endorsement of the report, we also see that there is a very strong wish that we should also look into the Scales of Contributions which is now in place and there is a suggestion that we appeal to the Conference to take this up and form a working group on this.

That concludes our debate on this item. I would like to thank Mr Mekouar and the Secretariat for their decision and response to this.

5. Programme Evaluation Report 2001 (C 2001/4)

5. Rapport d'évaluation du Programme 2001 (C 2001/4)

5. Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa, 2001 (C 2001/4)

CHAIRMAN

We now move on to Item 5. Programme evaluation report. I would like to ask Mr Rose to present the conclusion of the committee's debate on this item.

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

What I propose to do is review for Council the Programme Committee's discussions on a thematic evaluation that we discussed which was titled "The Thematic Review of FAO's Training Activities". Briefly review the topics that the Programme Committee has suggested be included in the work programme for the next biennium, so that Council has an idea of which topics are going to be considered over the next two to three years. That would conclude the report of the Programme Committee on this item. Then, you can proceed to the report itself.

The Programme Committee had for its consideration the thematic review of FAO's training activities. We noted, particularly, the strong methodology that had been used in undertaking this thematic review which could not take the form of a classic evaluation as such but was more a review of FAO's activities broadly classified under training. This review included the use of questionnaires to Member Nations, to FAO personnel as well. It included the use of an outside expert to review FAO's training materials and we generally felt it was a very strong methodology and a well-done thematic review. One of the major conclusions of the surveys that were done under this review was that FAO's training activities are assessed broadly as relevant and useful in meeting the needs of Member Nations.

One of the major conclusions of the surveys that were done under this review was that FAO's training activities are assessed broadly as relevant and useful in meeting the needs of Member Countries.

The Committee, however, expressed considerable concern about the various weaknesses which were identified in the review. Many of those weaknesses indicated institutional shortcomings in ensuring that training activities are planned and implemented in a well coordinated manner and that their achievements are monitored and assessed.

When we received this thematic review, we did not have the benefit of management's response to the evaluation or to the review. One of the items of methodology that we have adopted in the Programme Committee has been to ask management to give us their response to the findings of the evaluators. This was provided for us during the meeting and management's response is summarized in Paragraph 33 of the Programme Committee's Report, document CL 121/3, but is also included in the document for the Council, the Programme Evaluation Report.

As a quick summary, management decided that the existing Informal Task Force on Education and Food for All, which is chaired by the Extension, Education and Communication Service, should serve as the appropriate interdepartmental mechanism for leading the follow-up action on this particular Report. The Task Force was charged with preparing draft guiding principles, with establishing a suitable in-house network of trainers as well as an FAO website on training, with providing recommendations for management action regarding application of adult education approaches and on a staff training programme, and with providing options for the implementation of the proposed reporting and monitoring arrangements with a view to identifying a cost effective approach.

Management noted that the review did recommend a rather extensive and potentially expensive system of monitoring and review of FAO's training activities. The Committee shared with management the concerns that this could become rather expensive, particularly at a time of relatively fixed resources, and we applauded their approach to find an existing mechanism to tackle this and to find a low cost solution.

Turning to the topics to be considered for future evaluations, the whole structure of the Committee's review of evaluations has been, I guess, amended by and guided by the adoption of the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan. We are moving away from a system of evaluating specific FAO programmes such as Major Programme 2.1.2 or 2.4, and now undertaking reviews of themes as identified under the Strategic Framework of Strategic Thrusts of the Organization.

We have also entered into a dialogue with the Director-General so that the Programme Committee is in a position to recommend to the Director-General topics which should be included in the schedule of evaluations over the next two to three years. We make these recommendations to the Director-General for his consideration.

Topics which will be considered over the next two to three years include the full evaluation of the Special Programme for Food Security, which will be considered by the Programme Committee next May. Topics for Thematic Evaluations include a evaluation of Strategy A, which is Contributing to the eradication of food insecurity and rural poverty, evaluation under Strategy B.1, which is International instruments concerning food, agriculture, fishery and forestry and the production, safe use and fair exchange of agricultural, fishery and forestry goods, which is just a repeat of the text of Strategy B.1. Under Strategy B.1, we propose to evaluate the joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, also known as Codex Alimentarius. Under Strategy D, we propose to review selected activities in support of Strategy D.1, which is in fact the Integrated management of land, water, fisheries, forest and genetic resources.

Under topics for Thematic Evaluations Related to the Strategies to address Cross- Organizational Issues, we propose to recommend an evaluation of the Decentralization of FAO's Programmes and Services, and an evaluation of the Strategy for Communicating FAO's messages.

Under the evaluations of selected individual programmes, including the Field Programme, I mentioned that we were moving away from these but we have not moved completely away. So there are a couple of specific programmes which we propose to be evaluated, including Programme 2.1.2, Crops, covering food production components, Programme 2.1.3, Livestock, excluding animal health which has been covered by a thematic evaluation of TCP projects, and also excluding animal genetic resources, which was evaluated and reported on a couple of biennia ago.

Lastly, we propose to review Programme 2.2.2, Food and Agricultural Information Programmes, specifically activities related to agricultural statistics in the context of FAO STAT. I ask you to bear in mind the fact that we have asked for an evaluation of FAO STAT. because I am going to be raising it again.

Those are the items which we propose to be included in the Evaluation Schedule over the next two to three years.

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

Just to complete the introduction, Mr Rose was of course addressing those aspects of the Programme Evaluation Report which were considered at its September session. The Programme Committee has been addressing these Evaluation Reports progressively over the last biennium. In fact, this is the first version of the Programme Evaluation Report in its new form.

Council will recall that, at its Hundred and Seventeenth Session in November 1999, it agreed to modified arrangements for reporting of evaluation results to Governing Bodies. At that time, it also concurred in particular with the fact that the Programme Committee would henceforth be the prime recipient of Evaluation Reports, to be generally spread over the two sessions in the first year of the biennium.

The Council was satisfied that a more concise Programme Evaluation Report, summarizing those reports that had been reviewed by the Committee, would be submitted to the Council and Conference in the second year of the biennium. This is the first of those reports and of course it includes the training review which Mr Rose referred to.

The document before you is a summary of all of the reports reviewed by the Programme Committee during 2000-2001. In addition to the Report itself, you will find in each case the management response to the recommendations made in the Report; the reaction of the Programme Committee in the form of its report, that is, the relevant extract from its Report; and the comments of the external review panels where these were applied.

The Programme Committee has, of course, thoroughly reviewed the detailed reports which were provided to it, but I would draw your attention to the fact that the full reports are available to all Members on the FAO Website. Those of you who wish to go into any further detail of any of the reports shown here will find them on the FAO website.

In conclusion, my colleague Mr Kato, who is the Chief of the Evaluation Service in FAO and I are here to assist and answer any questions you may have.

Jörn BEISSERT (Germany)

I would like to request you to give the floor to Belgium to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

Christian MONNOYER (Observer for Belgium)

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

The position of the European Community and its Member States on the Programme of Work and Budget will be set out under Item 6.

The role of the Programme Committee concerning evaluation is crucial. We welcome the evaluation reports, which become more and more interesting and are essential for the quality of FAO's work.

The Programme Committee discussed this time the thematic review of FAO's Training Activities and requested to prepare a follow-up report at its next session on the management response to this quite critical review. We would like to support the Programme Committee's conclusions and stress the importance we attach to training activities, which are crucial in our opinion. These activities are indeed mostly considered to be relevant and useful in meeting the needs of developing Member Nations, but the Organization, on the other hand, does not seem to know whom it is training for what and when, and what it costs. The term "Training Activities" covers a

broad range of activities. We should welcome more information on the effectiveness of these activities.

The European Community and its Member States look forward to the implementation of a rather heavy but most appropriate evaluation programme, as described in Paragraph 37 of the Report. At some stage, we may like to be informed in more detail about the status of evaluations in the Organization, the independence of preparing evaluations and the way management itself is looking into the follow-up of conclusions of evaluation reports, of its own response to these and of the conclusions of the Programme Committee and Council.

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

We welcome the Programme Evaluation Report. We see that there is a very comprehensive treatment of the topics that have been undertaken for evaluation.

My first question to the Secretariat is how do you include these recommendations into your Programme of Work and Budget cycle. If all these recommendations are going to go through the Conference for approval now, in which Programme of Work and Budget will these recommendations be applied? I think it is very important that we do not carry out evaluations for the sake of evaluation. However, what effect the Evaluation Report could have on the Programme of Work and Budget of the Organization is very important.

The second point I would like to make is that of the various topics, the one topic that is of interest to my country, and I am sure to many developing countries, is the evaluation of FAO's policy assistance, because this also deals with the FAO TCP, as many of the TCP programmes are policy assistance programmes. There are quite a lot of findings both by the evaluation team and the peer review that need to be taken very seriously into consideration when we formulate policy assistance.

One important issue that I would like to highlight, and which we have highlighted in the past, is that much of the policy assistance that is needed by developing countries is now unfortunately dependent on extra-budgetary resources, except those that are served by the TCP. For example, one area which I can quote straight away is on trade-related issues. I remember that last time the Economic and Social Department was seeking extra-budgetary resources for trade-related issues. These are very crucial issues because by the time you find extra-budgetary resources, the needs might have changed as these are needs which need to be met at a very quick pace. I think that for policy assistance there must be adequate provision of budgetary resources. Unfortunately, I find it as the last point given in the Executive Summary is that larger budgetary allocations should be given for policy assistance. I would think that this is extremely important.

Policy formulation assistance should be based more on national priorities than on just general agricultural policy. Again, I think this is very important. We have a lot of general issues here in FAO where there is a tendency to say that policy assistance should be given to Member Nations, but is it relevant to national priorities, is it relevant to the Member Nations' needs? I think this is an area which is extremely important.

Another issue that has come up in this evaluation, and to which we will be coming back when we talk about the Programme of Work and Budget, is that the productivity and effectiveness of regional policy assistance branches could be raised, could be improved. We feel that when we read our Programme of Work and Budget on the regional dimensions also.

Lastly, I do know that consultants have their own language but I am quite foxed by sentences like this which I quote; "The technical quality of FAO's policy work is as good as or better than of other agencies, but significant areas for improvement were found, including in the integration of multidisciplinary input and in ensuring effective normative underpinning, especially for analysis of costs and benefits of subsector policies and the technology policy interface." I am not able to make out exactly what it means. I think if the Membership is to really enjoy reading this document, I think the language should become more pedestrian for people like me to understand.

Adnan Bashir KHAN (Pakistan)

Allow me to thank Mr Rose for his introduction to the Report of the Eighty-sixth Session of the Programme Committee. Allow me also to thank Mr Wade for his introductory note.

My comments are restricted to the Report of the Programme Committee. We concur with the Committee that training is a major vehicle for extending the Organization's technical and normative outputs, as well as for contributing to human resource development and capacity building in developing Member Nations. We attach great significance to this evaluation and treat its findings as a vehicle for improvement in FAO's capacity to carry out this activity, with a view to improving its performance and providing a basis for enhancing the impact of training activities. We wish to underscore the ability of the Organization to measure impact and, since this particular study was a desk study, and every desk study has its limitations, for impact measurement it certainly requires more field validation than just a questionnaire. The point I wish to make is that evaluation studies, and looking towards improving evaluation criteria or improving the quality of the evaluation, the issue of impact should be kept in the forefront. We share the Committee's concern regarding the weaknesses identified, particularly those related to institutional shortcomings, such as lack of an institutional framework, deficient in-house capacity and absence of an adequate monitoring and evaluation system. We have noted the recommendations and also the management response contained in paragraph 33. We see merit in many of the recommendations, including the one for establishing a system of monitoring and follow-up on training and here the issue of impact, we believe, is essential for impact measurement and demonstration and would stand the Organization in good stead.

We compliment management for its prompt response and look forward to receiving the proposals emanating from the Task Force's Report.

We endorse the Committee's choice of topics for evaluation for the next two biennia. We also note the Secretariat's desire to conduct a full evaluation of the SPFS and to submit to the Programme Committee in May 2002. However, we believe that some sort of a joint review was undertaken by FAO and the DFID regarding SPFS and would welcome information on this endeavour.

Finally, we endorse the possible items that may be discussed by the Committee as outlined in paragraph 42.

Víctor Hugo MORALES MELÉNDEZ (México)

Seré breve. Centraré mis comentarios en dos aspectos relevantes para México. Uno de ellos es la decisión sobre el aumento de los recursos proporcionados al Programa de Pesca, tal como lo había pedido el Comité de Pesca. Desde luego nos complace el respaldo a las prioridades de este sector, incluido el apoyo a la aplicación del código de conducta para la pesca responsable. Un segundo aspecto relevante se refiere al capítulo 4, Programa de Cooperación Técnica. Es un capítulo fundamental para los objetivos de la FAO, por lo que es indispensable que se superen los problemas temporales a que se refiere el párrafo 30 del documento CL 121/3, reforzar las acciones de cooperación técnica debe ser siempre una de las prioridades de la Organización y de sus órganos decisorios.

Por otra parte, deseo expresar mi reconocimiento por el esfuerzo que significa el nuevo sistema de evaluación para mejorar la transparencia, así como para aumentar el rigor y la eficacia de la evaluación como instrumento de gestión en la FAO. Es adecuada la recomendación contenida en el párrafo 37 sobre los ocho temas de evaluación, pero desde luego sería recomendable también conocer el grado de independencia de las actividades, justamente de evaluación, que se están realizando.

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

I sometimes feel that I am on the receiving end of a subcontinental volleyball game where Pakistan might serve out the ball and then India spikes it over the net.

There was only one question that came from India that I would like to address, and then there were others that were addressed to the Secretariat, that they may wish to deal with. The question of have you included recommendations emanating from evaluation into the Programme of Work and Budget, the technical aspects of this I will leave to Mr Wade, but as a practical matter I will point to the very evaluation that India mentioned, the evaluation of FAO's policy assistance. An evaluation, which I should say, the Programme Committee felt was probably one of the best that FAO has ever undertaken. The results of that evaluation are already included in the Draft Programme of Work and Budget that you see in front of you through some of the measures that are included and, if you compare some of the comments, or some of the draft, between the document that you saw in June and the document that you see before you today, you can, in fact, see how some of the recommendations of the policy assistance evaluation have already been included.

I share Pakistan's concern about impact. It is something that we have been trying to stress ever since we started talking about the Strategic Framework and the results-based management, and how do you actually measure the work that you have been doing. Again it is something that you can never stress enough so I thank you for continuing to raise that.

That concludes the comments I have on questions that were addressed my way.

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

Regarding the intervention of the Belgium delegate who made a comment concerning the status of evaluation, its independence and then the relationship between its reports and the response to those reports. Of course, the distinguished delegate was referring to the Programme Committee Report and not to the Programme Evaluation Report, which is also on the Agenda. It is interesting in the way it responds to that question because what you have in the Programme Evaluation Report is not only the summary of each Report but also the management response and, if there was a peer group review, then you also have that and you see in fact the Programme Committee's comments as well. So you have the whole lot brought together and hopefully a coherent view from management about what it is going to do about things. If management disagrees with the recommendation, you will see that as well. So it puts the Programme Committee in particular, but also Council and Conference, in a position to judge whether management is taking action.

The other thing that we are spending much more time on now is direct follow-up of evaluation recommendations, which I would have to say is in part because of the persistence of the Programme Committee itself to receive such reports, which is a good discipline to internal management as well. We certainly see, if I may say so, from the perspective of the evaluators, and Mr Kato may want to comment on this, that the Evaluation Reports are being taken more and more seriously and that is to the benefit of us all.

In response to some of India's comments, I think Mr Rose, in a way, has already replied to an extent, but it is certainly true that we do not wait for the publication of a biennial report to act upon the recommendations. They are acted on progressively. So if you look at, for example, the policy assistance report, it recommended additional resources be supplied to the regional offices in particular to support their work. You will find that in the budget there is an extra US\$ 600 000 allocated to the regional offices, directly because of this recommendation, and there is a reference in the text to that fact. You will see that the programme structure changes proposed under the Food and Agriculture Policy Evaluation are also already in the document. So we are acting on them progressively.

I am not too sure how I can respond to your legitimate concern on policy assistance relying on extrabudgetary resources and therefore using the example you had, which was the trade-related issues -- if you don't get the money in time it becomes too late and it's a problem. All we can do is try and change the balance of the amounts available on the budget for this purpose which, to an extent, is what we are doing.

On the sentence which you read out, I suppose I could say that you must be very grateful that you had the summary and you did not have the full Report where the sentence was much longer. I

apologize for that, we should have picked it up in the editing and we will try and do better next time.

I note Pakistan's comments on impact. I think Mr Rose has also commented on this and Mr Kato may wish to add something.

On the SPFS evaluation, that is not something we are about to start, that is something that is fully underway. It is broader than the DFID exercise, which was looking at the application of the sustainable livelihood's approach in SPFS projects in, I think, one particular country. Instead the SPFS evaluation is across all four continents, or all four regions I should say, and looks at twelve different countries. It is a completely independent team of evaluators and their report is actually in production at the moment. The last mission, West African mission, is about to start. They will have their report available to us so that we will be able to get it to you with the management response to the May 2002 Programme Committee.

I think that probably concludes my comments. I do not know if Mr Kato would like to add anything.

Masa KATO (Chief, Evaluation Service)

Perhaps I could address a couple of general points raised, one regarding the independence and the feedback from evaluation to Regular Programme activities. I think the practice that has been encouraged by the Programme Committee, whereby senior management is expected to respond and come up with concrete responses to evaluations and recommendations, has been very helpful to bring the loop between evaluation and programme action to address the issues raised. For example, for practically all of the topics we have covered here, there has been very intensive interaction between what we have produced and the management, for example in the case of field project design, the issue we raised, TC Department has already been addressing this through a number of workshops and there will be new procedures, new approaches for project design and formulation, including appraisal. I think also, similarly, I may say that in the case of policy assistance, already an interdepartment task force has begun its work to address many of the issues raised, including prioritization of policy assistance activities and how to coordinate. Resource questions will also eventually be addressed.

For the training review, this morning an interdepartmental task force had its first meeting and, in the next few months, they will be addressing these issues. There will be a report in February or so, to be reported to the Programme Committee in May next year. This has really been a very helpful mechanism and we will use this to the best of our ability to obtain the best value from the evaluation.

On the impact, it is a perpetual issue. The Programme Committee has never let us forget about this issue. In all of our work, we are always criticized for our weaknesses in this area. In the case of the training review, we have summarized some of the effective results being achieved, particularly under the field projects, through a desk review of some 35 projects active in this area.

One of the problems in reporting impact is ambiguity or the lack of a policy framework by which we can articulate the results *vis-à-vis* the policy goal, and what achievement objectives we have. I think establishing such a framework is a task that is being addressed by the interdepartment task force, in order to come up with common definitions identifying the major type of training activities. These definition approaches will give us a clearer conceptual basis by which we can say, for this kind of training, these are the results and the impact we should expect, and against those benchmarks, what has been their progress. This in an area that we will be concerned with, we will be working on in the future and I hope you will find progressively our work and report will be more satisfactory.

The meeting rose at 17.45 hours

La séance est levée à 17h45

Se levanta la sesión a las 17.45 horas

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

**Hundred and Twenty-first Session
Cent vingt et unième session
121^o período de sesiones**

**Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001
Rome, 30 octobre 1 novembre 2001
Roma, 30 de octubre - 1^o de noviembre de 2001**

**THIRD PLENARY MEETING
TROISIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
TERCERA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

31 October 2001

The Third Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.00 hours
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La troisième séance plénière est ouverte à 10.00 heures
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la tercera sesión plenaria a las 10.00 horas
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

(continued)

III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)

III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)

6. Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-CORR.1; C 2001/3-CORR.2-Rev.1 (Spanish and French only); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (espagnol et français seulement); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2002-2003: (C 2001/3 C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (español y francés solamente); C 2001/LIM/15)

CHAIRMAN

I would like to call to order the third meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-first Council Session. We will begin with Item 6, Programme of Work and Budget. Before that I know that the Open-ended Working Group will meet at 10:00 hours and I hope that the other Member delegates will take their places here so that we can proceed and meet our quorum in order to take decisions by the Council.

We will now start our Session on the Programme of Work and Budget 2002 to 2003 and the relevant documents are C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1 and C 2001/3-Corr.2.Rev.1 (French and Spanish only) and C 2001/LIM/15. Before the debate I would like to ask Mr Mekouar, Chairman of the Finance Committee and then followed by Mr Rose, Chairman of the Programme Committee, to present the conclusions of the debate of the Committees Chaired by them on this item.

Aziz MEKOUAR (Président, Comité financier)

Je voudrais vous faire part de ce que nous avons discuté au Comité financier au sujet du Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003. Le Comité a examiné les propositions du Directeur général pour le Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003 en accordant une attention particulière au cadre budgétaire et aux propositions concernant les chapitres 5 – Services de soutien, et 6 – Charges communes. Le Comité a pris acte des propositions de Croissance réelle du Directeur général impliquant une augmentation effective de 35 millions de dollars E.-U. ou 5,4 pour cent par rapport au budget précédent et un budget atteignant 688,7 millions de dollars E.-U. Quelques Membres ont regretté qu'un scénario de Croissance nominale 0, scène Z, n'ait pas été présenté malgré les demandes formulées précédemment, tout en reconnaissant que la différence sur le plan budgétaire était minimale, environ 1,8 million de dollars E.-U.

Le Comité s'est félicité de l'incidence très favorable du taux de change de 1 Euro pour 0,88 dollar E.-U. utilisé pour calculer les augmentations de coût et a reconnu que la conclusion d'un contrat d'achat à terme pour couvrir le besoin en Euros de l'Organisation serait un bon moyen de protéger le Programme de travail 2002-2003 de nouvelles fluctuations des taux de change avant que la Conférence n'approuve le budget en 2001.

Le Comité a examiné la méthodologie adoptée par le Secrétariat pour calculer les augmentations de coûts. Il a approuvé le niveau des augmentations de coût ainsi que les hypothèses sur lesquelles elles reposaient.

Le Comité a rappelé ses débats antérieurs au cours desquels il avait été souligné que les secteurs des finances du personnel et des technologies de la formation relevant du Grand Programme 5.2 – Administration, devaient bénéficier de ressources suffisantes pour garantir une bonne infrastructure administrative. Il a reçu des précisions supplémentaires de la part des responsables de ces programmes sur le contenu de leur programme de travail au niveau budgétaire proposé.

Les Membres du Comité ont exprimé des vues divergentes sur le niveau du budget, plusieurs d'entre eux appuyant un budget de Croissance réelle et d'autres un budget de Croissance réelle zéro, de Croissance nominale zéro. Les Membres se sont également déclarés favorables à diverses mesures visant, soit à réduire les augmentations proposées, soit à renforcer les programmes de l'Organisation.

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

I will report briefly on the conclusions of the Joint Committee and then, in slightly more detail, the conclusions of the Programme Committee.

As I mentioned yesterday, the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee met separately to review different aspects of the Programme of Work and Budget. On the Wednesday of that week, we came together in a joint meeting to seek a consensus on the level of the budget with the hope of being able to present to the Council a single recommendation on the level and thus ease your work.

In the Committee we examined the different scenarios and I believe that Ambassador Mekouar's summary of the Finance Committee accurately reflects the debate that also took place in the Joint Committee so I will not repeat that. I will just conclude by saying that in spite of a very full debate in the Joint Committee and an extensive exchange of views, I regret to report that it was not possible for the Joint Committees to reach a consensus on the appropriate level of the budget for 2002-2003. Thus we were not able to ease your work and I regret that.

Turning now to the discussions in the Programme Committee. We reviewed the proposed Programme of Work. As opposed to the budgetary aspects the Programme Committee focused extensively on the specific Programmes that were proposed, on the priorities, and changes in the actual Programme of Work. We left it to our colleagues in the Finance Committee to look at the financial aspects.

The one important thing to note for your considerations at this Council is that the Programme Committee broadly supported the Programme directions and priorities proposed in the Director-General's draft. We had no comments about things that should have been included that were not or disagreements with the broad direction. This is in no small measure due to the amount of predictability that we now have built into the planning systems in FAO. We spent a great deal of time, two years ago, examining the Strategic Framework of the Organization for a fifteen-year period. We then spent considerable time last year examining the Medium-Term Plan which was a six-year Programme of Work based on that Strategic Framework and it was consistent with the Strategic Framework. We then spent a great deal of time earlier this year looking at the initial draft of the two-year Programme of Work and Budget which again was consistent. We have now a very predictable planning process and therefore, we find that there are very few surprises when we come to examine the specific two-year Programme of Work and Budget. It was, in fact, very easy for the Committee to come to a general agreement on the work being proposed for the next two years.

We appreciated the fact that the document that we had before us in September had been redrafted from the version which you saw in June. Redrafted in order to respond to the requests made by the Technical Committees which met earlier this year, by our own Programme Committee in its meeting last May and by the Council itself in its meeting last June. Significant changes had been made to increase the proportion of Regular Programme resources allocated to the Forestry and to the Fisheries Departments as requested by those Technical Committees and by the Council. Significant additional resources were also allocated to improve language balance in FAO documents, meetings and websites, also as requested by the Council in June.

The Programme Committee reviewed those Chapters of the Programme of Work and Budget relating to programme activities, that is Chapters 1,2,3 and 4. In discussing Major Programme 2.1.2, which is the Crops Programme, and 2.1.3, the Livestock Programme, we supported the increased attention which is being given to sustainable rural livelihoods and food security and to

the planned support to facilitating and enabling policy environment which will enable countries to actually make use of existing technologies.

Under Major Programme 2.2, we paid particular attention to FAO's statistical systems and the problems which we had brought to your attention in June. The Secretariat outlined the steps which it had taken since Council's examination in June: to review the dimensions of the problem, to develop cost-estimates and options for ways these problems may be addressed. We also noted that the Secretariat had proposed to allocate additional resources to this issue, but only under the Real Growth scenario.

I am now going to quote extensively from paragraph 20 of our Report but only from that paragraph: "Bearing in mind the importance of this statistical work ... and while appreciating that a specific cost estimate could not be provided until a thorough study of system requirements and specifications had been completed, the Programme Committee urged that options for funding be identified, including through the use of arrears. Moreover, it stressed that an important new entity should remain a priority regardless of the level of the approved budget..." This entity appeared in the most recent draft of the Programme of Work and Budget. 2.2.2.A4, Systematic Evaluation and Improvement of Statistical Data Quality So we were suggesting that even if a budget less than Real Growth be allocated that FAO statistical system continued to receive priority treatment.

The Committee requested that an updated report on the proposal to modernize FAOSTAT be provided to its next Session in May when requirements, definition and conceptual design, with associated firmer cost-estimates had been examined. The result of that status report will be reported to Council at its Hundred and Twenty-second Session. As I mentioned before, we noted with pleasure the increase in the resources to the Fisheries and to the Forestry Programmes and we urge that measures be taken to ensure that these increase proportions be maintained regardless of the level of the budget selected.

Under Chapter 3, Cooperation and Partnerships. The Committee noted that the proposals under Major Programme 3.1 Policy Assistance, reflected measures to respond to the evaluation of policy assistance activities it had considered at its last Session-I alluded to this yesterday when I was speaking about the Programme Evaluation Report. The positive results of the evaluation had already been included in the proposals for Major Programme 3.1.

The Committee was also informed about the special arrangements that had been made in connection with the implementation of the Oil for Food Programme. This specific concern of the Programme Committee was that the programmes of the Organization should be protected should there be major changes in the scope of the Oil for Food Programmes and we were assured that contingency plans had been made by the Secretariat to deal with any abrupt changes in the scope of that Programme.

I asked permission of the Chair to make a short statement following that Report and he graciously gave me permission. Two years ago you elected me to Chair your Programme Committee. At that time I promised I would do my best to uphold the privilege but that my best was not going to be good enough and I reminded you that I would need the full support of the Membership. Let me say as I conclude my two-year term as Chairman of the Programme Committee, that you the Members of the Council have kept your bargain. You have provided tremendous support to the Members of the Programme Committee.

One of the outstanding ways that you have supported the Programme Committee was by electing a very competent Membership to the Programme Committee. We have worked extremely well as a Committee. The dynamics have been excellent. We held our meetings in a very collegial and informal manner and the Programme Committee over the past two years worked as well as any Committee I have ever seen operate in a multilateral system.

It is also important that your Council Members recognize the outstanding support that the Programme Committee receives from senior managers of this Organization. On the Programme Committee we have a very privileged access to the people in charge of the Programmes that we are charged with examining and our work, on your behalf, has benefited in countless ways from

that privileged access. Much has been accomplished by the Programme Committee. The implementation of the mechanisms that were spelled out in the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan are one example. The new evaluation systems which we talked about yesterday, I think is another example of things that the Programme Committee can be very pleased with.

It has been a pleasure for me to serve as your Chair over these past two years and I thank the Council very much for the opportunity that it gave me.

Aziz MEKOUAR (Président, Comité financier)

Je voudrais moi-même, également, faire un peu le bilan de ces deux années de ma présidence au Comité financier. Je ne serai pas aussi éloquent que mon ami Monsieur Rose, mais ce que je voulais dire c'est que lorsque j'ai été élu Président du Comité financier il y a deux ans, à peine arrivé en Italie, je m'étais également engagé à faire de mon mieux pour mener à bien la tâche qui m'avait été confiée. Je dois dire que le Comité financier, au cours de ces deux années, a très bien travaillé; non pas grâce à moi en tant que Président, mais surtout grâce aux Membres. Les travaux du Comité pendant ces deux années ont été extrêmement intéressants et extrêmement profitables pour l'Organisation à mon sens, justement à cause de la qualité de ses Membres. Je pense que le Comité a apporté une valeur ajoutée aux travaux de l'Organisation. Je voudrais donc remercier les différents Membres qui ont fait partie du Comité financier avec moi pendant ces deux années, de tout l'appui et surtout de leur apport inestimable au travail de notre Organisation.

Bien entendu, je ne peux pas ne pas remercier le Secrétariat qui m'a été d'un très grand secours, qui nous a éclairés sur bien des points parce que, pour certains d'entre nous, nous venions d'arriver, nous ne connaissions pas les arcanes de notre Organisation. Je le remercie beaucoup pour ce qu'il a fait, pour tout son soutien, pour sa disponibilité.

Mesdames et Messieurs, je vous remercie également pour l'appui et la confiance que le Conseil nous a accordés au cours de ces deux dernières années.

CHAIRMAN

Before I ask Mr Wade to take the floor, I would like to thank, on behalf of Council, Mr Rose and Mr Mekouar for their services during the last two years as Chairs for the Programme Committee and Finance Committee. Thank you very much.

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

In dealing with Item 6, of course, Council Members have already been fully involved in this process which now leads to the Programme of Work and Budget, which is before you today. You, in fact, examined the Medium-Term Plan 2002-2007, which was presented to you at the Hundred and Nineteenth Session in November 2000. Your reaction was that you generally felt that it provided an accurate presentation of the key priorities, and the needed balance amongst them, for FAO to be able to respond to the expressed requirements of the Membership. You were, however, unable to reach a consensus view about the level of resources at that time.

As invited by you, the Director-General used the substantive content of that Medium-Term Plan to develop the Summary Programme of Work and Budget, which was submitted to you last June at the Hundred and Twentieth Session. Again, while generally welcoming the programme priorities incorporated into those proposals, you were unable to reach a consensus as to the level.

The report of the Programme of Work and Budget, which is before you today, is based on that Summary Programme of Work and Budget but has been amended in a couple of important ways.

Mr Rose, Chairman of the Programme Committee, has already addressed the question of priorities but I will repeat the fact that in response to the request of some Members to maintain the TCP at the level of the Medium-Term Plan, it should be noted that in the proposal, as it stands, TCP represents 14.9 percent of the Programme of Work and Budget. This is the same level as proposed for the first two years of the Medium-Term Plan. Similarly, in response to those Members seeking an additional share of resources for Fisheries and Forestry, the levels proposed are 13.4 and 10.5

percent of Chapter 2 – that is the Technical and Economic Programmes – respectively. Therefore, this means 13.4 percent for Fisheries and 10.5 percent for Forestry. I point out that these are the highest shares that either of these programmes have ever enjoyed.

Otherwise, the PWB represents a refinement of the previous document but with much greater detail. Not only in the document itself - I should also direct Members to the FAO Website, where the individual biennial outputs are listed and made accessible by a variety of keys. For example, you can go into website and extract the biennial outputs that are proposed for any division, for any programme, by strategic objective, by the priority areas for interdisciplinary action or even by partner institutions with whom we are working. I think this gives you considerably improved access to the data. It also has a cross-reference linking biennial outputs to those that were envisaged in the Gender Plan of Action.

Turning to the question of cost increases. The figure of cost increases has been reviewed in detail and revised. While the gross figure, before taking account of the exchange rate assumption, is only slightly changed, the actions taken with regard to the Euro requirements need some explanation, as this has had a marked effect on the overall result.

At the time that the SPWB was being discussed, the cost increase figure was very substantial. The estimates were as high as US\$49 million for the biennium. In discussing the level of the budget at that time, some Members proposed a Zero Nominal Growth Budget which would have implied a further cut in the real value of the budget by US\$ 49 million, a proposition, about which, I do not think, any Member was particularly sanguine. However, the calculation leading to the US\$49 million was based on the established procedure for calculating cost increases, which is at the budget rate of exchange for the previous biennium. The budget rate for the previous biennium was one Euro equals US\$ 1.0327. For those of you, like me, who are still holding onto the Lire, that was 1 875 Lire to the dollar. In fact, the actual rate was more favourable at that time.

A little bit of history here The exchange rate for the purposes of the budget and the final calculation of cost increases, has in the past been set at the spot rate on the morning of the budget adoption. That would be 9 November 2001, in this particular case. This has meant that none of us really know what the budget is going to be until the day of the vote as the exchange rate is one of the key assumptions in the calculation of cost increases. Obviously, the cost of the Organization – when expressed in US Dollars, which is the currency of both the appropriation resolution and the scale of contributions – and particularly those costs in Rome, will vary with the exchange rate of the Euro to the Dollar.

During July, you may be aware that the US Dollar continued to strengthen. I have to say that always in the context that the key commentators were of the view that at such rates the Dollar was seriously over-valued and the Euro was under-valued. As explained in the document, the Director-General, therefore, decided to proceed with the forward purchase of the Organization's Euro requirements and this contract effectively freezes the exchange rate for the entire biennium, thus insulating the Organization and the Programme of Work against any further variations in the Euro/Dollar exchange rate over 2002-2003.

The forward purchase, for your information, is mentioned in the document was accomplished at the rate of one Euro equals US\$ 0.880. Or, to put it back into Lire, 2 200 Lire for the Dollar. This had two immediate beneficial effects. Firstly, it effectively established the budget rate, which in turn removed the uncertainty about the cost of the Programme of Work. Secondly, it reduced the cost increases from about US\$ 50.4 million to only US\$ 3.2 million on the Real Growth proposal.

For your information, the Euro was trading this morning at 0.9060 or back into Lire 2 137 to the Dollar, which would have implied, that if we had not bought forward, and if we set the budget today, the cost increases would rise to US\$ 12.3 million. That is 8.6 more than there is in the document. Therefore, from the perspective from where we stand today this does not appear to have been a bad move. As mentioned by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, these were elements welcomed by the Committee.

I believe a question was raised yesterday, if I can mention it, by the distinguished Representative of Belgium on behalf of the European Community concerning the legal authority for that contract. Of course it is a very significant contract and, as you can imagine, that was addressed before we entered into it. The authority comes from Financial Regulation 4.1(b), which reads: "The Director-General may also incur obligations against future periods before appropriations are voted when such obligations are necessary for the continued effective functioning of the Organization, provided such obligations are restricted to administrative requirements of a continuing nature, not exceeding the scale of such requirements as authorized in the budget for the current financial period." We therefore do not have any doubts about that particular authority.

As the Chairman of the Finance Committee noted, the Committee examined the cost increases in detail and endorsed the level of cost increases, as well as the assumptions on which they were based.

The last aspect of change which I would like to refer to is the Arrears Resolution. I would like to draw your attention to document C 2001/LIM/15 which is about the use of arrears.

As you know, the current Conference Resolution 3/99 lapses at 31 December 2001 because of the way it has been structured. As there is doubt about whether the US arrears will be paid prior to 31 December 2001 – therefore before the end of the current biennium – a new Resolution is needed if the arrears are to be utilized for specific purposes.

We also need a new resolution as the original resolution did not envisage changes in accounting for After Service Medical Coverage, which are now causing the accumulated deficit to increase. As the current resolution requires the entire accumulated deficit to be eliminated by US arrears, the increasing deficit arising from the After Service Medical Coverage liability will reduce the amount available for one-time expenditures. Therefore, for the reason stated in that document, the new resolution for 2002-2003 is slightly different from the current one in that it excludes the effect of the amortization of the accrued liability for After Service Medical Coverage.

Otherwise, I would note that the priorities proposed are those fully recognized by the governing bodies, include those already adopted in 3/99, as well as full funding for Oracle Phase II.

With reference to the Chairman of the Programme Committee's concern about the modernization of FAOSTAT, you may wish to note that Item 7 of the Arrears Resolution includes the amount of US\$ 3 million for the modernization of FAOSTAT. It is a very rough estimate at this stage because the work has not been completed but at least, the provision is there to allow us to be able to carry out the work.

The Council may wish to note that this document will be submitted to the Conference which will be asked to adopt the new draft resolution.

In conclusion, the Secretariat is at your service to answer any questions that Members of the Council may have.

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

I request your indulgence to allow me to make a brief statement on behalf of the Asia Group followed by a statement on behalf of my delegation.

I think that the topic we are now discussing is too important and pardon me if I take a little time in making these statements.

At the outset let me, on behalf of the Asia Group place on record our deep appreciation for the services rendered by Mr Rose as the Chairman of the Programme Committee. We have benefited from his wit and wisdom and we were lucky to have his services even after he left Rome as Permanent Representative. We wish him the very best in his future endeavours.

We also take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Mekouar, who had led the Finance Committee so ably. As a member of the Finance Committee, I have nothing but admiration and accolades for

the way he handled the Finance Committee matters and would definitely like to wish him the best in his future endeavour, which is fast approaching.

The Asian Region, according to the latest FAO report on the State of Food Insecurity still houses the largest number of food insecure. At the same time, it is a region which has shown great resilience in agriculture, and despite the burgeoning population pressure and susceptibility to natural calamities has shown the world that it is possible to increase agricultural production from relatively smaller holdings through a judicious mix of indigenous and modern technology. However, inter-regional and intra-country imbalances exist still and the Asian Region would continue to draw on expertise available in specialised agencies like FAO for increasing agriculture production and alleviation of poverty in rural areas, as well as for technical assistance in emerging areas in agriculture.

We would like to reiterate, in general, our support for strengthening of FAO and its activities. We have the following specific comments on the Programme of Work and Budget.

We welcome the well articulated and comprehensive Programme of Work and Budget for 2002-2003, which is firmly anchored on the strategic objectives spelt out in the Strategic Framework and on the programmes set out in the Medium-Term Plan. We fully realize the need for FAO to break from the negative trend in budgetary resources if it were to fulfil the needs expressed by the membership in the various technical meetings. The majority of developing countries of Asia, therefore, strongly support the Real Growth scenario as spelt out in the document. However, some of the countries may like to look at other options. We appreciate the Director-General's efforts in reducing the burden on Assessed Contributions of Member Nations by the forward purchase contract.

On the programme content, the developing countries of Asia have always maintained that FAO cannot be an effective technical Organization, unless it maintains a healthy balance between normative and operational activities. Many developing countries still look for tangible impact in the field from developmental interventions by technical organizations like FAO. In this context, we note that the Technical Cooperation Programme continues to be the most important source for technical assistance from regular budgetary resources to developing countries. We, therefore, strongly support the increase envisaged in the Technical Cooperation Programme in the budget. The lead time taken for approval of TCP need to be reduced, so that the required assistance can be given in time to member nations and effective utilization of funds take place between biennia.

We realize that FAO's field programmes are heavily dependent on extra-budgetary funding. The non-emergency field programmes have not shown any significant positive trend in the recent past, though an optimistic estimate is projected for 2002-2003. Data from FAO shows that the decrease in non-emergency Technical Cooperation projects has been the steepest in the Asian region - a 34 percent reduction between 1998 and 2000, which is the highest among the regions - the 2002-2003 projection for extra-budgetary expenditure by region and programme also shows a rather unsatisfactory distribution between regions and programmes.

In our view, this points to a need for a closer look at regional priorities, preparation of a regional plan for field activities at the regional office level and active liaison with donor countries. The developing countries of Asia place emphasis on policy and technical assistance in the field of sanitary and phytosanitary measures, conservation of plant and animal genetic resources, upgrading skills in food safety issues, training in trade related issues, etc. We do hope that a more systematic approach to linking up of felt needs in the region expressed through regional perspective plans prepared by regional offices and resources, will be undertaken in the future.

We welcome the chapter on Regional Dimensions. However, to obtain a holistic picture, it would be useful if in future documentation, the extra-budgetary funded projects and field projects are also analyzed along with the Regular Programme outputs. The generality and the resultant non-specificity of this chapter, once again, underscores a need for a more proactively regional planning process, priority setting and funding.

Finally, on behalf of the Asia Group, we would like to say that we have gone through the Arrears Resolution paper. We have not had the time to discuss it in the Group but we hope: i) that this time around we will receive the arrears; and ii) the programmes indicated in the resolution seem to be broadly acceptable; if we do have any other suggestions we will always come back during the Conference.

Let me now take this opportunity to make a statement on behalf of India.

We are thankful for the extremely cohesive and comprehensive Programme of Work and Budget which has accommodated to the fullest extent possible various suggestions made during the earlier technical meetings and the Council meeting in June.

India, in particular, is happy to see the establishment of a database on the output which would help post facto implementation reporting. We had been emphasizing on the necessity for this so as to link past performance with future targets, at least, in the case of continuing programmes.

We have been consistently calling for strengthening FAO by stepping up resources. The trend in the UN organizations, these days, to emphasize reforms in isolation from resourcing is worrying to say the least. If I can quote an analogy, a patient cannot be cured by stopping the blood circulation and then administering medicines. Reforms is an ongoing process and need not necessarily be accompanied by a reduction in resources as a means to "discipline" the Organization. In fact, the UN reform process, itself, underscores the need for predictable fund flow. We agree with good governance and structured approaches but let us face it, an Organization like FAO can never get too structured, given the mandate. The essence of development is diversity and vibrancy of institutions, such as FAO, lies in its ability to cater to the varied needs of its Member Nations. Such an engagement is a mutual education process for the institution and the Member Nations. In the name of priority setting and structuring, the vibrancy of organizations like FAO should not be lost.

A negative budget does not reflect very well the commitment of the international community to agricultural development nor is it in consonance with the concerns expressed by all of us, in various fora, regarding the decreasing level of all ODA to agriculture.

We do understand that a Real Growth Budget would mean an extra burden for some countries. In this regard, we welcome the effort made by the Director-General to mitigate this burden by the forward purchase contract. A Real Growth Budget, as presented by the Director-General, is a mere US\$35 million increase for two years. No one can call this an extraordinary increase, considering the level of needs in the world.

On the programme side, we would like to agree with Michael Lipton's observation in the State of Food and Agriculture that FAO has recently published. For the food insecure, low-income population higher yields from food staples would give both employment and income and enhance food security and this would continue to be the priority area for some time to come. Mr Lipton has put it up to 2020 and I do not know if it will go beyond that.

We, therefore, would continue to emphasize support for agriculture production programmes, especially through technical assistance and SPFS to have an impact in the field.

I have already talked as the representative of the Asia Group about the field programmes. The FAO document on the Situation and Prospect of Field Programmes presented to the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committee points to the fact that the contribution to non-emergency technical cooperation, including Regular Programme funding through TCP and SPFS, declined from US\$ 203 million to US\$ 177 million between 1998 and 2000.

Donor funded technical cooperation also decreased from US\$ 176 million in 1998 to US\$ 146 in 2000. The data also points towards concentration of fewer donors and fewer recipient countries. These are not very good indications and we strongly commend, in this regard, the efforts undertaken by the DG to strengthen field programmes. We would like to see the role of decentralized offices further strengthened in the identification of Member Nations needs, project preparation and securing funds.

Finally we have always emphasized the need to view efficiency in savings in the context of output. The findings of the Programme Committee in the evaluation of projects and the recommendation for various programme activities need to be carefully analysed while we recommend resources for the Organization and while we support efficiency in savings. We appreciate the efforts taken by the Organization in this regard and would encourage the Organization to continue to do so, but keeping in mind the output aspect as well.

Modern tools of management are important in the process efficiency saving. We are concerned about the setbacks that the Oracle project has suffered in FAO. The intended benefits have not been realized. A demonstration of the cost-to-benefit of this programme is overdue. The programme is caught in the classic chicken and egg syndrome. The Organization feels more funds are needed to make it effective. The larger part of membership feel that the programme has not been effective, therefore, funding has to be made with caution.

We would request the Secretariat to engage the membership constantly in a confidence building exercise on this project. We do not subscribe to the view that Oracle be funded at the expense of other programmes. A judicious combination of budgetary support and additional funding from extra-budgetary sources or arrears need to be found.

In my country when the budget is presented, the Finance ministers often quote poetry, perhaps to lessen the impact. Let me end with the words of Khalil Gibran "Life goes not backward, nor tarries with yesterday."

Let us take FAO forward.

Shoji SATO (Japan)

First of all, I would like to thank the Chairpersons of both the Programme Committee and Finance Committee. I also wish to thank the Director-General and the Secretariat for preparing this Programme of Budget as PWB 2002 to 2003. However, the regrettable thing is that the Zero Nominal Growth scenario, which Japan has requested, has not been prepared.

Japan has a view that the budget of FAO for the year 2002 to 2003 should maintain the Zero Nominal Growth for the following reasons.

Japan has the basic position that the administrative budgets of international organizations, including FAO, should be within minimum necessity and that continuous efforts should be made to streamline and improve the efficiencies of these organizations for the effective utilization of limited financial resources.

From this point of view, Japan highly appreciates the efforts made by FAO to restrain its normal budget since 1992 through implementation of various measures for structural reforms. Just to take the budget level since 1996, it has maintained Zero Nominal Growth for three consecutive terms.

Japan is fully aware of the importance of achieving the objectives of the World Food Summit and firmly believes that further streamlining of FAO's budget will make compatible both the achievement of these objectives and the Zero Nominal Growth budget. Measures for further streamlining, in my delegation's view, should include effective allocation of the budget to FAO's priority activities, reduction of its meeting expenses, implementation of international competitive bidding and positive introduction of outsourcing.

A priority should be given to cost-effective technical programmes in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. These programmes should include follow-up activities of WFS, *inter alia* FIVIMS, CODEX (Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme), IPPC, support to developing countries' participation in WTO, activities related to food and agriculture genetic resources, promotion of monitoring and evaluation of sustainable forest management and effective implementation of code of conduct for responsible fisheries, including ecosystem-based management.

Fully recognizing the importance of the achievement of the objective of the World Food Summit, Japan has been cooperating with FAO in the best possible way, including through individual trust fund as well as its assessed contribution. Japan also renders its assistance to the Special Project

for Food Security (SPFS), a programme for promoting the objective of the World Food Summit. This assistance is extended to East Timor and Uganda through the "United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security", which has been established within the United Nations by Japan's initiative.

As you may know, the Japanese Government is currently going through drastic economical and fiscal structural reforms. The Government strived for the reduction of government expenditure and effective utilization of its budget. It is planned that Japan's ODA budget for the next year will be cut by ten percent.

I hasten to add that, since 1986, Japan's ODA has been more than 15 percent of the total ODA of OECD-DAC countries and, in 1999, it was approximately 27 percent.

Many countries face low economic growth and suffer from heavy debt and the worsening exchange rate with dollars and my delegation strongly feels that this is not the time for FAO to increase its administrative budget. Japan suffers from debt, which is expected to amount to US\$ 5.6 trillion at the end of this fiscal year. In addition, the Japanese yen has depreciated by ten percent from last year. It will be extremely difficult for Japan to bear the assessed contribution should the substantially increased budget be approved.

Ms Mantho MOTSELEBANE (Lesotho)

I would like to request that the floor be given to the Chairperson of the Africa Group, United Republic of Tanzania.

Wilfred NGIRWA (Observer for Tanzania, United Republic of)

I am taking the floor on behalf of the Africa Group.

Firstly, I wish to thank and congratulate the Secretariat for preparing the Programme of Work and Budget for 2002 to 2003.

The Africa Group has examined the document in depth and with great interest. The following are our observations. The Group has observed that the Programme of Work and Budget proposal is nested within the Medium-term Plan 2002 to 2007 and the Strategic Framework 2000 - 2015, just in line with our obvious expectation, especially so since both documents were endorsed by the Governing Bodies of FAO. During the approval of the Medium-Term Plan by the Council, it was found that it provided an accurate presentation of the key priorities and the needed balance, and concluded that the substantive contents be the starting point for the next Programme of Work and Budget.

The Group has also observed that a lot has been done by the Organization to increase efficient savings through several means, among which the abolition of several posts, reduction of documentation, shortening of meetings, and the like. To expect that the Organization is going to continue with this painstaking method of efficient saving without affecting the quality of their output may not be the right judgement. Therefore, the Africa Group fully endorses the conclusions, as rightly put by the Finance Committee, that further savings could become counterproductive if pursued too far; for efficiencies only accrue when the reductions in resource level do not have negative effects on the level and quality of the outputs. In this regard, the most appropriate way forward for FAO will be to have increased resources.

Our appeal not to rely heavily on efficiency savings does not mean that efficiency savings should be stopped, but should be an on-going consideration that should always guide proper utilization of resources voted to FAO. It should not replace increased resources which are planned as a result of increased demands from Member States, as clearly indicated in various committee reports that were again approved by the Council.

Likewise, the Group has noted an increased attention to the work on the Emergency Prevention System for Transboundary Animal Diseases. This programme, if implemented as planned and with the proposed budget, will contribute greatly to the achievement of food security through prevention of problems associated with animal diseases.

The Africa Group has further noted the proposed budget to support the development of a Regulatory Framework for Food and Agriculture. This support will enable Member Nations to adopt guidelines, codes of conduct and action plans which will provide the basis for national legislation so as to avoid being excluded from the benefits of globalization.

The budget of the Organization has not been increased for the past six years, despite increased demands from its Members. It is worth noting several calamities that have led to severe suffering to the people and economic setbacks. Such calamities have pulled developing countries several steps behind, which makes the realization of the World Food Summit target to halve the 800 million vulnerable people a difficult task that requires exerted effort nationally and internationally. This, therefore, underscores the need for increased resources.

It is with the above account that the Africa Group, after considering the contents of the Programme of Work and Budget, strongly recommends that the next biennial budget for the years 2002 - 2003 be based on a Real Growth scenario as proposed by the Director-General.

Srta. Ana María BAIARDI QUESNEL (Paraguay)

Le solicito le otorgue la palabra a Bolivia, que intervendrá en nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

Sra Jacqueline CUELLAR CHÁVEZ (Observador de Bolivia)

Pido su venia para presentar la declaración del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe en el tema 6 del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2002-2003.

Los países de América Latina y el Caribe valoramos altamente la presentación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto 2002-2003 y vemos con agrado la inclusión de un capítulo sobre las Dimensiones Regionales. Alentamos en este sentido a la Organización para la implementación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto en el contexto del Marco Estratégico 2000-2015 y el Plan a Plazo Medio 2002-2007, partiendo de las prioridades de las regiones y los requerimientos de los países en desarrollo, en la lucha contra la pobreza y el logro del desarrollo rural y de la seguridad alimentaria. En este contexto reiteramos la necesidad de que se le asigne a nuestra Región un mayor porcentaje del presupuesto de la FAO del que se prevé teniendo en cuenta las disparidades que existen frente a otras áreas geográficas, en especial en los fondos destinados a programas de producción agrícola y pesqueros, y a los servicios de apoyo.

Vemos con preocupación la reducción de las operaciones de campo de la Organización, las que desde 1996 a hoy se han reducido en un 50 por ciento. Consideramos que se debe mantener de manera imperativa la importancia que le da el mandato de la FAO en mantener un equilibrio entre las funciones básicas tanto en los aspectos Informativos, Normativos y Operacionales, en los programas como en los documentos. En este sentido el GRULAC considera que se debe revitalizar el programa de campo y se le debe prestar mayor importancia al refuerzo de los programas técnicos y económicos, en especial al Programa de Cooperación Técnica.

Finalmente, reiteramos el llamado a continuar trabajando para mejorar el equilibrio de los idiomas en las actividades de la FAO; especial atención merecen el sitio Web y el Centro de Información Agrícola Mundial (WAICENT), en los que el español sólo ocupa el 10 por ciento. Dada la importancia que tiene la información en el mundo de hoy, la Organización debe estar en condiciones de satisfacer las necesidades de información que tienen los países de habla hispana.

Adnan Bashir KAHN (Pakistan)

Let me thank Mr Wade for introducing the full Programme of Work and Budget document. Allow me also to thank Mr Rose and Mr Mekouar for their elaboration of the Programme Committee's and the Finance Committee's deliberations on this important document.

Also let me add my appreciation to the eloquent appreciation that India rendered for Mr Rose and Mr Mekouar.

We note that the Programme Committee has thoroughly examined the contents of the document, both at its summary presentation and also of its current version, and we are quite satisfied with its consideration of the different chapters, in the light of the two guiding documents, the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan.

Before venturing forward with my comments, allow me to express support for the comments made by India on this subject, on behalf of the developing countries of Asia.

Firstly, on the format of the document, we welcome the inclusion of the regional dimension section or narrative, as the Director-General has termed it, in the introduction. We hope that this becomes a regular feature in the future Programme of Work and Budget documents. We would like to underscore the fact that the Asia and Pacific Region are proposed to receive lower allocations, both under the Regular Programme and the Trust Fund, compared to the size, population and agriculture potential, as well as the absolute number of hungry poor in these areas.

We welcome the additional details in the document on extra-budgetary resources at the programme level and the related forecasts.

We concur with the Finance Committee's views that one, the distribution of these resources was skewed between both regions and programmes and, two, the increasing importance of TCP as a source for technical assistance.

In terms of the content of the Programme, we note that the proposals are based on the demands made by the Membership, principally during the Hundred and Twentieth Session of the Council, emphasizing a higher share for fisheries, forestry and the Technical Cooperation Programme.

We, just like the Programme Committee, welcome the improvements in language balance but emphasize further progress in this direction. We also note with concern the implications of adopting a Zero Real Growth budget on some important proposals, including FAO's PLANSYS and FAOSTAT.

The areas of critical importance to our economies have been elaborated by India and we need not go further in detail. We note that both the Finance and the Programme Committees have addressed the issue of slow delivery of the Technical Cooperation Programme and we have covered this item under our intervention on the Finance Committee Report. We hope those views will be taken into consideration in addressing the issue of slow delivery of TCP.

On the budget level, we endorse the position taken by the developing countries of Asia to adopt a growth scenario which is more reflective of our political wealth to combat hunger and poverty and of our support to agriculture and rural development as a genuine instrument to be deployed towards this end. We need to re-emphasize that the growth budget proposed is less than the growth we supported in endorsing the Medium-Term Plan, which was of 9.6 percent as against this "compromise increase of 5.4 percent", entailing an additionality of approximately US\$35 million and which we were not exactly happy with in reviewing the Summary Programme of Work and Budget.

We note that the principle beneficiary of the growth budget is the Technical Cooperation Programme. We have already made extensive interventions in favour of TCP and believe that, if the Membership eventually agrees to anything less than the growth budget, the Secretariat may present us other options for adjustment leaving the growth in TCP intact, as per the wishes of an overwhelming majority.

Finally, we note the use of arrears payments proposed in document CL 121/LIM/15. We can concur with the areas proposed, which are mostly in accordance with priorities we identified earlier.

Carl-Josef WEIERS (Germany)

I would like to request that the floor be given to Belgium to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States.

Christian MONNOYER (Observer for Belgium)

I also would like to thank very much the Chairpersons of the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee and Mr Wade for their very useful introductions.

I am speaking on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. They welcome this Programme of Work and Budget, which is the first one to be presented under the new arrangements for planning, budgeting, reporting and evaluation, pioneered with the Strategic Framework endorsed by the Thirtieth Session of the FAO Conference in 1999. This evolving system is an important contribution to improving governance in the Organization. An important factor is the consistency of the proposal in the Programme of Work and Budget with the Strategic Framework 2000-2015 and the Medium-Term Plan 2002-2007. The placing of detailed information on the Internet is welcomed and we would like to see further use of electronic media for transferring information. The new parts of the Programme of Work and Budget on regional dimensions and on extra-budgetary resources increase transparency and facilitate overall understanding.

We are pleased to note the full application of the new programme model, the treatment of Priority Areas for Inter-disciplinary Action, the explicit discussion of efficiency savings and organizational changes, and the commentary on extra-budgetary resources at the level of technical programmes. We hope to embark on a dialogue based on transparency and openness, on the allocation and use of these resources, taking into account the needs of developing countries, the policies of the contributing countries and the needs of the Organization.

However, the European Community and its Member States would have liked to have seen additional budget scenarios as requested by the European Union and others at the June Council. We believe that it is important to continue with the consensus approach, which ensures the smooth running of the Organization. In order to have a substantial discussion on this subject, different options need to be on the table. The Secretariat is best placed to detail the ramifications of different budget levels. It is our belief that the programme content is the first and vital factor and that the budget translates the orientations of that programme. We, the Member States, need to see the different levels of activity that the Organization can propose in order to make an informed choice.

In order to improve the Organization further, it is important to quantify prospective - as opposed to achieved - efficiency savings, which is missing in this document. Furthermore, we would have liked to have seen a systematic treatment of vitally important cross-organizational strategies agreed in the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan.

For the next biennium's programme of work and budget exercise, we expect that the request of the Hundred and Twentieth Council will be accommodated, submitting to the Committees on Agriculture, on Fisheries and on Forestry detailed advance information on PWB proposals in their respective area, in order for the technical committees to again perform their substantial and central function to "review the Work Programme of the Organization". We are encouraged by the Report from the Programme Committee in this respect, and we look forward to its full implementation.

The European Community and its Member States are aware of the fact that a forward purchase contract of Euros has raised the Organization's purchasing power of budget, struck at the current level of US\$ 650 million, by almost nine percent, which obviously makes a significant difference to the budgetary position of the Organization. Among other things, it very largely offsets substantial cost increases previously envisaged, notably those arising from the salary awards authorized by the International Civil Service Commission. We note the positive effects of the forward purchase of Euros but are nevertheless concerned that a decision of such financial magnitude should have been taken without reference to the Governing Bodies. If such a step should be contemplated in future, we would expect the Finance Committee to be consulted first.

The monetary uncertainty deriving from the fluctuations of the foreign exchange concerns many Member States. Taking into account that at least 50 percent of the payments of the Organization will be done in Euros, the adoption of the Euro as the functional accounting currency of FAO is

more and more relevant in order to reduce the risk connected to the variations of exchange rate. The new approaches of other UN Agencies based on Europe should be followed. We propose that the Council request the Finance Committee to examine that issue at its next session.

As for the level of the budget, we note that, as a result of the forward purchase of Euros, a Zero Real Growth budget is hardly an increase compared to the budget of the present biennium. Furthermore, we believe that scope remains for increasing efficiency gains, for example by streamlining the Organization's cumbersome procedures. We further believe that a more efficient division of labour between international organizations would lead to FAO progressively reducing activities in which it lacks comparative advantage. All these elements should be taken into account in deciding on the budget level.

At the Hundred and Twentieth Council, we again pointed out that FAO is the only agency for agriculture, forestry and fisheries on a global level. A central test of the adaptability and dynamism of an organization is the change in resource allocation due to changes in the external environment. In spite of the fact that remarkable changes have occurred in the relative economic, social and political importance of the three main areas of work of FAO, no substantive changes in the allocation of regular budget resources have occurred, at least during the last decade. Despite the marginal increases in resources allocated to forestry and fisheries, the European Union continues to request a considerably larger share of regular resources to meet the challenges in these areas. We also believe that adequate resources should be allocated for FAO's work in food safety and genetic resources. It is difficult to have an informed discussion of these issues in the absence of the alternative budget scenarios we asked for earlier this year. In the field of Forestry, additional resources should be allocated to Programme 2.4.1, Forest Resources, where, for example, the forest resources assessment and work in criteria and indicators are important tools, and to Programme 2.4.4, Forest Programme Coordination and Information, to ensure FAO's continuous contribution to the work of UNFF; and in the field of Fisheries, to the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and for the Strengthening of Regional Fisheries Organizations under Programme 2.3.4, Fisheries Policy.

Furthermore, on programme content, we look forward to proposals to strengthen FAO's statistical work as stressed in the Report of the Programme Committee meeting in September of this year.

We remain seriously concerned that the Organization's administration infrastructure is not properly resourced. We agree with the report of the September Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees on the overriding importance of this. It is vital that the second phase of the Oracle project goes ahead as planned, irrespective of budget level, as the work of the Organization as a whole will suffer if this is not implemented. We cannot stress the importance of this enough, as well as the importance of improving human resource management.

The draft budget does not go in the direction of a linguistic rebalancing, contrary to previous commitments of FAO. This effort must be maintained and put into practice in the course of the biennium.

Ms Sigridur Asdís SNÆVAR (Iceland)

Iceland speaks here on behalf of the Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

This Programme of Work and Budget is the first one based on the new programme model endorsed in the Strategic Framework. We welcomed the new format when first used in the Medium-Term Plan and then again in the Summary PWB. Once again, we can commend the Secretariat for its work in implementing the new model. We also commend the Secretariat for the PWB Website, and would like to recommend further developments in presenting more of the detailed information through the Internet, with the aim of shortening the PWB document. As requested by many Members, the PWB has new sections on regional dimensions and on extra-budgetary resources. This has increased transparency and facilitated overall understanding of the Programme of Work. FAO's reporting on extra-budgetary resources is particularly welcome as it improves the possibilities for the Governing Bodies of FAO to have a full picture of all of FAO's

activities. We expect that, in particular, one request of the Hundred and Twentieth Council will be met, namely, to submit to the Committees on Agriculture, on Fisheries and on Forestry detailed advance information on PWB proposals in their respective areas, in order for the substantive committees to again perform their central function to review the work programme of the Organization. We are encouraged by the report from the Programme Committee in this respect and we look forward to its full implementation for the next biennium's PWB.

The task of the Secretariat is to assist Members in finding consensus on the budget level. The consensus approach is, of course, vital to the smooth operation of the Organization. This process should be one of true dialogue, with various options and scenarios on the table for discussion and elaboration. Members should be able to indicate where reductions could be made when discussing possible reduced budget scenarios but, at the same time, the Secretariat should also provide real options as to where to make reductions. To make a full and complete assessment of a proposal, other options must be examined; there is and never will be only one way to proceed to meet our goals.

We would like to underline that we have always been of the opinion that we have to consider the budget level in relation to the content of programmes and priorities proposed, and then decide on how resources should be allocated. With a very extensive and comprehensive Strategic Framework, coupled with limited resources, it is inevitable that we need to concentrate on specific areas of work. The focus of FAO's work should derive from its comparative advantage and that comparative advantage should be used to strengthen the Organization in terms of resources and capacity.

The Nordic countries have taken note of the Organization's financial foresight in closing a forward purchase contract of Euro currency requirements for the next biennium at a rate that will improve the Organization's purchasing power and eliminate exchange rate uncertainty. We very much look forward to a report at the next Conference on how this contract has affected the Organization's activities.

Our views on the importance of the Organization allocating more resources to the major programmes in fisheries and forestry are well known and widely supported. We welcome the first move of the Secretariat in that direction, be it merely indicative. The weakness of this positive sign is that it is only suggested in one budget scenario. We might therefore end up with an unchanged proportion of the budget for the Programmes in Fisheries and Forestry. The rationale behind our request for a considerably larger share of resources for the Programmes in Fisheries and Forestry is given in our detailed statement on this subject in the Hundred and Twentieth Council in June 2001, under the debate on the Summary PWB, but, in short, we are advocating an adjustment to the real life changes in the relative political, economical and social importance of the two areas concerned. Once again, we call strongly for a larger proportion of budgetary resources to be devoted to these two major programmes.

Some other priority areas without adequate resource allocation under the Zero Real Growth scenario can also be mentioned. One important task for FAO in the future is the impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on food security. CFS established the need for FAO to intensify work in this area and FAO must give priority to establishing a new post dealing with this issue within the Organization's field of competence, avoiding duplication with the work of other organizations. Gender mainstreaming is another important task for the Organization and the PWB clearly shows that insufficient resources are allocated to important tasks such as implementing the Gender and Development Plan of Action and SEAGA Training under a Zero Real Growth scenario. Women are the key to combatting food insecurity, both through their activities in growing, selling and cooking food and by, in many cases, belonging to the most vulnerable groups. Another priority area is the replacement of FAO's programme planning and budgetary system, the PLANSYS. It is difficult to understand why the Secretariat has not given this work higher priority, knowing that further delays will continue negatively to affect the overall performance of the Organization. Another priority area is resources for expert meetings relating to IPPC. It is our firm belief that

the core activities of the Organization should be funded through the regular budget and not rely on uncertain extra-budgetary resources.

The recently-held Reykjavik Conference, organized by FAO and Iceland with the co-sponsorship of the Government of Norway, adopted the Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem. Iceland, as host country, will, under agenda Item 12, Any Other Matters, inform Council of the results of this Conference. Nevertheless, when discussing the budget proposals for the next biennia, one part of the Declaration must get a firm place in the PWB 2002-2003. This is to allow the urgent implementation early next year of the development of technical guidelines for best practices with regard to introducing ecosystem considerations into fisheries management.

The Nordic countries have been and will continue to be strong supporters of the normative mandate that members have given FAO. It is the foundation for FAO's success in the field of agriculture, including forestry and fishery. Through this success, FAO can draw attention to these fields, and thus maintain them actively on the global agenda as priority areas within development policies.

We also recognize the importance of operational field activities; they contribute to the normative work. Many of us also support FAO's field activities through bilateral trust funds. In this context, we would like to commend the Secretariat for their measures taken so far to improve the field programmes. We fully support these efforts. FAO, in planning future work, must recognize that it is in a competitive market for funds. Resources go to the most competent competitors, which means that your partners have to see your comparative advantage clearly. If that is not recognized, FAO will not reverse the trend of decreasing resources for its work.

The Nordic countries firmly believe that if we have increased transparency, better donor cooperation, total concentration on activities where there is comparative advantage, and improved competitiveness, then we will also have more funds for FAO field activities in the future. We therefore look forward to the planned multi-donor meeting next year and to be further informed of positive developments in this sector. Furthermore, it is vital that the Organization take an active role in the upcoming major conferences concerning biodiversity and financial development in order to gain further recognition in global cooperation. It must also be remembered that the most important resource the Organization has is its staff, which is why the Organization needs to focus and invest in its human resource development in order to maintain an edge.

Philippe J. LHUILLIER (Philippines)

On behalf of the Government of the Philippines, I would like to, first of all, associate our view with the views expressed by the Chairpersons of the Asia Group.

We feel that the views and arguments presented by the Director-General in his introduction to document C 2001/3 are meritorious enough and need not be repeated here.

The Philippines lends it full and unqualified support for his request – even if it means an increase in our assessment of our Scale of Contributions for the next biennium.

While it is true that we fall behind some of our contributions, nevertheless, we believe that this is a temporary setback and we can improve our financial position.

Now, we would like to express some concerns on some specific items of the Programme of Work.

Generally, we find it acceptable and considering all the requests brought on the Secretariat, as well as the changing priorities made by the Members, we do not have any major disagreement. However, we would like to express some reservations over the functioning of the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS). In our case, while the Philippines remains a food insecure country, we nevertheless try our best to improve our production considering the meager resources we have. We support the SPFS and, in fact, we are in the process of sending some of our best water technicians to Papua New Guinea in order to start the process of an SPFS project there.

Now the point is that, while we are happy that an SPFS project can be formulated for the Philippines, we are rather dismayed that the project formulation will be built on existing infrastructures and systems. We would prefer that an SPFS project be formulated on new areas – either new areas or rehabilitation of existing systems – which are clearly targeted in order to maximize the assistance that will be given, unless the target for the existing areas would be rehabilitation of these. Moreover, the scale of irrigation projects we believe could be most beneficial in communal irrigation and other small-scale irrigation projects.

We have here a situation in the Philippines where some areas are practically drowning in technical assistance and projects, while other areas are not sexy enough for the donors. In this regard, we would support calls for a real evaluation of the SPFS because if SPFS builds on existing infrastructures rather than open up new ones, we feel that there is fundamentally something strange about its targeting methods.

Finally the Philippines would like to reiterate the position expressed by the Chairperson of the Asia Group and we would like to call for a more proactive stance on both the regional and FAO Representative Offices. In particular, we would like to point out that we should make the Organization as an institution that work for the country and the Region. It may be appropriate for the FAO Representative and the Regional Offices to work out an annual programming exercise with concerned national agencies for programmes or projects that espouses the needs of the country. This too would harmonize regional programmes with respective national programmes and projects.

Sitdhi BOONYARATPALIN (Thailand)

At the outset let me congratulate the Secretariat for the very comprehensive and informative document C 2001/3, on the Director-General's Programme of Work and Budget.

My major concern is the proposed scale of contribution. The Programme of work and Budget for 2002-2003 is closely related to the contribution of FAO Members. At the last Session of the FAO Council, Thailand had indicated the position not support the Programme of Work of Budget on the Zero Nominal Growth basis. We do have reasons to support our position, namely:

Firstly, Thailand faced the financial crisis in 1997. Since then, our economy has not yet recovered. There is no substantial data to convince my country to contribute more to the FAO. We are not actually against any contribution at all;

Secondly, in the year 2000, Thailand's contribution was 0.171 percent and 0.277 percent in the year 2001. The increase of the contribution is 62 percent higher. It is one of the highest increases of the contribution among the developing countries, if not the highest. In 2002 Thailand's contribution would be 0.256 percent and in the year 2003 the contribution will increase again to 0.295 percent. It is hard to explain to my government while our economy is still recovering but our contribution is going up. In my view, the proposed scale of contribution for 2002-2003 contradicts the reality;

Thirdly, a number of countries also seek Zero Nominal Growth throughout the UN System. If the FAO adopted the Scale of Contributions through the UN General Assembly, I would go along with this system;

Fourth, my Government has always recognized the leading role of FAO on food and agriculture. We normally support FAO's activities strongly with regard to the Programme of Work and Budget for the year 2002-2003.

My Government needs clear explanation and would suggest FAO to seek further explanation for New York in the case of my country. I am hopeful to obtain data from you before the conference starts.

Fifth, a Working Group could be created in order to analyze individual countries' contribution before the adoption of the Scale of Contributions.

In conclusion, Thailand's position on the Programme of Work and Budget is unchanged from the previous FAO Council. The Zero Nominal Growth is still our preference.

Roseley Bin KHALID (Malaysia)

The Malaysian delegation congratulates FAO for having successfully prepared a comprehensive budget proposal for 2002-2003. We are happy to note that the budget is based firmly on the strategic objectives and priorities outlined in the Medium-Term Plan 2000-2007 and the Strategic Framework 2000-2015. It spells out clearly the budget allocation according to the major programmes and the distribution of resources by Strategic Objectives. The breakdown of allocation by PAIAs (Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action) gives us confidence that these priority areas which we have agreed upon have been well taken care in the budget proposal. The concise description of the objectives and approaches of each of the programmes of the constituent entities is very informative.

The increase in budget in the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) and Technical and Economic Programmes (TEP) are highly welcomed, since these programmes supports directly to the World Food Summit Plan of Action. The programmes on Agricultural Production and Support Systems, Food and Agriculture Policy and Development, Policy Assistance, Field Operations and Technical Cooperation will definitely support Member Nations' efforts to increase their food production and food delivery. We give our full support to the strengthening of these programmes including enhancing their allocations and the deepening of FAO's work on these programmes at country level.

Much has been said by the Chairman of the Asia Group on the Programme of Work and Budget and we associate ourselves with what has been said, but permit me to stress on an issue of particular interest to the Asia Region. This issue is on the distribution of budget both the programme of work and the extra-budgetary resources to the regions. We detect an inconsistency in the distribution of the budget to the regions, in relation to the number of undernourished population identified existent in the regions. For example, from the 792 million undernourished people reported in the developing countries, about 65 percent which is 514 million are prevalent in the Asia Region. Sad to say, the budget allocated to this region does not reflect the serious efforts that are needed to uplift the situation of hunger and malnourished in the world's most populated undernourished region.

Malaysia urges FAO to re-look into this inconsistency, study the causes that leads to the low budget distribution to this region and propose remedial measures to improve the situation. We believe that a stronger coordination and facilitation effort by FAO must exist to initiate a more cohesive interaction between the Member Nations involved, FAO itself and the donors, to identify the focal points of development, the assistance required, the most appropriate and suitable programmes and projects to be implemented, and the source of funding needed to improve the food security situation of these countries. In this respect, we have high regards in the capabilities of the FAO Regional Office to undertake such efforts.

Finally, allow me to express my country's position on the budget level. The Programme of Work and Budget has presented a Real Growth budget. It has also put up for comparison the Zero Real Growth (ZRG) budget, which shows a difference of US\$ 35.5 million. It is a wonder that after more than eight years of budgetary decline and stagnation, this organization still manage painstakingly to sustain the number of undernourished to about 800 million.

If the organization continues to be burdened with a stagnant or declining budget, we are afraid that, even with the most effective cost savings efficiency measures, the number of undernourished will still remain stagnant and the target of halving this number by the year 2015 would continue to remain as an unachievable target. We would only have the capacity to reduce the number of undernourished by 8 million a year, or at the best 10 million, instead of 20 million as targeted.

Thus, my delegation believes strongly that for us to be consistent with the pledges that we have committed in the World food Summit, the most acceptable budget would be a Real Growth budget.

Thelmuth Harris Wilhelm WOUTERSZ (Sri Lanka)

Sri Lanka shares in the congratulations to the Secretariat, in particular, for producing a reader-friendly document using a fine format where the implications of the Zero Real Growth are summarized at the end of each chapter.

Sri Lanka supports a growth scenario for the next biennium, which will ensure that the Field Programmes are maintained at the proposed levels. We note with interest, the overview of planned achievements set out from pages 19 through 26, Indicative of Resource Allocations.

We also note with concern, that extra-budgetary resources for non-emergency assistance has declined considerably over the years. However, we are glad that the contributions of UNDP and other non-emergency trust funds to the increased availability of funds for the next biennium. In this regard, we request the Secretariat to elaborate on the proposed reinstatement of the Field Programme Committee and its likely impact on Field Programmes.

We also welcome the measures contemplated towards increasing efficiency savings and input and process oriented measures. While we agree with the spending of the country offices and transfer of FAO responsibility of country projects to the FAO Country Representatives, we expect the FAO Representation to play a more proactive role at country level.

Sri Lanka fully supports the main elements of restructuring of the Technical Cooperation Department and hopes it will contribute to efficiency, greater output and a positive impact on activities in the field.

We share with the Chairperson of the Asia Group the views on the analysis on regional dimensions.

Finally, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Government of Japan for their assistance towards the implementation of the expansion of the Special Programme for Food Security in Sri Lanka.

Ms Lan HOANG (Canada)

Canada commends the FAO Secretariat on the progress made in developing a budget which reflects the priorities identified in the Medium-Term Plan for 2002-2007. We believe that there is now much more clarity and predictability in the FAO planning process. We welcome the forecast of modest increases given to key priorities for Canada, namely the Forestry and Fisheries sectors, as well as to the Secretariat for the implementation of international conventions and standards such as IPPC, PIC and CODEX.

Canada is surprised that the FAO statistical system, FAOSTAT, will receive additional resources only under a Real Growth Scenario or upon receipt of the arrears. This is a matter of great importance for all Members, as the Statistical Service has been one of the activities in which FAO has a clear comparative advantage and one of the areas where all Members derive great benefits. We urge the Council to accord this Programme a high priority and the additional resources required, regardless of the level of budget eventually determined by the Conference.

Canada regrets that the Secretariat has declined to prepare a ZNG scenario, which we regard as an important planning tool for identifying areas of potential growth or reduction. We believe that rigorous budgetary discipline, the continued search for administrative efficiencies and the focused use of resources are key components of good governance and essential elements in the broader context of UN reform.

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

We would first like to thank Ron Rose and Ambassador Mekouar for their devoted service and inspired leadership of the Programme and Finance Committees.

We strongly support a 2002-2003 budget level for FAO that does not exceed US\$ 650 million, i.e. a no-growth budget. We believe that further efficiencies and savings of US\$ 1.8 million can be achieved in the Director-General's Zero Real Growth proposal, so that a no-growth budget could be reached. A no-growth budget is an effective means to ensure that the results in key reform

areas continue. We believe that further reform activities and continued cost-saving measures need not adversely impact key programme priorities. Our objective is to ensure that cost-effective resource allocation is directed toward the priority activities of FAO, particularly the Technical Programmes in Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

With the Nordic countries, we call attention to the Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine-Eco System. We urge that one part of this Declaration be given a firm place in the 2002-2003 Programme of Work and Budget to allow the development of technical guidelines in this area.

Member States cannot be expected to increase their contributions to international organizations at a time when most domestic budgets have remained constant or have actually diminished. We feel that strict adherence to the principle of budgetary discipline is an instrumental means of encouraging FAO to achieve further efficiencies.

Specifically, further savings can and should be found through intelligent use of new technologies and simplification of procedures in all activity areas. The cost and benefits of FAO country Offices continues to warrant close attention. Cost reductions should be sought through more rigorous tendering procedures, i.e. international competitive bidding for telecommunication services can lead to reduced fees. Reforms in the way documents and publications are produced, including outsourcing and remote translation, should continue. Increases in the number of professional staff posts should be minimized, especially since further post abolitions are expected due to the consolidation of the regional operations branches in Management Support Units. Further reductions in overall travel costs should be encouraged.

The United States places a high priority on FAO's work and is fully committed to providing the necessary resources to meet the demands placed by Member Nations on FAO, but this commitment must be balanced by continuing progress towards a modernized and optimally-effective organization that delivers full value for money.

Guillermo PUENTE ORDORICA (México)

Quiero dejar constancia del reconocimiento de mi país por la excelente labor de los presidentes de los Comités del Programa y de Finanzas.

Mi delegación apoya la declaración realizada por Bolivia en nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe. El proyecto de PLP es un documento consistente que responde a demandas e intereses de los Estados Miembros. Sin embargo, deseo realizar algunas puntualizaciones que son de particular interés.

La identificación de Esferas Prioritarias para la Acción Interdisciplinaria (EPAI), señala los bloques de actividades sustantivas de los trabajos de la FAO, lo que posibilita identificar de manera rigurosa las demandas de los países y su ejecución efectiva. Por ello, sería deseable que a nivel regional se realizaran ejercicios derivados, con impacto en los programas a nivel de país. Este planteamiento es congruente con el proceso de descentralización de la FAO. En este sentido es deseable que las conferencias regionales contribuyan cada vez más a los ejercicios programáticos y presupuestarios de la Organización apoyando los trabajos que se realizan en la sede.

En el anterior período de sesiones del Consejo, mi delegación indicó su preocupación sobre la asignación general de recursos, ya que en algunos conceptos que consideramos importantes se proponen reducciones, tal es el caso del Capítulo 2, Programa 3.3 Operaciones en Campo, rubro para el que se propone una disminución del 18.1 por ciento y en cambio se recomienda un incremento del 7.7 por ciento para Representantes de la FAO. Sería altamente deseable revertir dicha tendencia, cada vez más pronunciada de retirarse de esta importantísima actividad que permite aplicar las ventajas comparativas de esta institución en el campo, donde se pueden encontrar soluciones focalizadas a los problemas de falta de alimentos.

Mi país, y estoy seguro que muchas delegaciones lo comparten, considera como temas prioritarios para la actividad bienal de la FAO el Diseño de Políticas y Programas; la Sanidad Agropecuaria;

la Normalización; los Recursos Genéticos Vegetales y Animales; el Desarrollo Rural y el Financiamiento Tecnológico.

México apoya el escenario de crecimiento previsto PLP 2002-2003, pero desearía el cambio de prioridades que he señalado.

Finalmente, deseo llamar la atención que en la declaración efectuada el día de ayer por la presidencia del GRULAC, se señaló que la región asocia el tema de la Escala de Cuotas a la eventual aprobación del presupuesto en la próxima Conferencia.

KIM KYEONG-KIU (Korea, Republic of)

On behalf of the Korean Government, I welcome the forward purchase contract to cover the Euro requirements during the next biennium. I would like just to point out that this forward contract does not solve the exchange fluctuation problem fundamentally.

Thanks to the huge favourable exchange rate fixed at US\$ 2 200, the total growth rate is not so high as was expected. Most of all, a 0.6 percent cost increase is mild and endurable, particularly given the high increase of personnel costs, during the next biennium.

If we consider the tiny cost increase and inflation, Zero Nominal Growth does not have much difference from Zero Real Growth. This is not a matter of money. I think it is a matter of principle or discipline in dealing with the next biennium budget.

In my country, when the administration proposes the next annual budget to parliament, the government accompanies the related law or regulation amendment or reform for better implementation during the next session. This is the feedback system which we have.

In this regard, I would very briefly like to touch upon two areas in FAO which I already raised in the last Council and in the Finance Committee.

The first one is about the Oracle system. For approving the Oracle budget for the next biennium, the Members have to know the current situation in the whole picture. This is extremely important and necessary, in order not to repeat the failure or errors that have been made in the early stages of the Oracle introduction.

Secondly, I have already raised the issue of the huge delay in the TCP budget appropriation. I will not go into detail. I am saying that this is extremely inefficient in financial terms in resource distribution. I expect better implementation and earlier appropriation during the next biennium.

I fully appreciate the proposal of the Director-General on the next biennium budget. It is very clear, concise and a comfort to read. Unfortunately, however, my government has difficulty in accepting the level of the budget, the Real Growth Scenario. To arrive at a Zero Nominal Growth or a Zero Real Growth Scenario, we are willing to sacrifice several nights to come a compromise on this.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to say one more thing very briefly. Yesterday we agreed to compose a Working Group on the Scale of Contributions during the upcoming Conference. My delegation thinks we need more detailed guidance on this matter. According to the Provisional Conference Agenda, we are expected to deal with the Scale of Contributions on 12 November, just one day before closing. I think that more detailed guidance should be arranged by the Council, for example, on when and how to compose the Working Group, what it should deal with and, the most important thing, what is the exact mandate from the Council.

Vincent BOULÉ (Gabon)

Permettez-moi tout d'abord de remercier et féliciter Monsieur Rose, Président du Comité du Programme, et Monsieur Mekouar, l'Ambassadeur du Maroc, Président du Comité financier, pour leur efficacité à la tête des comités qu'ils ont dirigés.

La délégation gabonaise tient à féliciter le Secrétariat pour l'excellent document qui traite du Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003 et qui, pour la première fois, prend en compte pour le Plan à moyen terme les recommandations des comités techniques et la dimension régionale. Nous remercions le Directeur général et le Secrétariat pour la précision des études et des conclusions de ce document, et notamment, pour y avoir inclus pour chaque chapitre les effets qu'auraient sur le Programme l'adoption par la Conférence d'un budget à Croissance réelle zéro.

En ce qui concerne la position de mon pays sur le Programme de travail et budget qui nous est proposé, elle a déjà été exprimée par le Président du Groupe africain. Nous tenons toutefois à réaffirmer notre appui à un budget de croissance réelle de 5,4 pourcent, tel que proposé, et espérons que notre Conseil pourra le transmettre pour adoption à la Conférence. En effet, comme l'ont souligné d'autres délégations, ainsi d'ailleurs que le Président du Comité du Programme, le Programme de travail proposé reflète fidèlement les différentes recommandations faites par les Pays Membres au sein des différents comités techniques, tout en respectant les grandes lignes et les orientations définies dans le Cadre stratégique et le Plan à moyen terme.

Ma délégation se réjouit particulièrement de l'accroissement des crédits proposés pour les Départements des pêches et des forêts ainsi que pour certains programmes techniques et espère que le niveau constant du PCT, à savoir 14,9 pourcent du budget, constituera le niveau minimum acceptable.

Nous réitérons notre appui à l'assistance dans les domaines de la sécurité sanitaire des aliments, de la lutte contre les maladies animales, et notamment la trypanosomiase, des politiques commerciales et l'accès aux marchés mondiaux, de l'évaluation des ressources forestières ainsi qu'au PSSA.

Nous encourageons la FAO à poursuivre l'évaluation de l'incidence du VIH/SIDA sur le monde rural et sa prise en compte dans les projets agricoles, de même que pour les questions de parité hommes/femmes. La description pour chacun des programmes des effets sur ceux-ci d'un niveau à Croissance réelle zéro nous permet de saisir avec réalisme combien certains secteurs se verraient amputés d'activités primordiales pour les pays en développement. La délégation gabonaise espère que ces activités pourront être préservées, notamment dans les domaines prioritaires énumérés plus haut.

En conclusion, la délégation gabonaise réitère son appui à l'adoption du budget à Croissance réelle de 5,4 pourcent et sa recommandation à la Conférence.

Angel SARTORI ARELLANO (Chile)

Agradezco la presentación del Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para el próximo bienio como así mismo el trabajo de ambos presidentes. Apoyamos ciertamente la declaración efectuada por Bolivia en nombre del GRULAC. Felicítamos, también, los progresos que se han realizado en el proceso de planificación de las labores y, consecuentemente, en la asignación presupuestaria.

Vemos que desde la aprobación del Marco Estratégico 2000-2015, la creación del Programa Plano Medio de ahora con la definición del PLP 2002-2003, se ha consolidado un sistema que permite a los Estados Miembros seguir con atención la evolución de la Organización.

Deseo recordar la intervención efectuada por esta Delegación en el día de ayer, llamando la atención de este honorable Consejo sobre la actual situación económica, política y comercial que atraviesa el mundo, la cual es incierta y los pronósticos de la evolución de la economía mundial son pesimistas. Ya no podemos hablar de proyecciones, lo estamos viviendo hoy día. En este contexto mi país está siendo afectado, como muchos, por este escenario; la evolución de la

economía nacional de mi país depende en más de un 60 por ciento del comercio exterior. El actual proyecto de labores y presupuesto no ha tomado en cuenta estos nuevos escenarios. Es previsible que se producirá un incremento a las deudas impagas; en el caso de Chile se han sumado además dos efectos: por una parte un incremento en más de un 60 por ciento en su compromiso y responsabilidad financiera con el sistema de Naciones Unidas y, por otro, el impacto creciente de menores niveles de crecimiento y de depresión de los precios de nuestros productos de exportación. Si mi país, con una economía pequeña se ve afectado de esta manera, es evidente que el reflejo de una nueva situación debe ser tomada en cuenta por el presupuesto de esta Organización.

En cuanto a las áreas prioritarias de las labores, creemos que es importante destacar la singularidad del sistema de referencia internacional que reside en la FAO. De esta manera, el Codex Alimentario y la Comisión Interina de Medidas Fitosanitarias son elementos esenciales como generadores de normativas que facilitan el comercio y tienen impacto sustantivo en la creación de acceso a los mercados internacionales para todos. En este sentido, es especialmente importante reforzar las capacidades de la Organización en el ámbito del análisis y la evaluación de riesgos sanitarios, fitosanitarios, microbiológicos. Se debe recordar que la labor de la FAO en este campo es única en todo el sistema Naciones Unidas y en sus Estados Miembros; requiere un apoyo oportuno, eficaz y asegurar la neutralidad en la definición de estos criterios.

Una forma eficiente de favorecer la creación de mejores condiciones de seguridad alimentaria es mediante la creación de un sistema informativo transparente en sintonía con el acuerdo sanitario y fitosanitario de la Organización Mundial del Comercio. En este mismo orden de ideas felicitamos al Director General por su oportuna reacción para prestar asesoría a los países en el ámbito de la sanidad animal, mejorando también la capacidad de los países para el control, la vigilancia biológica y la erradicación de enfermedades que severamente obstaculizan el comercio de esos productos.

Creemos que el fortalecimiento y la creación de líneas de cooperación técnica en las áreas señaladas es fundamental en armonía con la aplicación del Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación.

Para finalizar, debemos reiterar nuestra posición en cuanto a la aprobación del presupuesto para el próximo bienio. Este debe considerar las preocupaciones expresadas por Chile y otros Estados Miembros para definir un sistema que morijere estos inesperados incrementos.

Ngoni MASOKA (Zimbabwe)

My delegation would like to express appreciation of the excellent work done by the Programme Committee, as is reflected in their report.

Further, we would like to express our appreciation to FAO for the continuing support for the TCP programmes.

In my brief comment I would like to draw attention to the comments made by the FAO Director-General at the Hundred and Twentieth Session of Council. The Director-General reiterated the various steps that FAO has taken to streamline and reduce expenditure to the extent that many posts in FAO remain vacant.

Against the backdrop of increased numbers of the world's hungry people, in this context, we fully support the comments made by the Chairman of the Africa Group, made by Tanzania in the Africa Group, India, on behalf of the Asian Group, and also endorsed by the delegation of Pakistan. We submit that a Zero Nominal Growth budget would not do justice to the medium and long-term strategy set forth by FAO in their documents.

We support the need for FAO to utilize resources more efficiently, to prioritize activities and to reduce activities in areas of low comparative advantage. We do not believe, however, that this will generate adequate funds to support the programmes that can meaningfully lead to increased food security.

We cannot expect to increase the demands for programmes on FAO while we provide zero additional funding.

Finally, our delegation supports a Real Growth Budget as this is the only way FAO can cope with the execution of the various additional programmes requested of them.

Brett HUGHES (Australia)

Australia acknowledges the efforts of FAO over the last eight years to cut unnecessary costs and to increase efficiency in the Organization and to implement a more effective planning model. These have been important undertakings and have provided the Membership with an improved management framework for FAO. The range of inputs and process orientated efficiency savings outlined in the PWB provides a clear indication of what is possible when the Organization is confronted with the imperative of having to find better ways to conduct its business.

While welcoming these improvements, Australia considers that greater efforts are need to be made by FAO to more effectively prioritize the work of the Organization. For with the constraints of a limited budget, it is clear that FAO needs to look more critically at its work programme to ensure that FAO is undertaken a clear prioritization of core work, where it has a comparative advantage and where it can provide maximum benefits to the Membership.

With regard to programme priorities, Australia wants to see further resources allocated to the work of the CODEX Alimentarius Commission and the International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat. Two vital programmes where FAO has a clear role and a comparative advantage. The importance of the work of CODEX and IPPC to the international community and the international trading environment, in particular, continues to grow. Along with ensuring CODEX and IPPC have the resources they need, we would encourage efforts to improve the way the two bodies operate. In this regard, we welcome the joint FAO/WHO evaluation being undertaken of CODEX.

The issue of prioritization also needs to be looked at in relation to the work of Fisheries and Forestry programmes. While recognizing the real increase in resources to these areas proposed under the PWB, we consider that this does not go far enough. Australia views the work of FAO in the Fisheries and Forestry areas as important aspects of the Organization's Programme of Work and would wish to see the proportion of resources applied to these areas increased, even under a Zero Growth Budget.

We also continue to believe that building on the positive progress to date, further scope exists for efficiency gains. It is essential that FAO continue to look for such gains by focusing on what its core work is and how this is best achieved. In this regard, FAO should continue to critically look at the role and work of the FAO Country Offices and at the distribution of resources for the TCP, as well as opportunities for out-sourcing.

FAO should also continue to improve and foster greater linkages with other UN Agencies. For example, in the Forestry and Fisheries area. Such an approach would maximize the value of funds allocated to FAO programmes and avoid duplication.

Finally, Australia wishes to comment on the overall budget level for FAO for 2001-2003 biennium. The framing of FAO's overall budget needs to be done within the realities Member Nations fiscal capacities and preparedness to pay increased contributions from national budgets. For example, as a result of the adoption of the new scale of assessments, many countries, including Australia, have already seen their financial obligations to FAO significantly increase. Secondly, the level of the budget must also take into account the capacity for the Organization to achieve its objectives and a scope for further efficiencies through better management and prioritization of activities from within existing resources. It is within this context that Australia does not consider that either a Zero Growth budget or a Real Growth budget appropriately reflects the realities within which the FAO budget must be set. It is, therefore, disappointing that the FAO Secretariat has failed to listen to Member's requests made both during the June Session of Council and the September Session of the Programme and Finance Committees for the preparation of a Zero Nominal Growth scenario. The availability of such a scenario would have greatly assisted

the Membership in fully understanding the implications of the budget for prioritization of FAO's future Programme of Work.

Australia is committed to Zero Nominal Growth as a ceiling for all UN Agencies and, therefore, Australia considers that the FAO budget level should not exceed US\$ 650 million for the next biennium. Australia believes that maintaining the FAO budget at US\$ 650 million will continue to impose financial discipline, which is an essential element in making the Organization more effective, efficient and productive.

Indeed, Zero Nominal Growth policies have been a powerful and effective tool for providing reform and efficiencies across the UN system, to the benefit of all Member Nations. We do not believe that the process has yet run its full course. As indicated, we continue to believe that there remains genuine scope for further efficiency savings and prioritization of activities in FAO.

Abdul Razak AYAZI (Observer for Afghanistan)

First of all I would like to thank both the Chairman of the Finance Committee and the Programme Committee, as well as the director of the Programme of Work and Budget for their very good statements and clear presentation.

We have been listening to many delegates who have spoken on many aspects of the Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003 and I do not wish to repeat the same things that they have said. What I am trying to do is to concentrate on, basically, three issues. One is the regional dimension. The second is the FAO Representation. The third is extra-budgetary resources.

Before doing that, I presume it is important to note that the Programme of Work and Budget is the linchpin of FAO's global mandate and its normative work. It also establishes a policy-cum-technical base for FAO's technical cooperation with the developing countries and for partnership with other UN agencies, financing institutions and civil society. It ought to be stressed that the normative work and field operations are mutually supportive and any attempt to create a distance between these two would produce undesirable consequences for the Organization, as well as Member Nations.

To accelerate the process towards achieving the target of the World Food Summit, it is essential that the next budget of FAO be based on Zero Real Growth.

Now I would like to go to the three points I mentioned before.

The regional dimension of Chapter 2 and Major Programme 3.1 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003, as given on pages 225 to 237 is appreciated. It is hoped that this regional dimension could be further expanded in the future budgets. From the tables shown for each region, three elements stand out.

One is the meagre resources assigned to country offices in comparison to regional offices. For example, what can a dismal amount of US\$ 73 000 for two years, allocated to country offices in the Asia and Pacific Region achieve?

Secondly, the gearing ratio, that is the ability of the Regular Programme to generate extra-budgetary resources, is extremely minor for Major Programme 3.1, Policy Assistance. This was also mentioned yesterday when the Chairman of the Programme Committee was introducing the evaluation on policy analysis.

The only exception is Latin America and the Caribbean Region. In the Near East, a sum of US\$ 4.3 million of the Regular Programme is allocated to policy assistance during 2002-2003 but with no trust fund expenditure. The same is true for Europe. Is there any special reason for this?

Thirdly, the inclusion of emergency operations has created a distortion in the ratio of extra-budgetary resources to the Regular Programme, the so-called Gearing Ratio. Thus, for Asia and the Pacific Region, the Gearing Ratio is 0.8 while it is 8.8 for the Near East, due to the inclusion of the Oil for Food Programme in Iraq, which is an emergency operation and marginally related to the work of the Regular Programme. It will disappear with the removal of the sanction regime.

My second point is with respect to FAO Representations. The increase US\$ 5.54 million for Major Programme 3.4, FAO Representation, deserves strong support. With respect to any new FAORs, serious consideration should be given to the countries of Central Asia. They deserve it.

Finally, I would like to make some comments on the extra-budgetary resources. A brief look of the extra-budgetary resources is given in pages 29 to 31. Unless I am misreading, the last column of the table on page 29 refers to estimates for the two years and is not an annual average of the biennium. If this is so, then the trust fund, non-emergency, is expected to reach an average annual figure of US\$ 145 million for the coming biennium, compared with US\$ 116 million in 2000. Based on the efforts outlined on page 30, this increase sounds reasonable. However, it is difficult to understand why a decline is expected in the trust fund, emergency, from US\$ 168.5 million in 2000 to about US\$ 127 million for the annual average of the coming biennium; especially when it is stated in paragraph 87 that the Iraq Oil for Food Programme will continue at the current level of activity. A clarification on this is required.

On this question of extra-budgetary resources I think it is about time that serious consideration should be given to it on how to generate extra resources.

Yesterday when we were discussing, briefly, the country policy evaluation it was clearly stated, though some people may not agree, that FAO's comparative advantage is no longer in doing sector studies but in doing sub-sector studies and forestry and fisheries. That is fine. Perhaps this is an area where FAO can generate more extra funds.

However, I would like to endorse the proposal made by India, in this meeting, in that probably one better way of generating extra funds would be to pass this work to the Regional Offices with the understanding that they will come up with a regional plan. Also to provide more services to the country offices.

In saying this, to generate extra-budgetary funds, one requires in-depth knowledge of the country. I presume that it is fair to say that the in-depth knowledge of the countries are really in the regional offices, rather than at Headquarters.

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

I should like to thank Mr Wade for having introduced the Programme of Work and Budget for the years 2002 to 2003. I would like to associate myself with what was said by the Indian representative when she thanked the Chairman of both the Programme and Finance Committees for their efforts in steering the work of their respective Committees.

Allow me to point out that we endorse the budget for 2002-2003 on the basis of Zero Real Growth, which is tantamount to an increase of 5.4 percent compared to the current budget.

My delegation supports the strengthening of field and technical programmes within the Organization. We support the TCP as well as Technical Cooperation between Developing Countries, with a view to achieving the goals of the Summit to reduce the number of the hungry and to secure food security.

Ghebre-Medhin BELAY (Ethiopia)

The Ethiopian delegation sincerely appreciates the Secretariat's work, as well as the Committee's work as documented in CL 2001/3.

Ethiopia full supports the views expressed by the honourable delegate of the United Republic of Tanzania on behalf of the Africa Group which is, in summary, the Real Growth Budget. Further, the Ethiopian delegation very much welcomes development efforts pursued by FAO on Tsetse and Thrips controls. In Ethiopia, over 100 000² kilometres are affected by Tsetse fly and hence the existence of Thrips, which is fatal to animals, particularly cattle. In this regard, the 100 000² kilometres, although very suitable for agricultural production, could not be used by smallholder farms. This is a very serious constraint in a country where about 45 percent of the population, that is nearly 30 million people, are food insecure.

Thus, in conclusion, Ethiopia wishes to see more attention to Tsetse and Thrips control activities by FAO.

João Maurício CABRAL DE MELLO (Brazil)

The Brazilian delegation supports what has been said by Bolivia in the name of GRULAC, and would also like to support Australia regarding the budget, specifically, and support what has been said by India and, I think, the Republic of Korea regarding the ORACLE project.

CHAIRMAN

Any other delegations that like to take the floor? I see none and I would like to ask Mr Rose to respond.

Ronald ROSE (Chairman, Programme Committee)

There was one item that has been raised and perhaps Mr Wade may want to speak to this as well. It was raised by Belgium on behalf of the European Union and, again, Iceland on behalf of the Nordic countries, so a sizeable proportion of the Membership is concerned about the concept of allowing the technical committees, as they meet in the spring of essentially the Conference year, to take a close examination of the Programme of Work and Budget.

We have gone a full circle on this and, many years ago, we used to have that opportunity, but we eliminated a meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees in January of the Conference year that looked at a very Summary Programme of Work and Budget that was then sent on to the technical committees. One of the objectives of the Strategic Framework and the Medium-Term Plan was that the technical committees would be able to have an extensive review of the Medium-Term Plan and, in that way, have discussions of the Organization's intentions in their particular technical areas. Obviously this does not seem to be working and you may want to have the joint committees, when they meet again, take a closer look as this aspect of our new methodology to see whether it is, in fact, working or whether you do require some kind of an amendment.

Other than that, if there were other questions addressed to the Programme Committee, I will turn those over to Mr Wade.

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

I think I will be unable to complete my response before lunch so I will start, if that suits you, and then I may have to continue after lunch because there are extensive questions.

Perhaps just to start with the point made by the Chairman of the Programme Committee; yes, it is true, we used to submit extracts of an advanced version of the Summary Programme of Work and Budget to the Technical Committees. However, the technical committees actually met at a later period than they do now. I cannot remember the dates but I think the first technical committee tended to meet in March/April, whereas it now meets in January.

When we looked at the Strategic Framework, and examined the way in which we could involve the various bodies in the process of establishing the Programme of Work, as Mr Rose points out the solution was to offer the much more detailed Medium-Term Plan to the Technical Committees, and this is what we did at the last occasion. At all three committees, some Members and, in particular the European Community, expressed dissatisfaction with that process in that they felt there was not sufficient information about the Programme of Work.

Our commitment at this stage, as a Secretariat, is to provide a paper to the next meeting of the Programme Committee, which will examine the timing of all of these elements and try to see some way in which that request can be satisfied without adverse consequences. However, there could be adverse consequences. It could mean starting the Medium-Term Planning Process so that Medium-Term Plan goes to the Council earlier, which means you could run into the difficulty in that you would be considering the Budget for a period at the same time that you are considering the Medium-Term Plan for the following period - so it could get very difficult. However, we will try and find a sensible solution.

Turning now to the bulk of the questions, I hope you will forgive me if I am not very ordered because I have not had time to reorder the questions. There was a lot of discussion about effective allocation to priorities. This came from Japan, it came from Australia, it came from the European Commission. There may be an implication that we are not being effective in doing that at the moment, which I find a little bit disconcerting because the entire effort at improving and changing FAO's programme planning process and, in fact, I should say a revolution in the programme planning process, was aimed at giving Member Nations the possibility of influencing the priority setting process, first of all at the high level as contained in the Strategic Framework, where I thought we had consensus for the next fifteen years about what FAO should be doing in broad terms, and then next, through the Medium-Term Plan, which very explicitly states what the priorities are for the next six-year period from 2002-2007. So to suggest that the Programme of Work and Budget in some way fails to establish the correct priorities is actually saying the whole process has failed, because it does reflect the Medium-Term Plan and the Strategic Framework. So I think that all we can do is address your explicit concerns as much as possible, but you will have to tell us where you feel the process is going wrong, because we have actually done our best to change the process so it meets your needs.

The second area that was within the same subject matter was the emphasis for fisheries and forestry on the one hand, and the emphasis by at least two regions, I guess the general Membership as well, on the need to concentrate our efforts to assist and implement the World Food Summit Plan of Action and, in particular, to reduce the number of hungry. Now, there were several arguments given as to why, for example, Asia should receive more resources because of the fact that it has the largest proportion of the undernourished in the world today. There is a contradiction between these statements: to put more money into fisheries and forestry is unlikely to have a direct correlation with addressing the issue of the 65 percent of the undernourished in Asia. So, we have a really quite serious underlying conflict between what the priorities really are.

I would also say that the comment by the European Commission that the budget has not evolved over ten years to reflect the changes in the political environment, maybe because you are looking at a dimension of the budget which is along sectoral lines and not a dimension along the budget, which is along the strategies of the Organization to address the needs of Member Nations. So it is not that unreasonable that the sectoral allocations remain constant but the real change is occurring in the way we are addressing the problems of Member Nations. The problems of Member Nations, as reflected in the Strategic Framework, are very much interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral, so you see, for example, great emphasis under A.1 about equitable access, A.2 about access particularly of vulnerable groups. That sort of thinking suggests that the change in the political environment will change allocations between strategic objectives but not necessarily between sectors.

Now, unfortunately, I cannot prove the case because the Strategic Framework did not exist ten years ago but I would suggest that where you are really looking for change is in the allocation of resources to what we are trying to achieve and not the allocation of resources to a particular sector or another sector.

Lots of comments have been made about efficiency savings, by all Members. Of course, the Secretariat joins Members in wishing to continue to find more ways of doing the same with less money, of trying to produce the same outputs in terms of their value but at less cost. We presented a paper to the Council, CL 119/INF/12, where we described all of the efficiency savings that have been made. These are briefly summarised in the document. We estimated that a total of US\$ 50 to US\$ 60 million per annum has been saved by reducing the cost of what we do, rather than reducing the volume or the quality of what we do. I have to say that has been generally accepted but challenged to a certain degree because some feel that we have, in fact, cut things too far. For example, you have heard today several comments about the need to strengthen the administrative side of the Organization, the implication that there are not sufficient resources on that side, the need to strengthen the ORACLE project, the implication that there are not sufficient resources on that side.

My reason for raising this is that several Members seem to imply that the room for further efficiency savings is such that it can address the problems that we have put up on the other side of the balance sheet. The proposed growth of US\$ 35 million is all in extremely high priority areas and there is no way that we can find US\$ 35 million worth of efficiency savings. It is absolutely and completely out of the question and totally unrealistic to imply that it is possible, so my concern is that we do not leave the Membership with the impression that we can do all of the things you are asking us to do, and do it by not having an increase in the Budget. It comes back to what you say, which is we have to prioritize and conclude what we cannot do and the proposals that we have before you are our best estimates at the best choices that can be made at the present time, whether you choose RG or ZRG.

The meeting rose at 12.45 hours

La séance est levée à 12 h 45

Se levanta la sesión a las 12.45 horas

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

**Hundred and Twenty-first Session
Cent vingt et unième session
121^o período de sesiones**

**Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001
Rome, 30 octobre 1 novembre 2001
Roma, 30 de octubre - 1^o de noviembre de 2001**

**FOURTH PLENARY MEETING
QUATRIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE
CUARTA SESIÓN PLENARIA**

31 October 2001

The Fourth Plenary Meeting was opened at 14.50 hours
Mr Philippe J. Lhuillier
Vice-Chairman of the Council, presiding

La quatrième séance plénière est ouverte à 14.50 h
sous la présidence de M. Philippe J. Lhuillier,
Vice-Président du Conseil

Se abre la cuarta sesión plenaria a las 14.50 horas
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Philippe J. Lhuillier,
Vicepresidente del Consejo

**UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN
INAUGURATION DU PORTRAIT DU PRESIDENT INDEPENDENT
DESCUBRIMIENTO DEL RETRATO DEL PRESIDENT INDEPENDIENTE**

CHAIRMAN

Colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. I declare open the Fourth Meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-First Session of the Council.

When I was sounded out to be one of your Vice Chairpersons for this Council Session, I agreed to be one on the condition that I would not do anything. Since the Session will only be for three days, I had the idea that I would not really be doing anything.

Unfortunately, we did not anticipate that this Session will also be something special for our hardworking, independent Chairman of the Council, Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah.

After four years of hard work, Mr Baharsjah will get his dues. It will not be rewarding financially but nevertheless, it will be an enduring reward.

When I entered this room two years ago, I asked myself who are these people. Now, I know the answer and it is a pleasure for me to know one of them personally today. This afternoon we will be unveiling his portrait.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I request you to remain seated for the ceremony. May I then invite His Excellency the Director-General Diouf, the Independent Chairman Baharsjah and the Secretary-General Ms Gardner to join me in this unveiling ceremony.

Unveiling

Inauguration

Decubrimiento

DIRECTEUR GENERAL

C'est toujours une cérémonie chargée d'émotion que celle qui consacre non seulement d'éminents services à notre Organisation, mais en même temps, la fin d'un mandat. Je voudrais dire à quel point, j'ai apprécié les efforts qui ont été faits par le Président, M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah, qui n'a pas hésité à chaque fois à parcourir de longues distances, parce que Jakarta n'est pas à côté. Non seulement, il a participé régulièrement à toutes les réunions du Conseil, mais il a aussi veillé à être assidu aux réunions des Comités des finances et des programmes et à toutes les Conférences régionales. A chaque fois, il a sacrifié ses obligations familiales, ses obligations professionnelles, pour servir l'Organisation. Il l'a toujours fait avec la douceur qu'on lui connaît, la gentillesse, l'amabilité et l'expérience de l'administration et de la gestion des questions de politiques agricoles.

Je voudrais, au nom du Secrétariat, lui dire à quel point nous lui sommes reconnaissants du soutien qu'il nous a apporté et de la compréhension qu'il a montrée dans les périodes difficiles que, parfois, nous avons eu à traverser. Je voudrais lui dire qu'il garde pour toujours notre estime et notre amitié. Je l'assure que ce magnifique portrait qui le représente dans toute sa sérénité est une manifestation de notre attachement indéfectible. Cette œuvre garantira la pérennité de sa présence dans cette Institution pour les années, les décades et les siècles à venir.

Encore une fois tous nos remerciements et toute notre gratitude.

CHAIRMAN

Being a Vice-Chairperson has its rewards as well. Now, I have the privilege of speaking after the Director-General.

First of all, I would like to state that indeed it is an honour for me to lead this Unveiling Ceremony for the Independent Chairman of the Council. His portrait is certainly adding more colour and life to this room. Not only is he a personal friend but he is a neighbour as well, and an adopted son of my country.

Four years may have been a long time for us and some of us may, in fact, have forgotten that before being elected as Independent Chairman of the Council, Mr Baharsjah was the Minister of Agriculture in Indonesia.

After four years, I am tempted to ask him which was the harder job? Being a Minister of Agriculture, where you have an absolute control of almost everything except mother nature? Or being an Independent Chairman where nobody can figure out where and how the endless debates will end? His white hairs will give you an indication of where he had the most headaches.

If I have to give him credit, I would like to believe that he has some of the most enduring patience I have ever seen. It would certainly be extremely difficult for me to chair the Council since I do not have that much patience.

In four years, we have seen how he steered the debates for the Programme of Work and Budget of this Organization, how he led in the discussion of Strategic Framework of FAO and how he consulted with the various regions during their Regional Conferences. Those four years were not exactly dull moments in our history. For one thing, we moved on to the next Millennium. If people will remember Mr Baharsjah, they can say he was the Millennium Chairman of the Council.

Seriously, resources for the Organization were going down on one hand, while the demands and expectations for it were increasing on the other hand. Mr Baharsjah had to patiently steer the ship of the FAO through rough waters — keeping in mind that his Organization should be for the benefit of the hungry, the malnourished and the poor.

Some people in the corridors have, in fact, accused him of partisanship, that he is not independent. However, considering the times and condition the FAO Council found itself, I believe Mr Baharsjah was indeed a partisan — but a partisan for the poor and hungry. He was not aloof, he was not an ivory tower. He understood what the poor wanted and I think he worked hard for this, within the limited resources and limited timeframe that he had. We certainly will be missing him as he leaves us but his patience and humility will instil in us the virtue of overcoming hunger and malnutrition.

On behalf of my country and on my personal behalf, I would like to thank Mr Baharsjah for everything he has done for the FAO Council and only wish him and his family all the best in whatever endeavour he brings himself into. I hope he gets to spend more time in my country, the Philippines.

Applause
Applaudissements
Aplausos

Sjarifudin Baharsjah, Independent Chairman of the Council, took the chair
Sjarifudin Baharsjah, Président indépendant du Conseil, a pris la présidence
Sjarifudin Baharsjah, Presidente Independiente del Consejo, tomó la presidencia

CHAIRMAN

I should like to thank you, the Director-General and Mr Chairman for the very kind words and indeed all Members of the Council for your support and understanding over the past two biennia. This morning a very close friend of mine, the Director-General said to me that this room will be different from now on and I responded by hoping that it will be in a better way, not a worse way.

But, seriously Mr Director-General and Mr Chairman, this is a great honour for me, for my family and with honour comes responsibility.

My fear is that so many years from now, somebody from Indonesia will come and see that portrait and say: hey, I know him. But then follows the question, what is he doing now? I think the responsibilities there are that even after I leave this Council, the work still continues.

My model, my ideal person would be the distinguished Independent Chairman who came from India, Dr Swaminathan. You all know that until this time, he has been very active, as we all are, in our quest to fight starvation and poverty. I hope to do that too. I know it is much greater than me but I hope that I can do it.

Let us now continue with our business. I hereby declare that we are in session.

III. PROGRAMME, BUDGETARY, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

(continued)

III. QUESTIONS RELATIVES AU PROGRAMME, AU BUDGET, AUX FINANCES ET À L'ADMINISTRATION (suite)

III. ASUNTOS DEL PROGRAMA Y ASUNTOS PRESUPUESTARIOS, FINANCIEROS Y ADMINISTRATIVOS (continuación)

6. Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-CORR.2-Rev.1 (Spanish and French only); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programme de travail et budget 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (espagnol et français seulement); C 2001/LIM/15)

6. Programa de Labores y Presupuesto para 2002-2003: (C 2001/3; C 2001/3-Corr.1; C 2001/3-Corr.2-Rev.1 (español y francés solamente); C 2001/LIM/15)

CHAIRMAN

As we have decided earlier, we will continue with Item 6, Programme of Work and Budget.

Mr Wade will now continue responding to your debate after which we can hopefully conclude our debate on Item 6, Programme of Work and Budget.

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

I will try and keep it as brief as possible but it was, in fact, a very rich debate which does need to be properly addressed.

I did start talking about the question of efficiency savings, and as there were some very specific suggestions. I think they deserve a response.

On the specific issues that were raised, the suggestion was made, I think by the delegate of Japan, that we should cut back on the cost of meetings. That is an area where we have concentrated some effort. If we look at CL 119/INF/12, which is the report on efficiency savings, you will find a short discussion of the reduction in the length of meetings and in meetings' documentation, which we estimated saved about US\$2 million per annum. That is built into this US\$ 50 million per annum that I referred to before.

There is a little bit of a problem, I have to say, which is that some groups feel that we have overdone it. For example, you will have heard yesterday that the Finance Committee feels under considerable pressure because the meeting is held down to six days including a Saturday, again to try to be as economical as possible. There may be a need to extend that to allow them to be able to handle their full agenda, but the point I want to make is that we are very attentive to the possibilities there.

You, and I cannot remember whom else, made the comment that international competitive bidding was a source of savings. We agree with you entirely, in particular with the variations in currency fluctuations that occur. Obviously, you can find advantages in the market, in terms of price. FAO's policy is always to go for competitive biddings and it is usually international, unless of course, we are restricted to working within the country in which we are. Some multinationals force us to go to the Italian distributor, for example, if we are seeking bids from Rome. So, we do not always get the full benefit of the international effect.

I think it was the United States who specifically mentioned the telecommunications tender. That was a fully international bid. It was a full competitive bid that got us where we are now. We have made very extensive savings in that area.

On the question of outsourcing, which is also covered in CL 119/INF/12, FAO has done several things. First of all, is the fact that we have outsourced a great deal of the maintenance of this building. We used to have very large teams of maintenance experts in every field on staff. The policy we eventually pursued was to maintain two experts in each trade, within the staffing, and eliminate the rest but replace them with outsourced services from contractual firms. That saved substantial sums of money and seems to work because the remaining internal people maintain the institutional knowledge that is necessary, for example, with electrical circuits, plumbing circuits, etc. So, we tried to find a balance between internal staffing and outsourced services.

In the area of translation, we have moved on average, for example, from 1998-1999 – and I only quote that year because I did not have the earlier years' to hand – from 33 percent external translation to 50 percent external translation in 2000-2001. So, staff handled half of it and non-staff handle the other half.

It is good to move as much external as you can manage, because the costs of the external translators are lower than the costs of the internal translators. It is bad if you overdo it because the only way you maintain quality is to have internal revisers checking the external translators' work. For example, we have a big problem in Spanish at the moment because we have vacancies in that area and in 2001 we were up to 78 percent external. Until we fill those posts, we have a quality control problem which is difficult to manage. So again, it is a question of finding balance.

Remote translation was mentioned I think by the United States of America. Again, this is something we have been doing since 1998, we do it anywhere where the communication facilities are good enough to manage it. Of course the remote translation is done from Rome in the sense that our translators are used for meetings anywhere in the world where we can handle the communications effectively.

Travel costs were mentioned by again, I think, the United States of America. For your information, that same document demonstrates that we made savings of about US\$ 2 million per annum by moving away from all forms of endorsable tickets to non-endorsable tickets. So our travel agent is now obliged to provide a service whereby we get the cheapest rate on non-endorsable tickets as possible, and it is his job to find the cheapest rate for us. We are meant to monitor that to make sure that it works. It has been pretty effective but there are probably more savings there.

The distinguished delegate of Belgium made the comment on behalf of the European Community that they would have welcomed more information on prospective efficiency savings. I apologize that the document is not clear enough on the fact that it is dealing not only with the efficiency savings up until this biennium but also with efficiency savings that are proposed in the document. Perhaps, the clearest view of that can be seen in paragraphs 104 to 108, which describe the benefits of restructuring Field Programme Operations. That is an on-going process which is occurring this biennium and in the next biennium and, in fact, of the US\$ 4 million per year shown in paragraph 108, I have to say US\$ 3 million are in this budget 2002-2003. This is a relatively recent area of efficiency savings. The other area where it is also not apparent from the text but is in fact the case, is paragraph 94, where we have the reduction in the average Professional grade. We have continued to try and push Professional grades down across the Organization. The savings there are shown as US\$ 5 million per annum, whereas in fact US\$ 1 million of that is in the current budget before you. There are prospective savings in there and I apologize that the document was not clear enough on that point.

I comment again on the question of overdoing it. Several delegates have made comments, not only in this place but elsewhere, that we have to be very careful about not pretending that we are making efficiency savings when in fact what we are doing is damaging the outputs, and it can be obscure; that is, the connections can be obscure.

In the case of the grades, we approached this because FAO had a higher than average grade point average for Professional staff versus other organizations in the UN, not the highest but we were above average. So it was an area where we felt it was legitimate to put some pressure to reduce

the grades and therefore reduce the cost. However, we are now seeing examples of problems - one was quoted to you yesterday. The Treasurer position of the Organization has now been vacant for far too long and we have been criticised by the External Auditor, simply because we have been unable to attract at that grade. Frankly, we are probably going to have to do something about it in terms of the grade.

You have also seen a little bit of a reflection of overdoing it, if I can call it that, in the Programme and Finance Committee Joint Meeting Report, where it makes the point that there is a need to make adequate provision for the administrative infrastructure. This was a direct expression of concern about the reductions that had been made, in particular to the staffing of the Finance Division over the last few years. Those were all parts of our efforts to create efficiency savings in the hope that the technology that was managing these systems would allow us to reduce the staffing. Frankly, we moved too quickly and took too many posts out and now, in this budget, you will see there are eleven additional posts for the Finance Division as a consequence.

What I would conclude on efficiency savings is not that there are not more efficiency savings, of course there are. There is always the possibility for improving; technology is always changing, the opportunities are there, and we are looking for them actively to try and accommodate the fact that resources are very constrained. But we should not have an illusion that we are going to make efficiency savings in the orders of magnitude of the past. We are not going to find another US\$ 50 million in the next eight years. We are going to find money which is much smaller than that.

I addressed in general terms the question of priorities. There were concerns about priorities by region, priorities by sector. I commented on the other dimension, which is priorities by strategic objective. I think that all of us have to work a bit more on this; we are discussing increasing resources for one region versus another, for one programme versus another, but are we directing it towards the strategic objectives which you through the Conference have approved? Is it right that in increasing the resources for a particular programme, you are also increasing the resources that go to E.1 and E.2, Information, when they now have 22 and 6 percent respectively of the total resources applied to them. It may be right, I am not questioning that. I am really saying that it is a dimension that we have to start taking into account.

One specific priority which was mentioned by the distinguished delegate of Pakistan and others, but in a very specific way by Pakistan, was the Technical Cooperation Programme. I think he said that he welcomed the increase in the Real Growth Budget but that, if we did not approve a Real Growth Budget we would have to find a way of retaining the same level in the Zero Nominal or Zero Real Growth budget. The implications of that, if we interpret it as meaning the absolute level, is that we would have to find US\$ 10 million from other programmes and transfer it into TCP. I simply highlight it because, in the issue of priorities, there is always the other side of the coin - where does the money come from? If you insist on no-growth budgets, that is the dilemma that we face.

Several delegates referred to the regional programming and the suggestion, I think, from India and Afghanistan at least, that we should be perhaps decentralizing more of our programming to the regional offices. I think we will take that on board but I would not like you to think that it is all a Headquarters-driven process. The process includes national strategy papers; it includes the policy assistance groups in the Regional Offices, and it includes country task forces in each regional office. What we may need to do is to bring this together into a more coherent form so it is obvious to the Membership, but I do not think that there is a problem in the sense of not involving the regional offices.

On the Scale of Contributions, this issue was taken up yesterday so I will not address it in any depth. I think, however, to put a framework around what is possible and what is not possible we need to recognize that the Scale of Contributions has never been determined by FAO. There is a full Contributions Committee in the United Nations which determines the Scale and FAO simply takes on that Scale and translates it. Now I appreciate that there are concerns about the way this was done the last time but the issue is not whether the Scale can be developed in FAO. It would

be very, very impractical for FAO to try and start developing its own Scale, so I hope we are not moving in that direction.

The questions that come, I think, from the distinguished delegate of Thailand, about why the Scale is increased for Thailand over this period really have to be addressed to the Contributions Committee in New York. I believe you really have to go through your Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Ministry of Finance, or whoever dealt with the negotiations on behalf of Thailand, in New York, because we are just not qualified to answer those questions for you. The complication of the calculations and the sources of information, are something that only they can give you proper answers on. I have to add that it has to be recognized that your delegates in New York did accept the Scale that was approved.

On the question of forward purchase: In my introduction, I did mention this but I think I have to come back to it, because the distinguished delegate from Belgium on behalf European Community said, I think, that the Finance Committee should be consulted if this arose again. I have to say in principle, I think the answer to that needs to be negative in the sense that if the authority existed for the Director-General, and we firmly believe it did under Financial Regulation 4.1.b, then on principle what was done was correct. If there is an opportunity to consult the Finance Committee beforehand, then of course we should do so. In this case, there was not from the time the currency rose to 2 300 which was after the Finance Committee met. So the opportunity did not exist and the authority for the Director-General to act did exist. Having said that, however, can I say in practice I do not think this situation will arise again.

Korea made a very important point, that we have not solved the fundamental problem of how to protect the Programme of Work against currency fluctuation. We have for 2002-2003, but not for the next biennium. For example, we have a situation for 2004-2005 where, if the US dollar weakened considerably, we would be faced with the same problem that we were trying to avoid this time. We have to recognize that we still have to address that.

By the way, we did consult the FAO Investment Committee, or at least the Members that were available. This has an external Membership of distinguished members that come from the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements etc., and so it was not done without consultation with expertise in this particular area.

In response to where we go from here, can I say that we are now entering into a contract with a major accounting firm, which is going out to tender shortly, which will have terms of reference to examine our currency requirements, examine how best to protect the Programme of Work and Budget, and examine the advantages and disadvantages of the Euro as a functional currency, and also the advantages and disadvantages of the Euro versus the second objective, which is to protect the Programme of Work. The output of that exercise will come to the Finance Committee. I would suggest not in May, because it will not be complete by then, but more likely in September 2002.

In referring to Oracle and the broader issue of FAO's administrative systems, Korea asked for some specific information, Iceland was concerned about the low priority given to the replacement of PLANSYS and Belgium, again on behalf of the European Commission, referred to the essential need to be able to fund Oracle stage two. To answer the factual question first: the total amount that we currently estimate is required is US\$ 27.8 million, of that US\$21.8 million relates to ORACLE phase two, and the remainder relates to the replacement of PLANSYS and to completion of phase one.

In the Zero Real Growth Scenario, we only have US\$ 2.3 million. In the Real Growth Scenario, we have another US\$ 5.2 million and the difference is in the Resolution for the Use of Arrears. In other words, the structure takes into account the capacity of each level of each Scenario to be able to fund this. Now if I understood what the European Commission said, the additional US\$ 20 million required should be brought into the base budget. If you are saying that, under any scenario, under any circumstances, ORACLE phase two and these other priorities ought to be fully funded in the budget, we therefore have to find US\$ 20 plus million from other programmes. So that would have to come to a great extent from Chapter 2, because you have ruled out Chapter

5, which is the administrative chapter, because in general you are commenting that it is not sufficiently funded. TCP, Chapter 4, is almost certainly not accessible for this purpose in that the large majority of Members would not accept it. Chapter 1 has been cut so much in efficiency savings that it is unlikely to be able to find anything other than a small fraction of this sum. So what we are saying, if we accept this argument, is that Chapter 2 should be cut by US\$ 20 million in the biennium 2002-2003 so we can complete ORACLE phase two. The Director-General has not proposed that. If the bill is that significant, and we do not get the resources from the arrears, then we have to think again about what we are going to do. We have to change the functional requirements of what is necessary, and deal only with the essential changes now and deal with the more desirable changes at a later date. I think we have to be a little bit realistic about what is possible in these sorts of circumstances.

Several delegates commented on the question of language balance and coverage, and I think there was an expression of concern that we were not paying attention to this issue. I really would like to allay your fears on that account. The first thing is a lot of progress has been made during the current biennium and we will be demonstrating that in the Programme Implementation Report.

You will also recall in the last budget we created a new entity 2.2.2 P5, which is called Programme for the Improvement of Language Coverage. The resources in that have been used in the current biennium for a number of areas to increase the language coverage of several statutory meetings, to increase the publications that are translated into all five languages but, more than anything else, to provide resources to WAICENT to develop the software that allows WAICENT to become a truly multi-lingual network facility. That work is underway at present. So you will see long-term benefits from that investment in the reasonably near future.

We have continued to include this entity in the budget for 2002-2003, not for the same items but for further new improvements in the area of language coverage. So there is a continuing programme within the Organization to extend the language coverage so that those languages which are currently disadvantaged do get better coverage than they have in the past, until such time as it reaches an equitable level.

On the question of Gender Mainstreaming, Iceland expressed the concern that the resources shown in the document were insufficient. Can I say that there is a technical problem here. The way Gender Mainstreaming and the Gender Plan of Action has been developed in FAO, which you will hear much more about in Commission I of the Conference, is to identify those major outputs in the Medium-Term Plan where there was the greatest potential or opportunity for Gender Mainstreaming. Those outputs were then subject to special treatment in terms of the planning technique and, in fact, even in terms of the development of Gender Sensitive Indicators for implementation monitoring and subsequent reporting. So what you find is that there are a large number of major outputs which have been included in the Plan of Action and are now subject to this treatment, but the resources against each of those entities are, in fact, allocated to the programmes where the entity lies. So, if there is a Gender Mainstreaming activity under Land and Water, you will find it under 2.1.1. and it will not be called Gender Mainstreaming, it will be called whatever subject matter it is, and the Gender Mainstreaming element is identified in the Plan of Action. Where we failed, I think, is to be able to demonstrate that well in the document. On this occasion, we felt that we could rely on the Plan of Action as being the major demonstration of that and I hope you will bear with us and see what you feel about that, once you have heard its presentation.

On the question of the SPFS, the Special Programme for Food Security, may I confirm to whichever delegate asked that the evaluation of the SPFS is underway and that there will be a full report of an independent evaluation to the Programme Committee in May 2002. That report will, of course, flow through the Council and the Conference in the usual way.

With regard to the statement of the Philippines on the SPFS; we thank you for your point, which has been noted. We are very grateful for the active participation of the Philippines in SPFS, particularly with regard to its preparedness to provide South-South Cooperation support to Papua New Guinea. You have pointed out that the project is currently under formulation and we will

take up these points with you directly. In fact, I have arranged for someone to contact you outside the meeting so that detail can be addressed.

The distinguished delegate of Mexico was concerned about the reductions in Programme 3.3, where there is a reduction of US\$ 4.3 million. Can I refer you to the table that precedes Paragraph 697, because this gives a breakdown of the amounts that have changed in Major Programme 3.3, which is Field Operations. The major reduction is, in fact, under 3.3.1, which is Field Operations in the Regions. There is a reduction there of US\$ 8.3 million. That US\$ 8.3 million is, in fact, largely a reflection of the reduction in the volume of the Field Programme. Remember this work is funded from the support cost earnings from projects, and support cost earnings from projects are included in the budget so therefore the work that is carried out from those earnings is also included in the budget. If the Field Programme declines, then it follows that the amount of staff that we have to operate it should also decline. However, that is simplifying the story because within the US\$ 8.3 million, US\$ 1.6 million is a transfer to the FAORs because, by decentralizing field operations for country work from the Regional Offices to the FAORs, we have also transferred some of the resources – not all of it as this is partially how we are making the savings – some of the resources to the FAORs to allow them to staff up at a national level. There is more background to the changes but, if you feel that is not satisfactory, perhaps you could take it up with me outside the meeting.

Korea's concerns about the delay in the implementation of TCP are shared and noted and are being acted upon. In fact, the Deputy Director-General chaired a meeting last week of senior management to investigate the reasons for that and to determine what action should be taken.

There were other questions but I really think I should stop there. If I may, I will close and if anybody feels that they need to come back, I would be more than happy to take up further questions.

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much, Mr Wade, for a very comprehensive response to the debate this morning. As was mentioned by Mr Wade, if there are still questions or elaborations needed, then we can always arrange direct contact with Mr Wade.

Based on the very intensive and constructive debate that we had, the introduction by Mr Rose and Ambassador Mekouar, and the response by Mr Wade, I would say that there is wide endorsement of the Reports that were made available to us by the Programme Committee and the Finance Committee. There are a large number of very important contributions arising from the debate, a large number of aspects on the Programme of Work and Budget.

There is a suggestion to study in more detail the impact of the new Scale of Contributions. Mr Wade made it clear to us that probably it is not very useful to propose to FAO to alter these rates of contribution. However, there may be benefits from looking into the impact of this increase or these new rates of contribution, both to the Member Nations and FAO.

On the budget level, I think there seems to be strong support for at least a Zero Real Growth. However, there are several Member Nations that disagree with this. I hope that a better report will be given to us by the Drafting Committee.

I propose that we conclude the debate on the agenda Item on the Programme of Work and Budget 2002-2003. If there is no objection, I will conclude the debate on Item 6.

II. ACTIVITIES OF FAO (continued)
II. ACTIVITÉS DE LA FAO (suite)
II. ACTIVIDADES DE LA FAO (continuación)

4. Arrangements for the World Food Summit: five years later: (CL 121/LIM/3)
 (continued)

4. Organisation du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: cinq ans après:
 (CL 121/LIM/3) (suite)

4. Preparativos para la Cumbre Mundial sobre la Alimentación: cinco años después: (CL 121/LIM/3) (continuación)

CHAIRMAN

I trust you have had the opportunity to examine document CL 121/LIM/3. I would now like to invite Ms Killingsworth to report to us the results of the consultations that have been going on.

Kay KILLINGSWORTH (Assistant Director-General/Special Adviser, World Food Summit Follow-up)

The two co-Chairs of the consultations which have taken place yesterday evening and this morning asked me to give you a brief summary of the results of these consultations, after which I believe that each one of them, Mr Ito and Ambassador Nuiry Sánchez, would like to further intervene.

So, very briefly, in its examination of the proposals in CL 121/LIM/3, the Council had noted that there was a need for some further consultations and had established an informal Consultation among regional groups in order to facilitate an open exchange and full understanding of the issues among the Organization's Members, with a view to reaching a consensus.

The consultation received clarification on various queries raised by different delegations, *inter alia*: that the World Food Summit: *five years later* was proposed as a separate meeting in 2002 so that it would be able to approve its own final outcome, that its rules of procedure would be adapted to the particular nature of the participation in the World Food Summit: *five years later*, which would include non-FAO members as full participants, and that the use of the term "Resolution" to designate the outcome of the event could now be reconsidered, as the event would no longer be a segment of the FAO Conference.

The Consultation also requested and received explanations from the Secretariat concerning the financial implications specified in the document and was satisfied. After a thorough examination of the issues and of other possible options, the Consultation reached consensus on the dates of the World Food Summit: *five years later* and on the rescheduling of related events. It was made clear that the venue of the Summit would be FAO Headquarters in Rome, Italy.

In regard to the decisions requested of the Council, the Consultation agreed on the dates 10-13 June 2002 for the World Food Summit: *five years later*. It suggests that Council agree to reschedule the Twenty-eighth Session of the CFS to 6-8 June 2002, and also that the Council request the Secretariat to consult with the host country of the Asia and Pacific Regional Conference to reconsider the timing of the conference to a suitable date prior to the CFS.

May I request that you give the floor to the two co-Chairs of the informal Consultation.

Masato ITO (Japan)

I have a few things to add to the oral report by the Secretariat, Ms Killingsworth. However, I would like to express my special appreciation to the Co-Chair of the Informal Consultation, Ambassador Nuiry Sánchez, distinguished Chairperson of G-77. I also express sincere appreciation to my colleagues who participated in the consultation in a very constructive manner.

I hope that the Council endorses this outcome of the consultation. This is a very good example of a consultation among Members to reach a consensus on a difficult issue. I strongly hope that this type of effort will be continued in the future.

Finally, I hope that the host country of the next Asia and Pacific Regional Conference, the Government of Nepal, will consider the timing of the Regional Conference so as to accommodate the concerns of the region.

Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)

Todos conocemos que este aspecto constituía un importante y sensible tema para este Consejo, pues de ello dependía el futuro de la CMA: *cad*. Este Consejo acordó un grupo de trabajo representado por todos los grupos regionales. Al terminar la sesión de la tarde de ayer nos reunimos y este grupo, que funcionó con una copresidencia, el Presidente de la OCDE Sr Ito, Representante de Japón, y nosotros como Presidente del Grupo de los 77, nos permitió en este corto pero intenso trabajo que la representación japonesa pudiera decir "*buenos días*" y nosotros pudiéramos decir "*domo arigato*".

Pero entiendo que es necesario destacar un aspecto aún más positivo que llegara al consenso. Quiero decir que se estableció una atmósfera de cordialidad, comprensión y cooperación en que cada delegado manifestó con toda sinceridad sus puntos de vista, sus opiniones, las ventajas de sus posiciones, bajo el propósito que nadie quería vencer sino convencer. Tenemos que reconocer que existió un diálogo abierto y fraternal; mientras esto decursaba, y perdónenme la cita, recordábamos un prócer latinoamericano, el mexicano don Benito Juárez, quién expresaba que el "respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz", y mediante este espíritu comenzó el diálogo, bajo la excelente y transparente conducción del Sr Ito, Representante Permanente del Japón y Presidente de la OCDE.

Al finalizar el tiempo de traducción, se levantó la reunión para que durante la romántica noche romana se pudiera aprovechar para la reflexión, y parece que dio resultados, pues hubo una positiva reflexión. De este modo, se comenzó la sesión de trabajos de hoy por la mañana bajo nuestra presidencia con el resultado que acaba de comunicar la Secretaría.

Tal y como lo hizo el Sr Ito, quisiéramos subrayar la destacada participación de la Sra. Killingsworth dando las oportunas respuestas a los distintos representantes que tenían lógicamente algunas expectativas; entendemos que este acuerdo es un triunfo de la FAO y que será un andamiaje para el éxito de la CMA: *cad*. Este evento pertenece a Japón y a todos los que estamos aquí presentes. Es un reto que, sin desconocer los obstáculos que se han tenido que vencer a través del proceso anterior, ha demostrado con este consenso que existe voluntad política.

En definitiva, este triunfo será para quienes trabajamos, para los que padecen hambre en el mundo, es un triunfo contra el hambre y ahora que tenemos la fecha, ésta se constituye un reto para no perder el impulso.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL

I remember well the discussion which took place yesterday on this very important agenda item. Many excellent and highly relevant points were made but two that stood out most in my mind were the need for more time for consultation among the Membership and second, the importance of coming to a consensus position.

On behalf of the Secretariat, I would like to say how pleased we are that the consultations that took place last evening and this morning did, indeed, lead to a consensus position. Your consensus on the arrangements and the date for the World Food Summit: *five years later* is a powerful message. It speaks well for the Organization as a whole. By that, I mean the Secretariat and the Membership. It will surely be helpful in organizing a Summit that will attract participation from the highest levels of government which, in turn, will be instrumental in accelerating efforts to reach the targets set by the first World Food Summit in 1996.

Thank you very much for pulling together so successfully on this important item.

CHAIRMAN

It is clear that we now can adopt the consensus that has been reached.

Anthony BEATTIE (United Kingdom)

May I ask you to give the floor to Belgium, who wish to speak on behalf of the European Community and its Member States?

Christian MONNOYER (Observateur de la Belgique)

Au nom de la Communauté européenne et de ses États Membres, je me félicite que la réunion du Groupe de travail à composition non limitée, dont vous avez décidé la convocation hier, ait permis de dégager un consensus entre les membres de la FAO sur la date et les modalités du report du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*. Cette réunion nous a donné l'occasion d'exposer de manière détaillée aux autres membres ainsi qu'au Secrétariat de la FAO l'ensemble de nos préoccupations, qui sont guidées uniquement par notre volonté d'assurer le plein succès du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*.

Il est en effet vital d'examiner soigneusement les arrangements à prendre pour des événements de cette importance, de manière à atteindre l'objectif que nous, États Membres de la FAO, avons fixé nous-mêmes. C'est la meilleure garantie d'un engagement politique soutenu envers les objectifs de ce Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*. Il est important que de véritables échanges de nos idées aient lieu avec les États membres. Cette pratique est l'une des clés du bon fonctionnement de la FAO et de la réalisation de ses objectifs.

Permettez-moi, Monsieur le Président, de vous rappeler brièvement les considérations que nous avons développées au sein du groupe de travail. Elles sont liées notamment à l'avancement de la date de la prochaine session du Comité de la Sécurité Alimentaire Mondiale, prévue à l'origine en septembre 2002. En effet, l'un des objectifs essentiels du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*, est justement de dresser le bilan de la mise en œuvre des engagements conclus lors du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation.

Si le Comité pour la Sécurité Alimentaire Mondiale se réunit en juin plutôt qu'en septembre, les rapports nationaux sur la mise en œuvre des engagements devront être présentés dans un délai très bref. Nous espérons que ce nouvel élément n'affectera pas la qualité et le nombre des rapports nationaux présentés. En outre, nous aurions aimé voir maintenus à l'agenda du Comité pour la Sécurité Alimentaire Mondiale les matières originellement prévues tel le panel informel et la question thématique.

D'autres options auraient pu utilement être examinées de manière approfondie et soumises aux Membres, de manière à assurer des conditions optimales pour la préparation de cette réunion, et pour la participation des Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement.

D'autre part nous sommes conscients qu'il est extrêmement difficile de trouver une date qui convienne à la totalité des Chefs d'État et de Gouvernement des pays représentés au Sommet. Toutefois, l'agenda international est particulièrement chargé au mois de juin.

Ceci étant dit, je voudrais, au nom de la Communauté européenne et de ses États Membres, vous réitérer notre ferme volonté de contribuer dans toute la mesure de nos moyens, à la réussite du Sommet Mondial de l'Alimentation: *cinq ans après*.

Oswaldo DEL AGUILA RAMÍREZ (Perú)

Quisieramos pedir la palabra para la delegación de Bolivia que hablará en nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

David BLANCO ZABALA (Observador de Bolivia)

En nombre del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe quiero transmitirle la complacencia de nuestros países por haber llegado a esta solución de consenso. Felicito a su Presidencia por el

procedimiento empleado en un tema que a todos nos ha venido preocupando en los últimos tiempos. Nuestra percepción ha sido de que este diálogo ha sido extremadamente constructivo.

Asistimos al nacimiento de un nuevo milenio, caracterizado por la conciencia social sobre el tema de la pobreza, el desarrollo agrícola y la alimentación, en momentos en los cuales es absolutamente indispensable asistir a los más pobres de nuestros países. Nuestra Región, en sus más altos niveles, participará en este evento. No hay que perder de vista que en América Latina y el Caribe hay 516 millones de personas que están pendientes de soluciones en los temas que a esta Institución le compete, y particularmente busca una participación no solamente más activa sino una asignación de recursos en los programas futuros de desarrollo.

CHAIRMAN

Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we can conclude this Agenda Item 4 by deciding that we endorse and adopt the conclusion of the Open-ended Working Group.

Krassimir KOSTOV (Observer for Bulgaria)

I cannot withhold myself to express how glad I am to hear that the consensus has been reached on holding the Summit next June.

I cannot help sharing with you a concern which is suggested by this article published in a very popular publication in Rome today. It is called the Hungry World and it is a Letter to the Editor. In that article, which I personally find very controversial and I cannot accept its main thrust, the blame for not holding the Summit next week is put on the Member Nations. I think that this is a reality which is unavoidable because we have not been very good at explaining what we are planning to do or how we are planning to do it and keeping the public informed as to the preparations for the Summit.

I am afraid that we might commit a second error because based on the proceedings of the Council and on what will take place, we as Member Nations are going to tackle the substance of the Summit just for two days on the eve of the Summit itself, mainly, under the form of the work on the final document.

I do not want to be misunderstood but I think that we, as Member Nations, have to do a little bit more on our part. The Secretariat has done a lot, and probably will do a lot, as well as the Director-General and the panels that have been called. We have to do something. That is why I would permit myself to suggest to the Council to discuss a possible form of maintaining a permanent mechanism, be it at the level of Permanent Representatives, that will follow in the course of the following months the work on the Summit and will represent our input as Permanent Representatives and Member Nations, before the Summit itself.

I think that the Summit and the outcome to which we are all looking forward and working for will only benefit from such a mechanism.

CHAIRMAN

I think we have to conclude this discussion on Item 4 and the information, namely, that the World Food Summit: *five years later* to be scheduled 10-13 June 2002 and CFS from 6-8 June 2002. This information will also be contained in a Provisional Calendar of Governing Bodies and Main Sessions for 2002 and 2003. It will be submitted to Council for approval after the Conference.

With this I conclude debate on Item 4.

V. OTHER MATTERS
V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES
V. OTROS ASUNTOS

12. Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and other Main Sessions

2001-2002: (CL 121/INF/8)

12. Calendrier révisé des sessions des organes directeurs et des autres réunions principales de la FAO 2001-2002: (CL 121/INF/8)

12. Calendario revisado para 2001-2002 de los períodos de sesiones de los órganos rectores y de otras reuniones importantes de la FAO: (CL 121/INF/8)

CHAIRMAN

Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now continue to Item 12, Revised Calendar of FAO Governing Bodies and Other Main Sessions for 2001-2002. The relevant document is CL 121/INF/8.

Further to Council's decision to hold the postponed World Food Summit: *five years later* from 10-13 June 2002, the Twenty-eighth Session of the CFS, from 6-8 June 2002, and to seek rescheduled dates for the Asia and Pacific Regional Conference with the Host Government. The Calendar you have before you will be amended and resubmitted to Council Hundred and Twenty-second Session for approval. You will note the proposed date for the next Session is 14 November, after the Conference.

Can I take it that the Council agrees that at its Hundred and Twenty-second Session convene here on Wednesday 14 November?

I see no objection.

It was so decided

Il en est ainsi décidé

Así se acuerda

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS

11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters

11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques

11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos

11.1 Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources:

(CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (English only))

11.1Projet d'Engagement international sur les ressources phyto~~g~~étiques:

(CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement))

11.1Proyecto de Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitog~~g~~neticos:

(CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (inglés solamente))

CHAIRMAN

Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now continue our Session and open up discussion on Item 11, Other Constitutional and Legal Matters. The relevant document is CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1, which is in English only, and C 2001/60.

Item 11.1 is the Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources.

On this Item 11.1, I would like to ask Ambassador Gerbasi, Chairman of the Committee on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to report to Council on the outcome of the Open-ended Working Group we established yesterday morning.

Fernando GERBASI (Presidente de la Comisión de Recursos Genéticos)

Quisiera informar al Consejo en lo que denominaría un "*Progress Report*" sobre la labor del Comité de Trabajo Abierto que usted y el Consejo estableció en el día de ayer y que me honró designándome presidente del mismo.

El Comité ha venido trabajando muy intensamente, tomando en cuenta las recomendaciones del 72° Comité de Asuntos Jurídicos y Constitucionales e integró la gran mayoría de las recomendaciones de este Comité al texto que había sido acordado durante la 6ª Sesión Extraordinaria de la Comisión de Recursos Fitogenéticos que tuvo lugar el pasado mes de junio del año en curso. Estamos trabajando sobre un texto que se denomina Tratado Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura. Actualmente hemos resuelto cosas fundamentales que tienen que ver con los seis corchetes que estaban pendientes. No obstante, considero que aún se necesitarán algunas horas de trabajo y es probable que, a pesar de ello, un artículo y un sub-artículo todavía vayan en corchetes a la Conferencia.

Hablo de esta manera porque deseo hacerlo con toda honestidad; ello no significa que no se pueda lograr un acuerdo sobre estos asuntos en la Conferencia, simplemente que son temas delicados aún objeto de negociación por parte de las delegaciones, o que una delegación está en proceso de profunda reflexión con miras a unirse al consenso que se ha generado entorno a estos textos por parte de la mayoría.

Hemos acordado un proyecto de resolución que se llama Aprobación del Tratado Internacional sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura y disposiciones provisionales para su aplicación, que sería la resolución que adoptaría la Conferencia después de haber aprobado este Tratado Internacional.

Mi solicitud al Consejo sería que nos permitiera seguir trabajando y que conviniera en recomendar y transmitir el texto en forma definitiva directamente a la Conferencia para su aprobación. Tengo la seguridad que después de siete años de intensas negociaciones y esfuerzos vamos a aprobar este tratado internacional.

No hay motivos ni razones para que así no sea; simplemente reitero, estamos en los últimos momentos, es lógico y natural que todavía hayan negociaciones sobre asuntos no para resolver, sino para buscar que el texto refleje mejor el entendimiento entre todas las partes y encuentre un equilibrio, incluso de carácter político, que subsane diferencias que han persistido a lo largo del tiempo.

CHAIRMAN

Ambassador Gerbasi has just reported to us on the progress of the Open-ended Working Group on the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources.

I think I will refrain from opening up a debate in order to give the Open-ended Working Group the optimum opportunity to solve the problems.

However, I think there is time before going to the Conference for the Council to be advised on what has been achieved by the Open-ended Working Group. I would propose, for instance, that we agree to give more opportunity for the Open-ended Working Group to continue its work and, if you all agree, I would like to invite Ambassador Gerbasi to give a Progress Report and, hopefully, the Report of the Open-ended Working Group tomorrow when we open the afternoon Session, before we adopt the Report of the Drafting Committee. Will that be agreeable?

So we give Ambassador Gerbasi 24 hours to work with the Open-ended Working Group but we require that the Council be advised of the results, whatever they may be, as the first item when we open the afternoon session tomorrow.

Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)

A procedural question: certainly we are happy to continue discussing this in the context of the Open-ended Working Group, but how will the results be reported to the Council? I understand that the Drafting Committee will meet tonight and tomorrow but, if the Open-Ended Working Group does not report to Council until Thursday afternoon, that will be after the Council Report is ready. Therefore, we wonder how it would be possible to reflect whatever views are expressed at that time by Members on the outcome of the Open-Ended Working Group. I was wondering if you could give some clarification on that.

CHAIRMAN

We do have a precedent, I think it was during the last Council in June; we refrained from putting an item into the Report of the Drafting Committee because Council was still debating it. I think we will do the same here. The Drafting Committee would certainly be urged to finish its work, except for the outcome of the Open-ended Working Group on the International Undertaking of Genetic Resources. So, when Ambassador Gerbasi reports to us at the beginning of the afternoon Session we will have a decision on this item, which then will be included in the report of the Council, and transmitted to the Conference.

We do have a precedent.

Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)

I am sorry to take up more of your valuable time on this but, in the precedent you cited, essentially the Council became the Drafting Group. Is that what you envisage tomorrow afternoon, that if there is some language that needs to go into a Report, that it would be decided upon by the Council at that time, at the time that the Chair of the Open-ended Working Group presents it, and if there are comments from the floor or views that are expressed, that all efforts would be made to ensure that the final Report reflects all of those views, not simply the Report that the Chairman gives on the results of the Open-ended Working Group?

CHAIRMAN

There is no reason why the Council should not formulate a report of its own. If we can have more time, I think what you have said can be done also. I have asked Ambassador Gerbasi and he is willing to report, say, tomorrow morning. We will then have time to discuss his Report and transmit the results of our debate to the Drafting Committee, so that it will be part of the Report of the Drafting Committee to the Council in the afternoon session.

Will that be agreeable? If I see no objections then I will conclude this item in that manner.

11.3 Applications for Membership in the Organization: (C 2001/10)

11.3 Demandes d'admission la qualiè de Membre de l'Organisation: (C 2001/10)

11.3 Solicitudes de ingreso en la Organizaci. n: (C 2001/10)

CHAIRMAN

The next item on our Agenda is Item 11.3, Applications for Membership in the Organization.

As you will see from the relevant document, C 2001/10, there are four applicants for Membership of the Organization, namely the Principality of Monaco, the Republic of Nauru, the Republic of Uzbekistan and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Pending a decision by the Conference on these applications, the Council is requested to authorize the applicant countries to attend this Session.

Does Council agree to this? I see no objection.

It was so decided

Il en est ainsi décidé

Asi se acuerda

V. OTHER MATTERS (continued)
V. QUESTIONS DIVERSES (suite)
V. OTROS ASUNTOS (continuación)

13. Any Other Matters

13. Autres questions

13. Otros asuntos

*Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem
 (Reykjavik, Iceland, 1- 4 October 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)*

*Conférence de Reykjavik sur une pêche responsable dans le cosystème marin
 (Reykjavik, Islande, 1er-4 octobre 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)*

*Conferencia de Reykjavik sobre la Pesca Responsable en el Ecosistema Marino
 (Reykjavik, Islandia, 1-4 de octubre de 2001) (CL 121/INF/10)*

CHAIRMAN

We come now to the last Agenda Item for this day, Any Other Matters.

We have an Information Document tabled under this Item, namely C 2001/INF/25, the Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem, Reykjavik, Iceland from 1 to 4 October 2001.

Are there any comments from the floor on this item?

Ms Sigridur Asdís SNÆVAR (Iceland)

I speak now on behalf of my Government, the Government of Iceland, which jointly with FAO and co-sponsored by Norway, organized the Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries and the Marine Ecosystem, from 1 to 4 October 2001.

I refer to the Conference Information Document number 25, under this Agenda Item. This initiative of having this Conference was endorsed at the Twenty-fourth Session of COFI and at the Hundred and Twentieth Session of the FAO Council.

The Reykjavik Conference was a success, not at least due to its broad participation. The Conference was attended by representatives of 59 Members of FAO, mostly COFI Member Nations, and by Observers from two non-Member Nations of FAO and from the Holy See.

Representatives from three specialized agencies of the United Nations attended, as well as Observers from 16 intergovernmental organizations and ten international non-governmental organizations.

The objective of the Conference was to review the experience of applying ecosystem considerations in fisheries management and to identify challenges to, and strategies for, inclusion of ecosystem considerations in fisheries management. The Conference included a special scientific symposium, where leading scientists presented papers on various aspects of ecosystem-based fisheries management, which led to lively debate on this important topic.

By bringing together leading scientists, policy-makers and other relevant stakeholders, we managed to create a unique forum for the exchange of views on how to incorporate ecosystem considerations into fisheries management.

In order to formalize the findings of the Conference, an Open-ended Drafting Committee was established under the Chairmanship of His Excellency Mr Abraham Iyambo, Minister of Fisheries of Namibia.

The Conference adopted the Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem, by which States declare their intention to incorporate ecosystem considerations into fisheries management, with the aim of reinforcing responsible and sustainable fisheries in the marine ecosystem.

In the Reykjavik Declaration, the Members of FAO request that my government convey the Declaration for their consideration to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Director-General of FAO, to the Chair of the World Summit of Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg in September 2002, and to other relevant organizations.

My government fully intends to take this duty seriously, because we truly believe that the Declaration is a step forward in contributing to global efforts towards developing better fisheries management systems, in order to secure sustainable fisheries for food security, for economic well-being and for development.

To give the Declaration its appropriate weight, we suggest that the Council endorse it and send it forward to Conference for adoption. We will raise the issue there in Plenary, anticipating full support from all Members of FAO.

Finally, we would like highlight that, since COFI in the year 2000, the Reykjavik Conference is the only FAO-Intergovernmental Conference dealing with fisheries to be held before the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

This gives us the opportunity to send from FAO in Rome to the Johannesburg Summit a strong message in support of sustainable fisheries, the environment and food security.

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

The United States supports the Reykjavik Declaration and supports its endorsement by the Council. We look forward to the issuance of the Technical Guidelines requested in the Declaration for the Promotion of Best Practices to introduce Ecosystem Considerations into Fisheries Management.

Blair HANKEY (Canada)

Canada is also pleased to join in the endorsement of the Reykjavik Declaration. We look forward to its adoption by Conference and, like Iceland, we believe it is an important contribution in the long and arduous road for the better development of sustainable fisheries practices.

Takanori OHASHI (Japan)

First of all, I wish to congratulate the Icelandic Government for its initiative in organizing the Reykjavik Conference and to thank also the Government of Norway for its sponsorship and the FAO Secretariat for its technical support.

The Reykjavik Conference had a good opportunity to define, promote and advance an important element in fisheries management. Having said that, I have recognized there is a general feeling, or a general wish for the endorsement of the Reykjavik Declaration but I must say that Japan cannot get along with the Declaration for some reason, although Japan does not intend to block or oppose the endorsement of the Reykjavik Declaration.

In our view, the Declaration fails to deal with a number of issues that were seen in the Reykjavik Conference. One of the major points of this Agreement was use of the term living marine resources. This term is used in a number of instruments, including UNCROS, UNCED and the *FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*, yet this term was not used in the context of fisheries management in the Declaration. To us, this is a position that puts us back 20 years and a position that certainly contradicts the objective of ecosystem-based fisheries management.

Another major point of disagreement was regarding marine mammals in the ecosystem, under specific reference to the fish consumption by marine mammals. The refusal to use the term marine mammals in the Declaration as if they did not exist or as if they are not a part of the ecosystem has made the Reykjavik Conference a political forum, like the International Whaling Commission. In my view, this is regrettable.

The Twenty-fourth Session of the Commission on Fisheries unanimously agreed that FAO should conduct studies on the impact of fish consumption by marine mammals, but there was a refusal to

even quote directly the words of the COFI Report as if we now no longer agree with what was agreed last March.

In my view, exclusion of this key issue from the Declaration means that the Reykjavik Conference failed to address the key issue required for effective implementation of ecosystem-based fisheries management. For those reasons I have noted, Japan cannot go along with the Declaration, but I wish to stress again that Japan has no intention to block or oppose the endorsement of the Declaration.

CHAIRMAN

May I summarize the subject that the Council was informed on; the outcome of the Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem, which was held in Reykjavik, Iceland, from 1 to 4 October 2001, jointly organized by FAO and Iceland with the co-sponsorship of the Government of Norway. The Council has also listened to the comments by the delegate from Japan.

Council endorsed the Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem, which had been adopted by the Reykjavik Conference, and sent it through the Conference for endorsement. It also took note of the statements by Members relating to the Declaration.

If there is no objection, then I will conclude this Item.

I understand that the United Republic of Tanzania wants to take the floor on Agenda Item Other Matters.

Wilfred NGIRWA (Observer for Tanzania, United Republic of)

On behalf of the African Group, I would like to introduce an Item on Pan-African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign.

The FAO Conference of this year coincides with the year which the African Heads of States and Government designated for the launching of a campaign to eradicate the Tsetse fly and Trypanosomiasis from the African continent. In a decision which they adopted last July in Lusaka, following an earlier Summit decision in Lome, Togo, African Heads of State and Government, realizing the shortcomings of traditional, local Tsetse control approach in individual countries, opted for total eradication of the flies from the whole African Continent, realizing an area approach, involving all the countries in the infested regions, as these flies do not know any geographical boundaries. It should be mentioned at this juncture that there are 37 African countries which are infested by the Tsetse fly. Regrettably, most of these countries are among the poorest in Africa.

Tsetse flies, which cause an estimated annual loss of US\$ 4.5 billion, are one of Africa's greatest constraints to socio-economic development, severely affecting human and livestock health, limiting land use, causing poverty and perpetrating underdevelopment on the African continent. They are, indeed, one of the causes of food insecurity in Africa. Thus, the eradication of Tsetse flies would significantly contribute to increased productivity of crops and livestock and reduce rural poverty on the African Continent.

In the Lusaka Summit Resolution, the African Heads of States and Government called *inter alia* international organizations to assist infested states in their eradication efforts. In response to this call, the Secretary General of the United Nations acknowledged this problem in his recent report to the Economic and Social Council and he called for action.

Consequently, the Economic and Social Council called upon all Member Nations, Organizations of the United Nations System and the international community to fully support the Organization of African Unity's Pan-African Tsetse Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign.

The General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, at its last meeting in September 2001, adopted pledging support to the PATTEC and called upon the international community to provide the required technical, financial and material support.

Noting the recommendations made by the FAO Liaison Officers' Meeting for West and Central Africa, in Ougadougou, Burkina Faso in September 2001, inviting the international community to fully support the PATTEC initiatives, and recalling that the World Food Summit Plan of Action of 1996 recommended that Governments, in partnership with all actors of civil society and their support of international institutions, seek to ensure effective prevention and progressive control of plant and animal diseases, including those which are transboundary in nature, and taking into account that PATTEC has already been launched.

I would like to propose, on behalf of the Africa Group, the inclusion of an item in support of PATTEC and the draft resolution thereon, on the agenda of the Conference of FAO, for consideration and appropriate action.

The meeting rose at 16.45 hours

La séance est levée à 16 h 45

Se levanta la sesión a las 16.45 horas

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<p>Hundred and Twenty-first Session Cent vingt et unième session 121^o período de sesiones</p>
<p>Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001 Rome, 30 octobre 1 novembre 2001 Roma, 30 de octubre - 1^o de noviembre de 2001</p>
<p>FIFTH PLENARY MEETING CINQUIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE QUINTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</p>
<p>1 November 2001</p>

The Fifth Plenary Meeting was opened at 10.30 hours

Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,

Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La cinquième séance plénière est ouverte à 10h30

sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,

Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la quinta sesión plenaria a las 10.30 horas

bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,

Presidente Independiente del Consejo

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL MATTERS (continued)
IV. QUESTIONS CONSTITUTIONNELLES ET JURIDIQUES (suite)
IV. ASUNTOS CONSTITUCIONALES Y JURÍDICOS (continuación)

11. Other Constitutional and Legal Matters (continued)
11. Autres questions constitutionnelles et juridiques (suite)
11. Otros asuntos constitucionales y jurídicos (continuación)

11.1 Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources
 (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (English only))
 (continued)

11.1 Projet d'Engagement international sur les ressources phyto g e n e t i q u e s
 (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1-Corr.1 (anglais seulement))
 (suite)

11.1 Proyecto de Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitog e n e t i c o s
 (CL 121/5; CL 121/5-Sup.1; CL 121/5-Sup.1 Corr.1 (inglés solamente))
 (continuación)

CHAIRMAN

I call the fifth meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-first Council Session to order.

We will now return to Item 11, Other Constitutional and Legal Matters and, specifically, to Item 11.1, the Draft International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources.

I would now like to ask Ambassador Gerbasi, Chairman of the Committee on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, to report to Council on the outcome of the Open-ended Working Group.

Fernando GERBASI (Presidente de la Comisión de Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura)

Quiero ante todo agradecer de manera muy especial el honor que me hizo este Consejo al solicitarme presidir las labores del Grupo de Trabajo Abierto, encargado de remover los corchetes que aún persistían en el Compromiso Internacional Revisado, para poder presentar un texto limpio a la Conferencia de la FAO, en su 31° período de sesiones, para su aprobación.

Me complace someter a la consideración de ustedes el texto del Tratado Internacional para los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura, así como un proyecto de resolución titulado "Aprobación del Tratado Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura y Disposiciones Provisionales para su Aplicación".

En el texto del Tratado, que entiendo será repartido en pocos minutos en los distintos idiomas y ruego nos excusen un poco la tardanza pero estuvimos trabajando anoche hasta altas horas de la noche, encontrarán ustedes que el Artículo 2, relativo a las definiciones, aquellas correspondientes a "recurso fitogenético para la alimentación y la agricultura" y la de "material genético", que se encuentran estrechamente vinculadas, están entre corchetes pues un país así lo pidió aunque ambas cuentan con el respaldo del resto de los países que participaron, por cierto muy activamente, en el Grupo de Trabajo Abierto.

El artículo 13.3, inciso (d), también se encuentra entre corchetes. Anteriormente existían dos textos alternativos y ahora hay uno solo que a mi entender cuenta con un amplio respaldo a pesar de que un pequeño grupo de países piensa que una posible solución al tratamiento de un tema tan delicado, como al que se refiere este inciso de este artículo, podría ser simple y llanamente la eliminación del texto. Estos son los únicos tres textos entre corchetes que existen ahora en todo el Tratado sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos que sometemos a vuestra consideración.

Debo subrayar que, como consecuencia de un intenso proceso de negociación, iniciado tres días antes a través de consultas informales con un grupo representativo de delegaciones denominadas

"Amigos del Presidente", y a raíz de una amplia voluntad política demostrada en la búsqueda constante del consenso y del entendimiento, logramos eliminar todos los demás corchetes, así como alcanzar un texto completamente limpio en lo que respecta al proyecto de resolución que someto a la consideración de este augusto Consejo. Además, y esto es sumamente importante, todos los comentarios formulados por el Comité de Asuntos Jurídicos y Constitucionales, en su 72° período de sesiones que tuvo lugar entre el 8 y el 10 de octubre próximo pasado y contenidos en el documento CCLM 72/5, fueron adecuadamente incorporados al texto del Tratado.

Atendiendo el mandato que usted nos diera y la decisión de los países, no se incorporó ningún texto nuevo al Tratado y sólo se revisó lo que estaba entre corchetes o las recomendaciones del Comité de Asuntos Jurídicos y Constitucionales.

Espero haber cumplido de esta manera con la responsabilidad con que usted y el Consejo me honraran.

Después de casi siete años de intensas negociaciones hemos logrado un texto sobre un instrumento internacional de la mayor importancia y relevancia para la seguridad alimentaria mundial y la conservación y uso sostenible de los recursos fitogenéticos para la alimentación y la agricultura. Posiblemente el Tratado que someto a vuestra consideración quizás sea aún perfectible en el transcurso de los años y como consecuencia, solamente como consecuencia, de su instrumentación. Por el momento, y de ello estoy totalmente convencido, es lo mejor que podíamos obtener y representa en sí mismo un esfuerzo inconmensurable de cooperación y entendimiento de la comunidad internacional en un tema que es de la mayor importancia para todos pero sumamente complejo, como consecuencia de la revolución tecnológica en que nos encontramos envueltos, así como de las diversas implicaciones derivadas de la normativa internacional que estamos creando en lo que respecta a los temas de agricultura, comercio y medio ambiente.

Muy respetuosamente les solicito consideren positivamente el resultado de nuestros trabajos y remitan al 31° período de sesiones de la Conferencia para su aprobación el Tratado Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura y la Resolución conexa.

CHAIRMAN

You have heard the Report of the dedicated work that has been done by the Open-ended Working Group. I now invite interventions from the floor.

Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)

Entiendo que no es la primera vez ni será la última que tenemos que agradecer el excelente y, como usted acaba de decir, abnegado trabajo del Embajador Fernando Gerbasi al frente y como Presidente de la Comisión de Recursos Genéticos.

Estamos totalmente de acuerdo con sus palabras y lo apoyamos. Entendemos que el Embajador Gerbasi durante todos estos años, especialmente en estos últimos meses, ha realizado un excelente trabajo, razón reitero, para apoyar su propuesta y más que suficiente para proponer, como Presidente del Grupo de los 77, que el Embajador Fernando Gerbasi presente el informe a la Conferencia. Estas son mis propuestas en nombre del Grupo de los 77.

Júlio Cesar GOMES DOS SANTOS (Brasil)

Yo tuve el honor de participar en las negociaciones del Grupo de Trabajo que en los últimos cuatro años intentó encontrar una solución para tantos y tantos problemas en la negociación del entonces Compromiso. Mi delegación estuvo presente en todas estas reuniones en Roma, en la República Islámica de Irán, en Spoleto, en Neuchâtel; hemos recorrido varios lugares para encontrar, quitar los corchetes que se acumulaban desde entonces. Trabajamos durante mucho tiempo y muchas horas. Y si no fuera por el Embajador Gerbasi no habríamos llegado a ninguna conclusión, posiblemente, porque él supo armonizar todos los intereses de todos los grupos allí representados, y con su llerazgo casi logramos un texto totalmente limpio ayer por la noche.

Personalmente creo que no es imposible lograr este texto limpio. Informalmente en este momento existe un pequeño grupo de trabajo que voluntariamente y representando todas las regiones, está reunido desde las ocho y media de la mañana para tratar de encontrar fórmulas para quitar los últimos corchetes. Nosotros sabemos que el tiempo está agotado, pero existe siempre la hora 25 y tenemos la esperanza de encontrar esta hora 25.

Para el bien de todos nosotros y como un último homenaje al Embajador Gerbasi, también nosotros le pedimos que considere su nombre como la persona indicada para presentar este informe en la Conferencia.

Ms Jackie SANDERS (United States of America)

We have listened with great interest to the report of the Chairman of the Open-ended Working Group, and want to thank him and other delegates in the Group for all of the efforts that have been made toward reaching consensus agreement on this text.

The United States is very much a part of this effort and we share in the hopes of others that the Conference will be able to adopt a treaty that has the broadest support from all Regions and that truly advances the cause of global food security.

That being said, we would like to make clear, for the Council and for the report that will be issued by the Council, that the United States continues to have a number of serious concerns. Of critical importance is the United States proposal for a provision on essential security. The provision was not considered by the Open-ended Working Group. It is a common element in international agreements. We must inform you that, without this clause, the United States would not be able to be party to the Treaty.

I would like to read this proposal so that it becomes a part of the record of this meeting: "Nothing in this Treaty shall be construed to prevent a Contracting Party from taking any action that it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests."

We will raise this again at the Conference.

Another vital issue on which discussion was not permitted in the Open-ended Working Group has to do with the operation of the Multilateral System, for example, situations where end-uses cannot be determined at the point of access and in which possible multiple uses may be envisaged.

Freedom of contractual opportunity needs to be clarified in the agreement. Our proposal, which we will read for the record, is as follows: "Establishment of the Multilateral System shall not preclude a Contracting Party, or legal and natural persons under its jurisdiction, from making a request outside the scope of this Treaty for access to Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) listed in Annex 1, nor shall it preclude another Contracting Party from providing such PGRFA in response to such a request. It is understood that any such transaction would involve no rights of facilitated access under this Treaty, but rather would be subject to such terms as may be mutually agreed."

We will raise this as well at the Conference.

Concerning the List of Crops, the United States has determined that the current crop list is unacceptable. Many of the crops integral to global food security and those characterized by a high degree of interdependence among countries and regions are absent from the list. We are not prepared to accept a treaty that deliberately omits crops such as soybeans, peanuts and tomatoes, yet includes crops like asparagus. Such a list is indefensible.

Concerning text that still needs to be finalized before Conference adoption, we would like to take this opportunity to highlight our concerns in two key areas.

In Article 13.3.d, on Facilitated Access, we cannot support the bracketed text. We oppose efforts to deny the exercise of intellectual property rights available under national laws. In light of the impossibility of achieving consensus on this provision, we agree with those who support its deletion.

The definition of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in Article 2 fails to sufficiently clarify the scope of a Contracting Party's facilitated access obligations under the multilateral system.

We request that the foregoing concerns be reflected in the Council's Report.

The United States' commitment to providing access is unparalleled. Annually, the United States distributes, at no cost, 35 000 samples of seeds and tubers to researchers and breeders outside of the United States. Most of these materials are distributed to public sector research scientists, many of whom are in developing countries.

Regarding access and benefit sharing, we want to leave you with one important thought. As is evident from examples of successful agriculture and prospering farmers around the world, access is the most valuable benefit that could come out of this Treaty. In pursuit of such global benefits, the United States has spent hundreds of millions of dollars facilitating access to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture over the last half century, through our system and through the international agricultural research centres. This demonstrates our commitment to the objectives of this Agreement.

It is our hope that there is still time to find solutions to our serious concerns with the text before us today.

Acisclo VALLADARES MOLINA (Guatemala)

El Consejo acertó sin duda en hacer recaer en el Embajador Fernando Gerbasi la Presidencia del Grupo de Trabajo Abierto que hizo posible el resultado que ya está a nuestras puertas.

Con gran entusiasmo el Consejo puso en sus manos el mandato y con el mismo recibimos el resultado de ese trabajo con la satisfacción que para él debe de ser el deber cumplido.

Respaldamos así la propuesta del Sr. Embajador de Cuba, Presidente del Grupo de los 77, ya respaldada por el Sr. Embajador de Brasil, de que sea el Embajador Fernando Gerbasi quien presente el informe a la Conferencia.

Finalmente instamos a que la voz del consenso sea entendida por quienes sostengan aún reservas que van quedando aisladas, en el entendido que nos encontramos ante un resultado perfectible, importante y que merece desde ya su aprobación.

Dato' Abi Musa Asa' Ari Bin MOHAMED NOR (Malaysia)

Malaysia would like to express our thanks to His Excellency, Mr Fernando Gerbasi, Chair of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture for the extraordinary and lengthy, and yet complicated task which he has accomplished with patience and diplomacy.

The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, which will be put into the forthcoming FAO Conference for adoption is, of course, of historic matter. This treaty, if adopted by the Conference, will be positive for World Food Security and Malaysia strongly approves its final conclusions and adoption by the forthcoming FAO Conference.

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

I take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, to express our heartfelt gratitude to the efforts taken by Ambassador Gerbasi to arrive at a conclusion for the seven-year process.

We only want to briefly highlight the fact that what we are talking about here, the International Undertaking, or the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources, is something that is inevitably connected to what we keep talking about in this Red Room, that is food security. The food security is the underlying theme in this treaty and, in that spirit, I do hope that the outstanding issues are resolved to the satisfaction of everyone and hope that, for the Conference, we have a consensus document.

We agree that there are complicated issues in this treaty. There are national interests, but we have seen a lot of mutual give and take during the negotiations and I do hope that that spirit will

prevail. We know that no multilateral agreement can be satisfactory to everyone. We see all the multilateral agreements being reviewed constantly in the world. I do not think that we should aim for something which will satisfy everybody's national interest. Here we are talking about the Global Treaty.

With this appeal, I would once again like to thank Ambassador Gerbasi for all his efforts and I hope that this leads us to some positive outcome during the Conference.

Sra. Elsa Diana Rosa KELLY (Argentina)

Quiero sumarme a los colegas de Cuba, Brasil y Guatemala y a la Delegación de la India para expresar nuestro más profundo reconocimiento al Sr. Embajador de Venezuela, Fernando Gerbasi por su magistral conducción de estas negociaciones que deben culminar ahora con la adopción por parte de la Conferencia de la FAO del Tratado Internacional sobre Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura. Estamos cercanos a la terminación de nuestra tarea que no hubiera sido posible sin la tenacidad, la paciencia y la profesionalidad que debemos de reconocer como cualidades personales del Presidente de la Comisión de Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura.

Esperamos también, como lo expresara el distinguido Embajador de Brasil, que podamos adoptar este tratado por consenso. Tenemos la esperanza que se logre extraer del texto los paréntesis en el artículo 12.3(d) del tratado que nos acaban de distribuir, y poder también definir adecuadamente la cuestión de la estrategia financiera y, tema que preocupa a varias delegaciones, la ampliación de la lista. Esperamos que estos dos problemas se puedan resolver antes de que se discuta este tratado en la Conferencia.

Simon HEARN (Australia)

Australia is committed to an open and equitable exchange of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and will work constructively within FAO to achieve this objective.

Indeed, a suitable system of exchange is essential for crop genetic improvement. Such improvement, in turn, is essential for the future wellbeing of world agriculture and food security, based on open and uninterrupted exchanges.

For this draft treaty, to contribute to and secure such benefits, it must be workable. We believe that the Draft Treaty in front of us has significant potential to provide these beneficial outcomes but, inevitably, challenges remain ahead. This is a challenge for this treaty to be both workable and practical. This is a challenge for us all.

For the record, Australia will be working both within the FAO and in other arenas to improve capacity-building, information exchanges and cooperation in fields of genetic resources and crop improvement. We do, however, stress briefly the need for implementation of this draft treaty to address the following key issues.

Plant genetic improvement and research will require suitable returns for technological investment and risk taking. On-going ambiguity in this matter, within the text, could be damaging to the agreement and we do wish to seek that Article 12.3(d) is either resolved or deleted.

The multilateral system must be commercially realistic in facilitating open, fair and reasonable exchange of genetic resources for food and agriculture, based on an equitable sharing of benefits.

The implementation of a suitable, realistic, material transfer agreement system is an essential component for the proposed Governing Body and Experts' Group to address, sooner rather than later.

Finally, on the basis of mutual benefit, it is also important that, at the earliest opportunity, the list of crops under the multilateral system should be reassessed and extended. We are confident that, if this agreement is effectively implemented, this extension of the list will occur.

Eduardo BENÍTEZ PAULÍN (México)

Al igual que otras delegaciones, deseamos sumarnos al reconocimiento y al agradecimiento hacia el Embajador Gerbasi por su ardua labor llevada a cabo para que lleguemos al texto que hoy día tenemos enfrente.

Como han dicho otras delegaciones, tenemos un documento que es perfectible y que dentro de este proceso, consideramos que para lograr la perfección tendrá que, durante todo un proceso que continuará, tomarse en cuenta los elementos principales de lo que hoy tenemos como tratado internacional: la distribución de beneficios, los mecanismos de financiamiento, y obviamente la ampliación de la lista de cultivos. Para nosotros es muy importante que cultivos como la soja, caña de azúcar, que son cultivos que cumplen con los principios que hemos acordado en este tratado sobre seguridad alimentaria sean incluidos, pero igualmente reconocemos la necesidad de tener el equilibrio en la fórmula. En ese sentido y esperando que la evolución del propio documento vaya hacia esa perfección, estaremos muy pendientes de cómo sigan las negociaciones respecto a los acuerdos de transferencia de materiales.

Debo mencionar nuestra preocupación ya manifestada desde los primeros días del proceso de negociación respecto a la posibilidad de sistemas o mecanismos paralelos al del Sistema Multilateral. Por ello insistimos en que dentro de este Tratado existan equilibrios que nos permitan perfeccionar el documento y obtener un Tratado que realmente nos dé soporte para que haya un flujo de recursos fitogenéticos en el mundo.

TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original language Chinese)

The Chinese delegation would like to mention the following three points.

First of all, the Chinese delegation would like to thank Chairman Mr Gerbasi for all the efforts he has made for the success of this Treaty. Thanks to his outstanding leadership, organizational and diplomatic skills, as well as the flexibility he showed during the negotiations, today we have a rather clean text. Without his Chairmanship, we would probably not have this result today.

Secondly, the Chinese delegation would also like to thank the efforts made by various Member Nations during the negotiating and extraordinary meetings, as well as at these Sessions of the Commission on Food and Agriculture Plant Genetic Resources. We appreciate their spirit of compromise and cooperation.

Thirdly, the Chinese delegation agrees to the idea that Mr Gerbasi reports the negotiation and submits his text to the Conference for the approval.

Jón Erlingur JÓNASSON (Iceland)

Can I ask you to give the floor to Norway please.

Jan BORRING (Observer for Norway)

On behalf of the European Region, I would also like to thank you wholeheartedly for your efforts during these years and your immense patience with us, as the negotiating groups.

We do have a couple of comments on the present text and a couple of suggestions. Let me first say that during the negotiations to revise the Undertaking, the European Region has consistently sought an extensive list of crops, in order to achieve maximum benefit for world food security. We do see the multilateral system as a system for multilateral exchange, or PGRFA, to the benefit of all, not as a system where some give access and some receive, as is sometimes portrayed in the debates. This is a mutually-beneficial system.

The list, as contained in Annex I, is severely deficient in the context of world food security. The absence of many crops of crucial importance to world food security means that the draft instrument before us, indeed, is a very weak one. Yesterday, and into the night, we sought to negotiate a mechanism through which extension of the list of crops would be facilitated. We

failed to achieve this and, as a result of the provision requiring consensus for all decisions of the Governing Body, we see the prospects for extending the list to be extremely slim.

As proposed yesterday, we would ask that crops contained in Appendix E of the Report of the Last Extraordinary Meeting of the CGRFA, together with the tropical forage grasses and legumes identified by the Expert Panel, as being of critical importance to the food security of many of the poorest countries, to be added to Annex I of the draft treaty, in brackets, so that the Conference be given an opportunity to consider the inclusion of these crops in the Multilateral System.

On another issue, we place a reserve on the three recitals which deal with relationship between this treaty and other international agreements. Having completed internal consultations, I wish to stress that the European Region believes it extremely important that this treaty should not, in any way, be subordinate to other international agreements. We believe that the text of these recitals, as they now appear in the text, are open to interpretation.

We would therefore be grateful if, in the first recital, the words "should be" are placed in brackets and that the word "are" are being introduced as an alternative, also in brackets. We would also prefer the deletion of the words "in any way" from the second recital of the preamble, dealing with the relationship between this agreement and other agreements.

We would be grateful if these changes could be made in the text so that the Conference can decide on this issue, as well as the previous issues mentioned in our intervention.

Javad MOZAFARI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)

I also would like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere thanks and gratitude for the hard work put into this by Ambassador Gerbasi of Venezuela. Under his leadership, the Group was able to achieve one of the most difficult tasks that one can imagine to develop where parties have different interests, and bringing all these different interests and ideas together was really a big job that Mr Gerbasi was able to do thanks to his capable leadership. I still remember the hard work and the long hours that he was sitting on the Chair, for sometimes from 08.00 in the morning until 03.00 the following morning, i.e., morning to morning.

However, we have been very keen on this Treaty and have worked very hard to achieve it. We have faith in this Treaty and we were also very active. We are very hopeful that this will take us somewhere and will really contribute to food security which was the goal of this undertaking, through facilitating access to Plant Genetic Resources and their utilization. However, I could say that, although my Region has contributed to this facilitated access more than any other Region, you all know that most of the more important crops originate from the Near East. The only content of this Treaty is the crops and, for sure, if we can increase this content, we will benefit more from it. Unfortunately, however, there are provisions in this Treaty that were not really planned to be, as they are not in line with the objectives of this Treaty, i.e. Facilitated Access, Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources in order to Achieve Food Security, and Increased Crop Content.

These provisions are not encouraging, and they do not give a feeling of security to the countries who will provide access. But, for the sake of compromise, I believe all those countries, although they are not very happy with the provisions of benefit-sharing, with the restrictive provisions of the IPR issue and the financial mechanisms, would still like to have this Treaty in place because they feel that achieving a perfect Treaty at the outset may not be possible. However, having something imperfect is improvable, we can improve based on that in the future, and taking into account the concerns expressed here by different parties, specifically the concerns regarding the restrictive provisions of IPR, which are not in line with free access to Plant Genetic Resources, nor with promoting the utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for the benefit of humankind and to achieve food security.

My delegation would like to bring the concerns just expressed to the attention of the House. Hopefully, they will be taken into consideration for improving this Treaty in the future, so that it can serve all humankind and developing and developed countries and, at that time, it will appeal

to everybody. I am sure that once the appeal is there, all countries will voluntarily include their genetic resources in this undertaking.

Júlio Cesar GOMES DOS SANTOS (Brasil)

En primer lugar me gustaría saber si es posible reabrir corchetes y cambiar palabras en un texto que ya fue negociado y aprobado. No me parece que este procedimiento sea correcto. Yo estoy de acuerdo que se negocie un texto que está entre corchetes y que debe ser encontrada una solución entre hoy y mañana, o entre hoy y el final de la Conferencia; pero cambiar lo que ya está negociado no me parece correcto y yo le pediría que usted y la Secretaría nos diera esta aclaración y también la última palabra sobre este asunto.

Ahora me gustaría hablar un poco de la Lista, porque parece que delegaciones de todos los matices están muy preocupadas por el aspecto didáctico de la presentación en Plenaria de lo que significa la Lista a quienes menos saben de esto. Yo quería dejar en claro que la lista existente no es una limitación, no significa una limitación como algunas delegaciones están intentando hacer creer a todo el mundo en esta Plenaria. Ella, por menor que sea, y no es chica, representa una apertura en un sistema que funciona por lo menos hace cincuenta años, usando y con el permiso, la información que nos fue dada por la delegación de Estados Unidos. No hay ninguna amenaza a la seguridad alimentaria del mundo en el hecho que la primera lista aprobada tenga más de cuarenta cultivos. El sistema existe y nosotros queremos facilitar el acceso a determinados recursos fitogenéticos en nombre de la seguridad alimentaria. Es una donación que realizan los países que disponen de estos recursos fitogenéticos; para ello es necesario una compensación y este es el motivo de toda esta negociación. Culpar a quienes detentan los recursos fitogenéticos más importantes de no avanzar en la lucha contra el hambre, no es justo como mínimo. Esto es un seguimiento de la lucha en la que todos nosotros estamos involucrados y con mucho entusiasmo.

Yo tuve la ocasión de decir más de una vez, que nunca hubo tanta oferta de alimentos en el mundo y nunca hubo tanta imposibilidad de acceder a estos alimentos. Nunca se dio tantos subsidios a la agricultura en el mundo: 360 mil millones de dólares para distorsionar el comercio agrícola. Nosotros hacemos parte de esta negociación de recursos fitogenéticos, de este conjunto de medidas que se toman a favor de la seguridad alimentaria y no cerramos la posibilidad de que la lista no se amplíe, lo que queremos es determinar las condiciones para la ampliación de la misma. Ella ya representa un 90 por ciento de todos los géneros alimenticios consumidos por el mundo. A esos géneros, a esos recursos fitogenéticos importantes para este 90 por ciento, el acceso ya está facilitado por esta negociación.

Para terminar repito la lista no limita, la lista amplía la posibilidad de acceso a los recursos fitogenéticos.

Brad FRALEIGH (Canada)

Canada considers that this Treaty is of great importance for global food security and the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity. We would like to thank other delegations and other countries for the enormous amount of work that they have put into negotiating this Treaty. All delegations have worked very hard under the leadership of successive Chairs of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food in Agriculture. Indeed, Canada has been an active participant in these negotiations.

As others have said, we feel it is important that as many countries as possible participate in ratifying and working together in implementing this Treaty and, because of its importance, we feel the need to express certain concerns with the text that is here before us.

In particular, Canada is concerned that not all of the major food crops important for global food security are part of this multilateral system right from the start. Second, we are concerned with the treatment, in this Treaty, of the question of consistency with intellectual property rights regimes as incentives for development. As the International Food Policy Research Institute has pointed out very clearly, there will be a great need to increase the quantity, the amount of food, in the world

over the next decades. This is a significant point to Canada as an important contributor of innovative material.

Therefore, we would like to suggest, as the United States and Australia have done previously, the deletion of the clause which is now numbered Article 12.3d.

Finally, Canada is concerned by the absence of an effective statement in substantive text about the relationship between this Treaty and other international agreements. However, in the Open-ended Working Group, we compromised on this issue. We do not agree with the proposal made by the European Region, which would reopen agreed text in the preamble addressing this issue.

We would be grateful if our concerns could be reflected in a general way in the Report of Council. Our region was not fortunate enough to participate in the informal Working Group that Brazil referred to earlier. However, we look forward to the next steps that will be taken in FAO and beyond Conference in addressing this important treaty.

Masato ITO (Japan)

My delegation appreciates the effort made by the Chairman, Ambassador Gerbasi, in the Open-ended Working Group meeting. My delegation also appreciates the effort by all the delegations in the meeting. Having said that, my delegation has concerns on several points, like some of the previous speakers. Our most serious concerns are on the ambiguity of the definition of PGRFA and all patentable innovations. These concerns were already expressed by my delegation in the meeting.

Although we cannot exclude such concerns with the current text under negotiation, we will make a possible contribution.

Ms Mariem MOUSA (Egypt) (Original language Arabic)

On behalf of the Egyptian delegation, I thank His Excellency, Ambassador Gerbasi, for the great effort he has made in leading this Working Group, particularly in trying to reconcile differences and thus achieving a satisfactory result.

In addition, I would like to stress the role and the concern of Egypt as regards the list of crops in the Annex and the great importance of including such crops in the multilateral system, particularly for the Near East.

I would like to draw attention to the question of intellectual property rights. Of course, it can be very restrictive and very difficult to exploit those resources adequately. However, we fully respect the form of words that has been produced as a result of the negotiations, but we do hope to have further support and understanding for the problems of developing countries so that we may successfully eradicate hunger from this world.

Ricardo TORRES (Observador de Colombia)

Para comenzar, sin duda nosotros nos unimos al reconocimiento general que se ha hecho a la labor del Embajador Fernando Gerbasi en su liderazgo y en su habilidad en conducir las negociaciones, que por ya varios años nos han reunido aquí para poder obtener un texto del Tratado Internacional de Recursos Genéticos que, como ya lo han mencionado varios oradores, tiene debilidades seguramente, no es el mejor que cada uno de nuestros países hubiera querido obtener, pero que sin duda representa un avance porque es una posición de compromiso; es el resultado de concesiones mutuas con las cuales todos creemos que es posible dar los primeros pasos en la creación de un sistema internacional que es muy importante para todos nuestros países y para todos los pueblos del mundo.

Quisiera también señalar que Colombia, como todos lo saben, está comprometida y sigue pensando que es necesario que este Compromiso, este Tratado, realmente pueda ser aprobado en la Conferencia que empieza el día de mañana. Consideramos que el texto avanzado de una manera tan sustancial y significativa en ese compromiso y aún así, representa una gran ventaja y una gran posibilidad para la agricultura y para la alimentación de todos los pueblos del mundo.

Pero dicho esto, también quisiéramos referirnos a algunos puntos que son un poco difíciles y sobre los cuales aún tenemos algunas horas para intentar aumentar el consenso que hasta el momento se ha logrado. Coincidimos con algunas delegaciones que han expresado que efectivamente la lista no representa ninguna limitación dentro de los acuerdos que se han logrado hasta el momento en el texto, y que por el contrario significan una gran posibilidad. En esa lista está contenido prácticamente todo lo que representa el mercado mundial de alimentos, significativamente, y que es posible además, como el mismo Tratado y la propuesta del Tratado lo contempla, una revisión periódica, una actualización del contenido de la misma. Pero hay que tener en cuenta además que no solamente no es una limitación, como alguien trataba de extender, como una limitación a los objetivos de la seguridad alimentaria en el mundo.

Por el contrario, creemos que justamente la mayor limitación que encuentra hoy la seguridad alimentaria en el mundo, y una de las principales causas de la pobreza y el hambre que afecta particularmente a los países en desarrollo, es la distribución injusta de los beneficios que se obtienen de las actividades agrícolas. Es justamente el no reconocer una distribución justa y equitativa de las actividades que tienen que ver con la conservación y el suministro de recursos genéticos, una de las causas más importantes de la pobreza de nuestros agricultores y de las pobrezas y los bajos ingresos de que son víctimas las actividades agrícolas en los países en desarrollo.

De manera que para nosotros lo que sí es limitante es la debilidad de los temas referidos a la distribución de beneficios. Y por eso creemos firmemente que aún es posible encontrar algún punto en el cual esto pueda ser mejorado en beneficio de la comunidad internacional.

Un punto particular en relación con esta distribución de beneficios y con las características de este Sistema Multilateral novedoso que estamos creando a través de este Tratado es justamente el referido a los derechos de nuestros pueblos, de nuestras comunidades y nuestros países, sobre la biodiversidad y los recursos genéticos. El sistema tiene que ser flexible, el Sistema tiene que ser amplio, el sistema tiene que ser generoso, y estamos dispuestos a comprometernos con un sistema que facilite el acceso a los recursos genéticos; pero quienes estamos dispuestos a dar acceso a los recursos genéticos necesitamos tener la seguridad de que los derechos de nuestros países, los derechos de nuestros agricultores y de nuestras comunidades no sean afectados por el solo hecho de facilitar ese acceso a los recursos. Y es ese punto, donde el tema de cómo se ejercerán los derechos de propiedad intelectual de esos materiales a los cuales se accederá fácilmente, es crítico, por lo tanto hay que asegurar que el sistema sea creíble y seguro para quienes estamos dispuestos a depositar los materiales allí.

No es solamente el problema de que no se pueden desconocer ni poner en peligro los derechos de nuestros países sobre esos materiales sino que, además, uno de nuestros objetivos fundamentales al crear el sistema multilateral, es asegurarnos de promover el uso, la circulación y la utilización de esos recursos, y por consiguiente la necesidad de que hayan provisiones, como ya están contempladas en el texto, que se refieran al ejercicio de los derechos de propiedad intelectual que no afecten al Sistema Multilateral, porque de otra manera el sistema empezaría con un hueco muy grande y a los pocos años seguramente tendríamos muy pocos recursos o muchos menos recursos de los que empezarían a circular a través del sistema facilitado.

Dicho esto, reiteramos nuestro optimismo, reiteramos el compromiso de nuestro país, en el interés de que salga adelante de este Compromiso; creemos que es factible, que se ha logrado un Compromiso que hace unos meses era prácticamente imposible; pero creemos aún que las pocas horas que nos restan en el día de hoy podemos afinar algunos de los detalles que todavía restan para así asegurar que el Compromiso, aún no siendo lo que cada país o cada grupo de países desearía, es algo por lo cual podemos vivir y transitar en un nuevo sistema de distribución de beneficios mucho más equitativo y mucho más justo para todos los países del mundo.

Oswaldo DEL AGUILA RAMÍREZ (Perú)

Quisiéramos solicitar la palabra para Bolivia en calidad de Presidente del Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe.

David BLANCO ZABALA (Observador de Bolivia)

Una de las principales críticas que los organismos multilaterales tienen en los foros mundiales de reflexión sobre sus propias actividades, es que las discusiones que se llevan a cabo son interminables y no llevan a ninguna parte, que, por el contrario, se traducen en pérdida de tiempo para los asistentes de las mismas. En este caso particular el Grupo de América Latina y el Caribe, y en el caso de la FAO en este Consejo dirigido por su persona, ve con profunda satisfacción que aquí no es esa realidad. El trabajo realizado por uno de los miembros de nuestro Grupo, particularmente el Embajador Gerbasi, pionero en este campo, es quizás, y no lo decimos con interés de promover el trabajo de la región sino particularmente por el esfuerzo realizado por el distinguido Embajador de Venezuela, una de las cosas más concretas que se presentan al seno de la Conferencia bajo el tema del Tratado Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Agricultura y la Alimentación.

Es importante resaltar que estos objetivos se fijaron cuando se formuló la Declaración de Roma sobre la Seguridad Alimentaria y el Plan de Acción de la Cumbre Mundial, y es particularmente importante recibir la información del Embajador Gerbasi de que todos los comentarios del Comité de Asuntos Jurídicos y Constitucionales fueron incorporados en el texto. Conozco la paciencia, personalmente, del Embajador Gerbasi; esto seguramente ha sido producto de una ardua negociación y le da el contenido que este Tratado multilateral tiene. Indiscutiblemente, como ha señalado el Representante de Brasil, es una lista que debe ampliarse en línea con los intereses de los países desarrollados y en vías de desarrollo.

Nuevamente, apoyamos la labor realizada y felicitamos al Embajador Gerbasi por el trabajo llevado a cabo.

Mrs Mary Margaret MUCHADA (Zimbabwe)

We share with the delegations who have spoken before us the importance of having an international instrument to guide our operations in genetic resources.

Naturally, we all started with a number of concerns that we wished to see addressed in the Treaty. Our experts exercised their minds over these issues for a long time and over many sessions in order for us to reach some point of reference, which is where we are today.

It is now our responsibility to reach some finality in our debate. I would like to commend Ambassador Gerbasi and this Committee for having skilfully tried to synthesize our views in the document before us. I appreciate that this is a compromise document and I would like to appeal to all present to view it in that spirit and to find a way of accommodating their own views and interests in the document that we have all concluded at the end of the day.

In the same vein, I would like to thank the Committee for the work they have done to help us reach where we are today and I would like to request that we offer the Chairman of the Committee an opportunity to present the document.

Abebe DEMISSIE (Ethiopia)

My delegation would like to express its appreciation to Ambassador Gerbasi for his outstanding work, leading the negotiations to a successful conclusion here and now. His skill and tact in handling and managing crises has been unparalleled all the way through. We have had our dizzy spells from time to time in many of the sessions, but this was not demonstrated by the Chairman at all.

We believe the draft Treaty in front of us has acquired the support of an overwhelming majority of the nations of this world. Although there are a few brackets which demonstrate this argument, these are extremely few, considering the initial working documents and the give-and-take involved.

We believe that, like everything, this Treaty is not absolutely complete and does not cater for our interests in full. It is far from addressing our concerns, especially regarding benefits sharing, funding mechanisms, so on and so forth, but we believe it can be improved as time goes by.

Issues such as benefits sharing, funding strategy and facilitated access which do not tolerate restrictive practices should be encouraged, with a view to ensuring global food security and sustainable agriculture. We are not against incentives whatsoever, but we believe that incentives should be rational and considerate in all measures.

Finally, I would like to extend our appreciation to all parties, including the Chairman, who have participated in this process for the last seven years.

Javad MOZAFARI (Iran, Islamic Republic of)

I would like to bring two particular concerns to the attention of the House, however, before that I would like to extend my appreciation and gratitude to all those who have worked hard for this undertaking to conclude these negotiations, in particular, those countries who have organized different negotiation meetings, specifically the Government of Italy that organized the last two or three. I would also like to express my gratitude to all those who have worked very hard in FAO, specifically the Secretariat of the Genetic Commission, to arrange all these negotiations.

My two particular concerns are: firstly, regarding article 13.3b. With the way that this article is formatted now there is a big concern that it might lead to the drainage of the plant genetic resources put into the System by the countries who provide the plant genetic resources. This drainage might lead to keeping the generated plant genetic resources that are in the System, out of the System. This is due to the rigidity of the IPR issue in that article.

I would like to place this on record, and warn all the participants about this issue. This should be taken into account at the Conference, and improved. According to our understanding this might lead to the drainage of the plant genetic resources out of the system as keeping away from those who have provided the genetic resources for the system.

The second particular concern is regarding the relationship between this Treaty and other international agreements. This agreement is unique in itself and requires the autonomy and independence of it. It requires to stand on its own. Unlike other agreements, in this agreement one side is the provider and the other side, or the other parties, are users. In providing this fact it is very important to formulate the stand of this Undertaking in such a way that it does not become a subordinate to any other international treaties.

I would like to bring these two important points to the attention of the House and my delegation would like to see this treaty as an independent Treaty which stands on its own.

Sra. Elsa Diana Rosa KELLY (Argentina)

Le ruego me disculpe por pedir la palabra nuevamente, no era mi intención hacerlo y no quiero detener la sesión. Con sorpresa, he escuchado una declaración del Representante del Grupo Europa vinculada a un párrafo del preámbulo que negociamos, yo diría en buena fe, por lo menos de parte de las personas que hicieron concesiones monumentales. Todas aquellas personas que queríamos ver en el texto del Tratado una cláusula de salvaguardia tuvimos que movernos de nuestra posición para aceptar, no solamente de sacar ese artículo del texto sino llevarlo al preámbulo, que todo el mundo sabe que no es tan operativo como puede ser el texto de un Tratado, aunque pueda de alguna manera servir para la interpretación del mismo. Hemos negociado, también, con mucha claridad, palabra por palabra, esos tres párrafos que se incluyen en el preámbulo vinculados con la cláusula de salvaguardia. Volver ahora a replantear en Plenaria los acuerdos que hemos alcanzado en buena fe, repito en buena fe, representa una actuación que jamás en mis treinta y más años de actuación profesional en negociaciones multilaterales, había visto antes.

Por cierto, mi delegación se va a oponer y hasta diría con indignación, ha que puedan volver a discutir los textos ya acordados definitivamente por los participantes del Grupo Ampliado.

Modesto FERNÁNDEZ DÍAZ-SILVEIRA (Cuba)

Quiero reiterar el reconocimiento expresado por mi delegación al trabajo del Señor Embajador Fernando Gervasi . Al mismo tiempo reiterar que sea él quien presente el Informe a la Conferencia de la FAO que se celebrará a continuación de este Consejo.

Además de esta reiteración, permítame hacer un comentario apoyando a la delegación de Brasil en su planteamiento muy claro en que no debemos incluir ningún nuevo elemento en este Tratado, como ha sido la línea que hemos seguido desde el comienzo de los trabajos del Grupo de Trabajo que se constituyó.

Le ruego que considere la posibilidad de otorgar más tiempo a la negociación, para un último esfuerzo dirigido a mejorar aún más el texto del Tratado, eliminando los corchetes existentes. Como ha sido mencionado por algunos oradores que me precedieron, hemos estado haciendo esfuerzos en este sentido y somos optimistas en que podremos avanzar al menos un poco más y poder presentar a la Conferencia de la FAO un texto más limpio, que haga honor a la ardua labor que ha tenido el Grupo de Trabajo con todas las Delegaciones.

Quisieramos, a nombre de la delegación de Cuba, reconocer el trabajo de toda la Secretaría de la Comisión de Recursos Genéticos, pero muy especialmente el trabajo que ha desarrollado el Profesor José Esquinas Alcázar durante muchos años al frente de la Comisión y que gran parte de los éxitos que podamos alcanzar, se lo debemos a él y al trabajo de la Secretaría.

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

Mrs Neela GANGADHARAN (India)

I would like to support the statements made by Brazil, Colombia, Islamic Republic of Iran and other developing countries on the issues relating to the list of crops and introduction of new texts. We feel that at this stage we would like to go forward with what we have in hand. It would be very unfortunate if we are to have a list of crops in brackets attached to the Treaty or put the agreed list of crops in the next one into brackets. I think we would be very unhappy with this.

We just want to briefly point out that the entire agreement, or the entire treaty, is delicately balanced on access and beneficiary. Therefore, when we are asked to be flexible on the access, we have to have the same approach towards the beneficiary. For countries like ours, issues relating to IPRs are very critical. We would be very distressed with any provision that restricts access or research in PGRFA under the Multilateral System because of their ambiguity in the articles relating to IPR.

Sitdhi BOONYARATPALIN (Thailand)

I too would like to join the previous speakers in thanking Ambassador Gerbasi for his excellent work. My country attaches great importance to the International Treaty.

Let me brief you on what is happening to the genetic resource of rice. Today, my country, together with the farmers, are protesting that genetic resources of jasmine rice were taken away from my country to the United States. The United States rice researchers are now improving the jasmine rice originally from Thailand. Now, the question is who is the owner of this new variety? What happens if the rice researcher patents this new variety originated from Thailand? This is one of the examples of what happens and I therefore urge all Members to finalize this Treaty as soon as possible.

Audunn ATLASON (Iceland)

I would kindly ask you to give the floor to Norway.

Jan BORRING (Observer for Norway)

In my first intervention I forgot to do what another delegate did, namely to thank Mr Esquinas for his extremely hard work during all these years.

I have two comments. One is on the savings clause or the preamble language. We agree in the European region with Argentina that this is difficult, it is very sensitive and we made a lot of efforts. We think we made a lot of progress and we are probably extremely close to a solution that we can all live with. I think, in fact, in the small Drafting Group under the leadership of Mr Gerbasi, we basically agreed to what the problem really was. We agreed that it was a question of finding the wording.

However, we did make a reservation in the debates and that was because some countries of our Region simply, at the moment, do not have a mandate to accept this text. Not all countries were represented in the Drafting Group. The reason we are now suggesting language in brackets is because we want to find a solution that everyone can agree to. The alternative would be to have a situation where some countries could be forced to just have the choice of saying yes or no, and this is in fact the case. Some countries might have to face that choice and that would be quite a difficult choice which would have very negative effects for our negotiations. We would rather strive to finding a solution very close to the one we have, which we can all live with.

Secondly, a few words on the list issue. I really object to some of the things which have been said about this being a situation where the world is simply divided into two parts, where one part provides genetic resources and the other receives and makes profits on benefits. This is simply not the case. All recent scientific material shows the importance for all regions of this interchange of genetic material.

As we have pointed out in the Negotiating Group, in fact, the main losers are not putting a lot of the Annex E crops as well as the tropical forage crops on the list of Annex 1, would not be the developed countries of the north. We would not notice it. We would have no reduced benefits whatsoever. The only losers would be the food-insecure populations in the poorest countries, so I think we really have to be quite frank about this and face realities. This is why our Region is extremely disappointed that we have not even been able to discuss putting some crops, which are only of value at the present for developing countries on the list. We have not been able to have a real substantial discussion on those crops as to whether we could put them on the list. This is the rationale behind our now submitting Annex E, as well as the tropical forages, for being bracketed and sent to the Conference.

Simon HEARN (Australia)

I would simply like to have your indulgence to take the floor again, firstly, from the point of view of my delegation, to give the utmost support to Argentina and Brazil in questioning this very late and, in my view, inappropriate attempt by the European Region to introduce brackets on text that has been negotiated in goodwill and language which has also been worked on in sometimes difficult circumstances and with very good leadership from Ambassador Gerbasi.

This goodwill that I refer to has been reflected here in this chamber today. Of course, there are some differences between delegations but differences will always be there. It is on the basis of goodwill that we move forward in FAO and I think this is an example. I have seen expressions of goodwill around this chamber several times.

I do ask the European Region that if they wish to have one rule for one Region and another rule for another Region, that it runs the risk of damaging goodwill and I do plead to them not to do that.

Krassimir KOSTOV (Observer for Bulgaria)

I ask for the floor, in the first place, to express profound professional and personal admiration for all the colleagues from the Member Nations and from the Secretariat who negotiated this Treaty and, in particular, to the extraordinary Chairman of the negotiating body, Ambassador Gerbasi.

The negotiating body had finished its work and is presenting it to us and the Council now. It is for the Council to complete another stage of the elaboration of this Treaty. Tomorrow the Conference begins, during which we shall make the final decision.

I would like to apologize to those of you that might remember a situation in this very room, at the time of the previous Conference. Please do not perceive me as a kind of specialist on brackets, but I have a problem with brackets in international treaties. That is why I would like to ask the Legal Counsel to clarify to us the procedure and the possible mechanism, at the appropriate time during the Conference, to deal with the bracketed text in the Treaty and eventually with the Resolution which is to be adopted by the Conference, and what could be the way to deal with the concerns expressed by a number of Member Nations at this moment, Member Nations who participated with extraordinary goodwill in this historic negotiation.

I request the Legal Counsel for this clarification in order not to say some day, as the Russian poet Pushkin's hero said: "Happiness was so close, so possible."

EL ASESOR JURÍDICO

Creo que he entendido la pregunta: ¿Qué habría que hacer si llegara un texto entre corchetes a la Conferencia? En este caso habría que encontrar un método para quitar los corchetes puesto que la Conferencia aprueba un texto determinado, que debe ser claro y establecido. Como saben, las decisiones sobre los acuerdos y las convenciones bajo el Artículo 14 de la Constitución se hacen por mayoría de dos tercios. De todos modos tiene que ser una decisión sobre una propuesta concreta, sobre un texto establecido. De modo que hay que encontrar un método, que depende del Consejo y de lo que la Conferencia proponga, para conseguir que el texto esté determinado.

Ms Elizabeth M. MATOS (Observer for Angola)

My delegation would like to add its voice to the many distinguished delegates to Council who have paid their tributes to Chairman Ambassador Gerbasi.

We would like to express our most sincere thanks for his patience, his skill and perseverance in leading us to completing the text of this important International Treaty.

We would also like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Secretariat of the Commission, especially to Mr Esquinas. We would also like to express our gratitude to those countries who, so many times, have supported the participation of representatives from developing countries to be able to participate in these negotiations. Without their support, we would not have been able to.

None of us expected at the beginning of this process that it would take seven long years to come to this stage. Our delegation now warmly supports the presentation of this text to Conference, by Chairman Ambassador Gerbasi.

Much has been said concerning the list of crops to the Annex to this Treaty. We are confident that with the implementation of the Treaty, the implementation of benefits-sharing and financial mechanisms of this Treaty, that the list of crops covered by it may soon be increased.

Percy Wachata MISIKA (Observer for Namibia)

The Namibian delegation takes this opportunity to join those who spoke before us in congratulating and commending His Excellency, Ambassador Gerbasi, for having steered this boat through the troubled waters of the past seven years.

Namibia has participated in many of the sessions that dealt with this highly sensitive and contentious issue. At those sessions, we were always imbued with Ambassador Gerbasi's sense of

duty, his unwavering spirit of dedication, tolerance and perseverance, for which we had great admiration.

The Treaty before us is a result of Ambassador Gerbasi's hard work, of course in collaboration with the Members of the Committee which he chaired. It may not be the ideal Treaty that we may all have wished to see. However, appreciating that this Treaty deals with such a sensitive issue, it is our sincere hope that Member Nations will demonstrate a spirit of flexibility and a compromise and be able to live with at least those clauses of the Treaty that have been agreed upon by consensus in the Working Groups.

Of course, some clauses still remain bracketed. This should not discourage us from moving ahead. Instead, Member Nations should view these as challenges that beckon us to re-double our efforts and commitment in striving towards a compromised consensus.

With regard to cause for adding new clauses or new brackets to the already agreed-upon text of the Treaty before us, we urge Member Nations to be considerate and demonstrate a spirit and principle of consensus. There has been no consensus on these issues that we are being requested to include. Of course, this does not mean that they are not regarded as consensus. In our view, they could be or they might be, or else those proposing them may not have raised them. However, it is our strong belief that they may be noted for the record, for consideration in future negotiations, but asking for them to be included now is going too far.

Mohamed Said Mohamed Ali HARBI (Observer for Sudan) (Original language Arabic)

Sudan has also followed the efforts that have been deployed by the Africa Group and the Near East Group regarding the International Undertaking. We do appreciate the strenuous efforts that have been made by all the experts in the countries of those regions.

In particular, I would like to thank experts from the Africa Region, and Islamic Republic of Iran and Syria from the Near East. The Islamic Republic of Iran and Syria have actively participated in the negotiations that led to this positive result. We think that we have almost achieved our goals. We thank His Excellency, Ambassador Gerbasi, for the efforts that he has made in the work of this International Undertaking and, indeed, it is thanks to his wise leadership that we have achieved these positive results. We would also like to thank the Secretariat.

CHAIRMAN

I thank you very much for a very intensive and constructive debate. We have been working on this very important item for so many years and, as the delegate from Bulgaria said, we are almost there but we are not there yet.

This is the twenty-sixth hour of the day and I see no possibility, actually, to remove brackets and come to the Conference with a really clean text. The only thing that we can conclude is that the report of Ambassador Gerbasi will go to the Conference and will be presented by him. It is then up to the Conference to continue working on it.

We appeal that it is high time we had such an important agreement on the access and the system of plant genetic resources for the sake of going toward food security for all of us, but this is the situation we are in.

It is very sad but this is what we can do until now. The only thing we can say is that we have to thank Ambassador Gerbasi and all those who have been working very hard on this, including, of course, Mr Esquinas.

Sra. Elsa Diana Rosa KELLY (Argentina)

He tomado nota de un pequeño error que existe en el texto en español, porque en el artículo 2 al definirse "*conservaci. n ex situ*" y más abajo vuelve a decir "*conservaci. n ex situ*" cuando creo que debía decir "*colecci. n*".

The meeting rose at 12.15 hours
La séance est levée à 12h15
Se levanta la sesión a las 12.15 horas

COUNCIL CONSEIL CONSEJO

<p>Hundred and Twenty-first Session Cent vingt et unième session 121^o período de sesiones</p>
<p>Rome, 30 October – 1 November 2001 Rome, 30 octobre 1 novembre 2001 Roma, 30 de octubre - 1^o de noviembre de 2001</p>
<p>SIXTH PLENARY MEETING SIXIÈME SÉANCE PLÉNIÈRE SEXTA SESIÓN PLENARIA</p>
<p>1 November 2001</p>

The Sixth Plenary Meeting was opened at 1.30 hours (2 November)
Mr Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Independent Chairman of the Council, presiding

La sixième séance plénière est ouverte à 1 h 30 (2 novembre)
sous la présidence de M. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Président indépendant du Conseil

Se abre la sexta sesión plenaria a la 1.30 horas (2 de noviembre)
bajo la presidencia del Sr. Sjarifudin Baharsjah,
Presidente Independiente del Consejo

**ADOPTION OF REPORT
ADOPTION DU RAPPORT
APROBACIÓN DEL INFORME**

CHAIRMAN

I call the Sixth Meeting of the Hundred and Twenty-first Council Session to order. May I kindly invite all delegates to ensure that they have before them the various parts of the report which the Council is called upon to adopt.

There are ten parts, numbered consecutively from CL 121/REP/1 to CL 121/REP/10.

I think we should give the Council time to look at this and please again ensure that you have all parts of the Report.

I should now like to ask Mr Nahi Al-Shibani, who chaired the Drafting Committee, to introduce the Draft Report.

CHAIRMAN, Drafting Committee (Original language Arabic)

First of all, I am duty bound to apologize to you for the delay in the work of the Drafting Committee.

We have all worked strenuously and arduously. However, because of the nature of the issues before the Drafting Committee, it was not possible for us to finish our work earlier. The Drafting Committee met three times, yesterday and today as a whole. It reviewed the Draft Report submitted to it. It examined all the paragraphs in full seriousness. We have all worked with a deep sense of responsibility with one objective in mind, that is to faithfully reflect the debates that took place in the Council and the decisions taken therein.

In this context, I should like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the Members of the Committee who worked strenuously during those meetings. I wholeheartedly thank the Secretariat for the services it rendered to the Members of the Committee, and I address my thanks also to the teams of simultaneous interpreters.

We have prepared the Draft Report requested of us. It is in your hands and it has been adopted with full consensus by all Members of the Drafting Committee. I hope it will be agreed upon by the Council.

**DRAFT REPORT - PARTS 1 -10
LE PROJET DE RAPPORT – PARTIES 1 - 10
EL PROYECTO DE INFORME, PARTES 1 - 10**

CHAIRMAN

Thank you very much, Mr Nahi Al-Shibani.

The Drafting Committee has worked very long hours to prepare the Draft Report. It examined all the issues in detail. I wish to thank you and to acknowledge the hard work of all the Members of the Committee.

It seems to me that the result is a Draft Report which has been skillfully put together in order to achieve a final balanced text which is generally acceptable to all.

I would therefore like to ask the Council whether, in the light of this, we could adopt the Report *en bloc*. Of course, we recognize that the text may not be completely satisfactory to all Members. Accordingly, if the Report is approved *en bloc*, those Members wishing to take the floor may do so and their comments will be reproduced in the Verbatim Records of this meeting.

Do I see comments from the floor?

TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original language Chinese)

The Chinese delegation would first of all like to thank the Chairman of the Drafting Committee and we would also like to thank all the Members of the Group.

Yesterday and today, they have really put in an unstinting effort and we wholeheartedly agree with the Chairman when he says that this Report can be approved *en bloc*.

The Chinese delegation believes that, in the sixth part of the Report, that is CL 121/REP/6, paragraph 5, the discussion is not entirely correctly reflected here. Now, at the time of the discussion in Council, the majority of Members did not take the floor against the Scale of Contributions. Some Members asked the Secretariat to make other considerations on the Scale and to ensure that this issue was raised at the Conference.

If you will allow me to, let me say that we would like to amend or correct paragraph 5, as follows. I can submit a text in writing. That being so, China would approve the adoption *en bloc* of the Report.

Sra. Lilia ROMERO PEREIRA (Paraguay)

Pido la palabra para el Representante de Venezuela, Embajador Gerbasi.

Fernando GERBASI (Observador de Venezuela)

Ante todo, permítame agradecer al Sr. Representante de Siria, Presidente del Comité de Redacción, por este excelente Informe. Quería referirme solamente al documento REP/10 relativo al Proyecto de Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos e introducir una pequeña enmienda en el párrafo 1 para reflejar adecuadamente lo que dije en el informe que presenté esta mañana y que creo es de utilidad para las decisiones que pueda tomar la Conferencia.

En la primera oración de este párrafo se dice que "el Embajador Gerbasi, que había presidido el Grupo de Trabajo de Composición Abierta establecido por el Consejo para...", quisiera tomar una frase de la segunda oración y decir entonces "para negociar las cuestiones pendientes que se mantenían entre corchetes y continuar en el texto del Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos revisado (titulado etc. etc.)". Con esta enmienda sugiero además eliminar la segunda oración que dice: "observó que el mandato de este Grupo de Trabajo que había consistido en...". Entonces el primer párrafo diría: "el Presidente de la Comisión sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura, Embajador Gerbasi, Venezuela, que había presidido el Grupo de Trabajo de Composición Abierta establecido por el Consejo para negociar las cuestiones pendientes que se mantenían entre corchetes en el texto del Compromiso Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos revisado (titulado Tratado Internacional sobre los Recursos Fitogenéticos para la Alimentación y la Agricultura) informó de los resultados de su labor. Expresó su satisfacción por haberse eliminado todos los corchetes, etc.". Pasaré el texto a la Secretaría para una mejor evaluación.

Mrs Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)

I apologize for my slow reaction but I wanted to clarify what the distinguished delegate of China said. Did I understand correctly that he is proposing alternate text for paragraph 5 of CL 121/REP/6, that he would propose to have inserted into the Report of Council? If that is the case, may we hear that text?

TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original Language Chinese)

We would like paragraph 5 to read as follows. "The Council decided to submit the Scale of Contributions in document CL 120/15-Add.1 to the Conference for discussion and adoption."

Ms Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)

I certainly appreciate having an opportunity to hear that text. This is a different paragraph from what we have before us, which I understand was the agreed conclusion of the Drafting Committee. I am not sure what to make of this, to tell you the truth.

CHAIRMAN

China does not have any objection to adopting the report *en bloc* with the amendment.

Juan NUIRY SÁNCHEZ (Cuba)

Quisiéramos en primer lugar felicitar y agradecer a nuestro colega de Siria por su paciencia y responsabilidad al frente de esta compleja misión, así como a los miembros del Comité de Redacción por su larga y ardua labor.

Como Presidente del Grupo de los 77 y en su nombre respaldo lo expresado por el Embajador Gerbasi y una vez enmendada su petición finalmente solicito aprobar en bloque este importante informe.

Masato ITO (Japan)

On behalf of the OECD Group, I would like to propose that the Council adopt the Report *en bloc*.

Ms Lucy TAMLYN (United States of America)

We too would support adoption *en bloc*, but I must seek a clarification on whether we would be adopting the original paragraph 5, or the paragraph 5 as amended by the delegate of China.

CHAIRMAN

The speakers Ambassador Gerbasi, another speaker, Cuba and Japan referred to the original text before the proposed was amendment by China. I am now asking China if we may insert this comment in this Verbatim Records and adopt this report *en bloc*.

TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original language Chinese)

The Chinese delegation would not like to prolong this meeting. This delegation only wishes to point out that paragraph 5 did not reflect the discussion of the Council.

In order to fully reflect the discussion of the Council and truly reflect what has happened, we believe it is necessary to amend this paragraph 5. If the United States feels that there might be difficulties in accepting this proposal, we could put forward another formula.

CHAIRMAN

The suggestion from the Chair is that we adopt the Report *en bloc*, and then your comment on paragraph 5 of REP/6 will be on the Verbatim Records, if that is agreeable with you.

TANG SHENGYAO (China) (Original language Chinese)

In the spirit of cooperation, this delegation would agree with the suggestion of the Chairman.

Paul LUU (France)

Pourriez-vous, s'il vous plaît, donner la parole à la Belgique.

René POISMANS (Observateur pour la Belgique)

Au nom de la Communauté européenne et de ses Etats Membres, nous vous annonçons que nous sommes prêts à adopter ce rapport en bloc.

Toutefois, nous souhaiterions émettre deux remarques sur le rapport qui nous est présenté. Tout d'abord, le paragraphe 3 du document 10 indique tout au début, en anglais, "the concern was expressed". Ces mots ne reflètent pas la réalité des débats, car plusieurs pays de plusieurs Régions ont considéré fermement que certaines des principales cultures vivrières jouant un rôle important

pour la sécurité alimentaire n'étaient pas reprises dans la liste des espèces cultivées à l'Annexe 1, et que cette liste devait être élargie. D'autre part, nous souhaitons souligner qu'il avait été mentionné que cette liste de cultures devait être étendue en reprenant la liste des cultures de l'Appendice E du Rapport de la Sixième session extraordinaire de la Commission des ressources phytogénétiques, qui s'est tenue à Rome en juin de cette année.

CHAIRMAN

All comments will be reflected in the Verbatim Records.

Sra. Lilia ROMERO PEREIRA (Paraguay)

Me gustaría saber si en la propuesta presentada para aprobar en bloque también están respetadas las enmiendas que propone el Embajador Gerbasi.

Brad FRALEIGH (Canada)

We agree to adopt the Report *en bloc*. I asked for the floor on a purely secretarial detail. In document REP/10 in paragraph 4 there is a term that is capitalized which should be in small case. It is the term on the sixth line of paragraph 4 "intellectual property rights" should be with small letters, and not capitals. We agree with the amendments and the clarifications brought by Ambassador Gerbasi, and we would like to thank the other Members of the Drafting Group and its Chair, and you, yourself, Mr Chairman, for their patience and the success achieved.

DRAFT REPORT - PARTS 1 – 10, approved

LE PROJET DE RAPPORT – PARTIES 1 – 10, est approuvé

EL PROYECTO DE INFORME, PARTES 1 – 10, es aprobado

Applause

Applaudissements

Aplausos

CHAIRMAN

We have had a very intensive session of the Council and I would like to thank all the Members of the Secretariat for their constant support over the past four years.

The Hundred and Twenty-first Session of the Council is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 2.00 hours

La séance est levée à 2 h 00

Se levanta la sesión a las 2.00 horas