

**Ex-post Evaluation  
of the STDF Project  
STDF/PG/401**

**TRAINING OF PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY  
EVALUATION (PCE) FACILITATORS**

**Evaluation report  
March 2021**

**Evaluator:**

**Lois Ransom<sup>1</sup>  
Canberra, Australia  
T +61466327114  
loisransom@yahoo.com**

---

<sup>1</sup> See page six (box 1)

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	4
<b>2. Introduction</b>	5
<b>3. Methodology</b>	7
<b>4. Findings and analysis</b>	9
4.1 Logframe analysis	10
4.2 Feedback on training	15
4.3 Relevance	16
4.4 Coherence	17
4.5 Effectiveness	18
4.6 Efficiency	19
4.7 Impact	20
4.8 Sustainability	22
4.9 Other issues	23
4.10 Riskmanagement	23
<b>5. Key findings and conclusions</b>	24
5.1 Project planning, implementation and outcomes	24
5.2 PCE and the IPPC	25
5.3 Facilitators for SPS capacity development	26
<b>6. Lessons learned</b>	27
<b>7. Recommendations</b>	29
<b>8. Where to from here?</b>	32
<b>9. References</b>	36

### Annexes

**Annex 1: Terms of Reference Ex-post evaluation of STDF/PG/401**

**Annex 2: Logframe matrix from final project report**

**Annex 3: Evaluation matrix**

**Annex 4: Key stakeholders**

**Annex 5: List of evaluation questions**

**Annex 6: Implementation of PCE under IPPC Secretariat oversight from 2015 to date**

**Annex 7: Facilitator training - curriculum**

**Annex 8: Assessment of PCE facilitators**

**Annex 9: Results of participant feedback in facilitation training workshops**

## Abbreviations

<b>CAHFSA</b>	<b>Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (RPPO for the Caribbean)</b>
<b>CDC</b>	<b>Capacity Development Committee of the CPM</b>
<b>CPM</b>	<b>Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, governing body of the IPPC</b>
<b>FAO</b>	<b>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</b>
<b>IC</b>	<b>Implementation and Capacity Development Committee of the CPM</b>
<b>IPP</b>	<b>International Phytosanitary Portal of the IPPC [<a href="http://www.ippc.int">www.ippc.int</a>]</b>
<b>IPPC</b>	<b>International Plant Protection Convention</b>
<b>IRSS</b>	<b>Implementation Review and Support System of the IPPC Secretariat</b>
<b>logframe</b>	<b>Logic framework</b>
<b>NPPO</b>	<b>National Plant Protection Organisation</b>
<b>OECD/DAC</b>	<b>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee</b>
<b>OIE</b>	<b>World Organisation for Animal Health</b>
<b>PCE</b>	<b>Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation</b>
<b>PCE tool</b>	<b>Internet based database for gathering and collecting information gathered when conducting a PCE</b>
<b>PVS Platform</b>	<b>Performance of Veterinary Services Platform</b>
<b>RPPO</b>	<b>Regional Plant Protection Organisation</b>
<b>SDGs</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations</b>
<b>SPG</b>	<b>Strategic Planning Group of the CPM</b>
<b>SPS</b>	<b>Sanitary and phytosanitary</b>
<b>SPS Agreement</b>	<b>WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures</b>
<b>STDF</b>	<b>Standards and Trade Development Facility</b>
<b>ToR</b>	<b>Terms of Reference</b>
<b>WTO</b>	<b>World Trade Organization</b>

# Ex-post evaluation of the STDF project ‘Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation facilitators’ (STDF/PG/401)

## Evaluation Report

### 1. Executive summary

This report presents the outcomes of an ex-post evaluation of the Standards and Trade Development Facility’s STDF/PG/401<sup>2</sup> project for training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) facilitators by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The main objectives of this evaluation are to determine the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the project; and the contribution it has made to STDF objectives.

The project aimed to enhance the capacity of countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacities using the IPPC Secretariat’s PCE through a pool of phytosanitary experts trained to facilitate the PCE process.

The evaluation conclusions and recommendations are based on an analysis of outputs and outcomes identified in the project logic framework (logframe). The analysis was informed by a desk study of program and other documentation, followed by semi-structured interviews and email questionnaires to collect information from key people who participated in the project and others with an interest in the project and its outcomes.

Forty phytosanitary technical experts completed the full training program, with 20 lawyers completing several PCE modules including the phytosanitary legislation module. The joint training provided a platform for better legislation to support NPPO operations. Four individuals were validated as PCE facilitators and have been added to a facilitator roster on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) ([www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)) as accredited facilitators.

The IPPC Guide “Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy”<sup>3</sup> was developed and tested through the training program. It has been published and is available on the International Phytosanitary Portal.

This report makes 16 recommendations that are directed at the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures and relevant subsidiary bodies, the IPPC Secretariat, the STDF Secretariat and STDF Working Group and others who may be considering the use of facilitators to assist implementation of capacity development projects. The recommendations will ensure that the outcomes of the project are sustainable and support the use of the PCE as a valuable method for gathering and analysing information for the IPPC community.

A section on ‘where to from here’ looks forward to several ‘future states’ that would be enabled by the outputs and opportunities from this project for the IPPC community. These include commentary on the impact of COVID-19 on PCE processes and opportunities for their innovation, particularly into a virtual training environment, in the ‘new normal’ that will emerge from the pandemic.

This project was well designed, with a clear view of the desired outcomes. It merged internal and external expertise to develop a training curriculum that has been effective in practice, but which also provides lessons for others considering the use of facilitators that would improve the value, efficiency and effectiveness of their training and deployment.

Key lessons are documented in this report. Among them:

---

<sup>2</sup> Project webpage: <https://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-401>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/fr/publications/86077/>

- The use of intensive training at a venue removed from distractions fosters team building and the development of networks within the training group.
- Interactive, best practice adult learning methods that encouraged the contribution of trainee experience greatly enriched trainee learning, and also became a toolbox that trainees could use when deployed as PCE facilitators.
- Selecting technical experts based on their phytosanitary experience and upskilling them as facilitators that optimised the number of trainees assessed as suitable to progress through validation processes.
- The logframe provided a useful structure to monitor project progress, risks and outputs, but could have been used more effectively to review and adapt the project to emerging risks.

## 2. Introduction

The ex-post evaluation of the STDF/PG/401 project for training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) facilitators [2014-17] was initiated by the STDF Working Group following STDF processes. These require a short list of three potential consultants to be circulated to the Working Group and a preferred consultant nominated. Mrs Lois Ransom was selected and contracted for this evaluation mid-2020.

### *About the evaluator*

Mrs Ransom was a senior executive in the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment until her retirement in July 2020. She has over 30 years of experience in all aspects of plant health and protection including applied plant pathology, phytosanitary and crop protection treatments, pest risk analysis and risk management, technical market access, legislation and policy development and implementation. She has led many Australian plant health strategies and participated in many CPM forums including standards setting and implementation-related Task Forces, and in regional activities with the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation, including the position of Executive Vice Chair. She was Chair of both the CPM and CPM Bureau from 2016 – 18 and a Bureau member for five years. She was also Chair of the CPM's Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement for a number of years.

The STDF contributes to increased and sustainable SPS capacity in developing countries to facilitate safe trade. This, in turn, contributes to the country's sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction and food security by helping imports and exports to meeting SPS requirements for trade that is based on international standards and ultimately drives sustainable improvements in SPS capacity and improved SPS outcomes.

The goal of the project was to improve national-level coordination and coherence of plant protection programmes through improved and robust needs assessment and action planning. Enhancing the ability of countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacities should assist their development of a national capacity development strategy, based on government priorities, and engagement with potential donors on projects that address needs and gaps. Targeting capacity development to these priorities will better enable them to participate in international trade of plants and plant products and ensure that trade is conducted safely from a phytosanitary perspective.

This project was initiated in 2012 to enhance the ability of contracting parties to define their phytosanitary capacity through a pool of individuals who are trained to facilitate phytosanitary needs assessment and action planning processes using the PCE designed by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat.

The PCE is a method, supported by process and an on-line tool, to assist a country to self-assess the capacity of its phytosanitary systems, which establishes the baseline for a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy and implementation plan. It is referenced in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 [FAO, 2020] and is arguably a core process of the IPPC community that assists parties to the Convention identify, define and address their capacity needs and meet their treaty obligations. The PCE also provides a consistent approach to monitor the outcomes of capacity development activities actions through repeated evaluations over time. More information on the PCE can be found on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/#a>.

The PCE has been used for many years but completing an evaluation is dependent on the availability of trained facilitators in the IPPC Secretariat. A key driver of this project was to increase the number and availability of trained PCE facilitators and enable more countries to assess and address their capacity needs.

A summary of the project is presented in the following box:

#### **Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) Facilitators (STDF/PG/401)**

**Overall objectives:** To enhance the ability of countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacities and improve national-level coordination and coherence of plant protection programmes through improved and robust needs assessment and action planning, leading to the improved performance of the phytosanitary systems of countries.

**Specific objectives:** To establish a pool of individuals trained to facilitate phytosanitary needs assessment and action planning processes using the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) designed by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat.

**Approved by STDF Working Group:** October 2012. **Commenced:** 1 April 2014. **Original end date:** September 2016. **Revised end date:** 31 December 2017

**Total project value:** US\$1 194 404; approved STDF contribution: US\$734,088. Total expenditure: US\$1 194 404

**Implementer:** International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat

**Beneficiaries:** Initial benefit to individuals who undertook facilitator training and their organisations and, subsequently, countries that completed PCEs using the validated facilitators. Ultimately all countries benefit from an increase in phytosanitary capacity in countries participating in trade of plant-based goods. This project focussed on developing countries.

**Partners:** Centre of Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE) Kenya, National and Regional Plant Protection Organisations that enabled participation of staff in the training program.

**Results:** 40 phytosanitary technical professionals from 36 countries selected and trained on the PCE, together with 20 legal experts; six technical experts and three lawyers trained as trainers; four trained experts validated as PCE facilitators; the facilitator training package improved, tested, available in English, French, Spanish and Russian; training and guidance material developed, used and posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)) and PCE applied in four countries.

The final report of the project is at [https://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_PG\\_401\\_Final\\_Project\\_Report.pdf](https://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_PG_401_Final_Project_Report.pdf). It outlines the project objectives, outcomes and activities, challenges, lessons learned and

recommendations. The project logframe and lists of participants and training materials are appended to the report.

The main objectives of this ex-post evaluation, as per the Terms of Reference (ToR) in [Annex 1](#), are to determine:

- The extent to which the project achieved the objectives and indicators set out in the project documents, with reference to the project logic framework (logframe) in [Annex 2](#)
- The effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the project
- The contribution to STDF objectives on market access, national and regional sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) situation, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as per the STDF Medium Term Strategy for 2015-2019.

This evaluation covers the whole process from planning to analysis, submission and follow-up. This includes the development of the facilitator training program and training of trainers, selection of trainees, implementation of facilitator training, facilitator validation, resources developed and used and ongoing support for PCE facilitators.

It evaluates the project's relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and in doing so, identifies results, lessons learned, good practices, replicable approaches, gaps and needs.

The project developed and used existing resource materials that have wider relevance to the implementation of the Convention. A number of these were developed through the STDF project STDF/PG/350. The outcomes and outputs of this project can be found at <https://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350>. The value of these resources is analysed in this context to validate the investment made by the STDF in this related project.

The evaluation assessed challenges that arose during the project in the context of risk management, lessons learned and good practices.

These findings come together in a number of conclusions and recommendations for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) through its relevant subsidiary bodies, including the Bureau, Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) and Strategic Planning Group (SPG), as well as the IPPC Secretariat, STDF Secretariat and Working Group, AID and donor organisations and the broader development community. They cover a range of matters, including the opportunities, risks, challenges and potential benefits from deploying a pool of trained facilitators to implement SPS capacity development programs.

### **3. Methodology**

The overall approach for the evaluation followed the "Guidelines for the evaluation of projects funded by STDF", which are appended in [Annex 1](#). This included collecting and analysing relevant data from project reports as a desk analysis and validating/supplementing this through questionnaires and interviews with project participants and relevant organisations. The project logframe indicators were used as the basis for evaluating the project.

This report presents outcomes against OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learned. There were updated in 2019 to include 'coherence', which refers to the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution and the extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. A section on coherence has been included in this evaluation report. Information on the criteria can be found at <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/evaluation-criteria-flyer-2020.pdf>.

The evaluation also considered cross cutting issues and suggestions for improvements in addressing gender and environment considerations in planning and implementing similar projects in future.

The Evaluation Matrix in [Annex 3](#) guided the analysis consistent with the evaluation ToRs. It set out the review tasks, main evaluation themes, approach and outputs relevant to the task.

A mixed-methods approach was used to collect and analyse both qualitative and quantitative data. Data was collected from both primary sources (interviews and questionnaires) and secondary sources (programme and other documentation, training materials developed). It reviewed relevant documents from the STDF Secretariat and other sources and used email questionnaires, video, audio interviews and face-to-face semi-structured interviews to collect information from key people who participated in the project and others with an interest in the project and its outcomes.

The ToR outlined key individuals to be consulted during the evaluation. These included:

- PCE facilitator trainers, legal and technical trainees and facilitators that were successfully validated through the project.
- Representatives of the STDF and IPPC Secretariats
- Selected representatives of the beneficiaries (countries that have used validated facilitators to complete a PCE)
- Selected representatives of the other stakeholders and organisations with knowledge and interest in the application of PCE and the application of this project including National Plant Protection Organisations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organisations (RPPOs), capacity development and donor organisations.

The key stakeholders listed [Annex 4](#) participated in the project in a range of identified roles and were approached for feedback relevant to the STDF evaluation criteria from their perspective. Not all stakeholders approached provided the feedback requested as it is some time since the project was completed and even longer since it was planned and approved for funding. However, 29 of the 46 approached kindly gave their time and considered views through email, video, teleconferencing and two in person. They represent a reasonable cross-section of involvement or interest across a range of roles. Additional contacts suggested by the STDF Secretariat were followed up and proved helpful.

The STDF Evaluation Guidelines provide an indicative list of questions which formed the basis of this evaluation and the final report. These drew out information relevant to the STDF evaluation themes including results, impact, coherence, sustainability, efficiency and effectiveness, risks, lessons learned, and opportunities identified. They were supplemented by project-specific and stakeholder-specific questions arising from the desk analysis phase of the evaluation.

All base questions included in email questionnaires and/or interviews are in [Annex 5](#). These are differentiated by the role of participants as trainers, trainees, PCE country contacts, donors, NPPOs and others, and are additional to course evaluation feedback from facilitator trainees that was attached to project progress reports provided to the STDF.

General inquiries were made through several IPPC contacts to assess the reach, use and value of project outputs/resources (training materials and guidance on carrying out PCE) for NPPOs and plant health practitioners globally.

The findings from the desk analysis and participant interviews have been analysed to evaluate the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project and the lessons that can be learned from it. The main conclusions that can be drawn from the findings are summarised in subsequent sections of this report. They cover all phases of the project, from initial planning to implementation and follow-up activities, and are addressed not only to the stakeholders (governments, private sector, etc.) and others involved in the planning and implementation of the



projects, but also to the IPPC community including the CPM and its bodies, the IPPC Secretariat, STDF, donors and development partners.

#### 4. Findings and analysis

The STDF/PG/401 project was implemented over an extended period from late 2012 to the end of 2017 by the IPPC Secretariat, with governance by the CPM's Capacity Development Committee (CDC). A summary timeline is in [Table 1](#).

**Table 1.** Summary timeline of STDF/PG/401 project.

Date	Action
October 2012	Project application conditionally approved by STDF Working Group pending amendment to the project document (to include certain additional elements and revisions)
April 2014	Project commenced (contact between WTO and FAO relating to the project comes into force)
June to November 2014	Call for workshop participants
December 2014	Priority criteria for selecting participants agreed by CDC, personality test element for the application form developed in consultation with CDC
June 2015	160 applicants assessed, 66 participants selected
Late 2015	Training service providers selected
Early 2016	'Train the Trainer' workshop completed
March 2016	STDF Working Group approved project extension
April 2016	Workshop curriculum, agenda and material completed Confidentiality agreement drafted by FAO lawyers
May 2016	Training on the assessment of candidates completed
Late June to mid-November 2016	Five facilitator training workshops completed Facilitator assessment process finalised
First half of 2017	PCE in Kenya, Madagascar, Guinea and Barbados completed
Second half of 2017	Four PCE facilitators validated
End December 2017	Project end date

The five facilitator training workshops were held:

1. In English, 27 June – 9 July 2016 in Ronciglione (Italy)
2. In English, 15-29 August 2016 in Chang Mai (Thailand)
3. In English, 19-30 September 2016 in Ronciglione (Italy)
4. In French, 16-28 October 2016 in Ronciglione (Italy)
5. In Spanish, 31 October-11 November 2016 in Punta Leona (Costa Rica).

In summary, trainees who met the criteria for selection prepared for and attended a two-week facilitator training program run by trainers who had successfully completed the 'Train the Trainer' workshop to deliver the curriculum. Trainees who were assessed by their trainers at the end of the

training program to be suitable as facilitators make up a pool of candidates that can progress through the validation process. Facilitators are validated when they have successfully completed a PCE process under the guidance and mentoring of the IPPC Secretariat. This is based on the view that they will be fully competent PCE facilitators when they take responsibility and carriage for a PCE from start to finish. Once validated as fully competent against the agreed assessment criteria, the facilitators are accredited by the IPPC Secretariat and are listed on the IPP in the pool of PCE facilitators. Validated facilitators who have completed two PCE processes are then able to guide and mentor trained facilitators to validation. Technical trainees are primarily from NPPOs and have experience in plant protection. Lawyers had legal expertise and current or past involvement in plant health or food safety regulation.

The list of technical trainees is at

[https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/list\\_of\\_participants\\_to\\_ippc\\_pce\\_training\\_course.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/list_of_participants_to_ippc_pce_training_course.pdf).

The biographies of validated PCE facilitators is at

[https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/pce\\_facilitators\\_accredited.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/pce_facilitators_accredited.pdf).

#### **4.1 Logframe analysis**

The overarching goal of the project was an improvement in the performance of the phytosanitary systems of countries, as indicated by increased reports of contracting parties showing active participation in IPPC activities and improved implementation of the Convention and its standards. This would be achieved by enhancing the capacity of countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacities as indicated by country development plans adopting strategies derived from PCE, improved budgetary support for phytosanitary capacity development and at least 10 country action plans produced and published. Key to achieving this outcome is the use of competent facilitators to apply the PCE effectively so that the country undertaking the evaluation has confidence in the evaluation outcomes and a clear view of actions needed to address capacity needs.

The proposed means of verification of this goal using statistics and various international trade databases are not particularly good measures given the large number of variables that contribute to trade volumes and values, not least being product to trade and available market access. Analysis of information in the two general surveys undertaken by the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) of the IPPC Secretariat in 2012 [IPPC, 2014] and in 2016 [IPPC, 2017] shows an improvement in contracting party implementation of the Convention and its standards over the four year period measured. This is reflected in the number of countries responding to the survey increasing from 73 to 100. The most used provisions of the Convention are those relating to establishing and operating a NPPO, and standards underpinning the management of imports, exports and phytosanitary certificates. This is presumably in support of the international trade of plants and plant products and potentially as a result of capacity development activities.

Unfortunately, there is no comparison analysis between the findings of the two surveys, which might have explored these points.

A further repeat of the general survey may indicate change, although the lag time between training facilitators, undertaking a PCE and addressing gaps and needs could take up to a decade to realise and will be attributable to other factors than solely this project. As such, the overarching goal of the project should be seen as a medium to longer-term outcome that this project will progress indirectly through its purpose rather than through readily quantifiable direct benefits.

In retrospect, measures of impact and change in a country following a PCE might have been linked to key modules of the PCE such as:

- New laws
- Number of comments on the online comments system in response to feedback from the IPPC Secretariat prior and after the PCE

- Number of postings on the country page on the IPP against National Reporting Obligations in the IPPC
- New organogram of NPPO structures and functions
- Resource mobilisation in the countries
- Active participation in CPM or subsidiary bodies and IPPC fora
- Media and other notifications of changes in trading patterns, volumes etc.

There may have been some improvement in performance of individual countries that have undertaken a PCE with the assistance of a trained facilitator as a result of the project, but this will likely be limited to a small number of areas of operations of the NPPO. Some countries have focused on revising phytosanitary legislation, but this generally takes time to pass through parliaments and enter into law, although will vary with country. The PCE in Nicaragua was undertaken after the project was completed, using one of the PCE facilitator graduates. The new legislation passed into law three months after the PCE was completed.

The SPS Agreement and the IPPC both promote harmonisation of measures for safe trade. The use of a consistent approach to identify, define and apply guidance to underpin phytosanitary measures through the use of PCE provides a solid platform for progressing harmonisation and facilitate safe trade, in line with STDF goals.

Four PCEs were undertaken under the project and a further 16 are completed or in progress (refer [Annex 6](#)) since 2014. A further two PCE are scheduled for 2021. Of the PCE undertaken, 15 have been assisted by trained and/or validated facilitators who participated in STDF/PG/401 workshops. Three national strategies have been developed, with a further 10 in process.

The primary output from this project was a growing pool of validated PCE facilitators that can be accessed by IPPC contracting parties and technical assistance providers. The project aimed to validate 10 facilitators but fell short at only four, largely due to a lack of PCEs requested during the term of the project. The estimate of 10 validated facilitators reflected the number of PCE requests with the IPPC Secretariat when the project proposal was drafted. A number of these were completed by the Secretariat pending completion of protracted negotiations on the final project proposal between the STDF and FAO.

While the goal of validating 10 PCEs as approved facilitators by the end of the project was not achieved, the IPPC Secretariat committed to complete 10 PCEs as soon as possible. As indicated in [Annex 6](#), several PCEs have been completed in Africa and the Caribbean using both trained and validated facilitators, which will increase to eight the number of validated facilitators trained through this project and the number of facilitators accredited by the IPPC Secretariat to 14. The IPPC Secretariat is developing a standard and transparent procedure for the supervision and mentoring of trained facilitators through to accreditation by any of the accredited PCE facilitators, which will increase their number. The roster of experts that has been developed by the IPPC Secretariat is posted on the IPP and being used. A list of PCEs that have been completed is maintained by the IPPC Secretariat and can be found at [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/implementation\\_of\\_pces\\_in\\_countries2020-03\\_12.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/implementation_of_pces_in_countries2020-03_12.pdf).

There is no indication in project reports of the final number of facilitators that would ultimately be trained and validated using the developed training program and resources. This is a question for the CPM to consider and is discussed later in this report. However, these are available to train more facilitators consistent with those trained through this project.

The objectives of the three key project activities were to select and train a pool of professionals on PCE; validate trained experts as PCE facilitators; and improve the PCE training package, test it and apply the PCE in at least four countries. The aim was to make the facilitator training package available in at least 5 FAO languages and update the PCE, also in 5 FAO languages. PCE facilitator

training materials were developed and made available in English, Arabic, French, Russian and Spanish as projected. The PCE was updated in three languages – English, Spanish and French.

The original project proposal included generating a pool of 80 technical experts. A call by the IPPC Secretariat resulted in 160 applicants. These were reduced to 66 by application of the selection criteria, with a further twenty-six withdrawing. A number who applied were from developed countries and not eligible for assistance under the project. The final 60 trainees including 40 phytosanitary technical experts from developing countries and 20 lawyers from a number of countries and organisations including the FAO, met the priority criteria targeting the right people with the right personal and professional skill sets. STDF program requirements precluded the funding of experts from high income (developed) countries and the FAO. The training for lawyers was approved by the STDF, in recognition of the limited capacity that many countries have to implement the PCE legal module and the vital role that regulation has in enabling NPPO actions. A number of interviewees reflected on the value of legal trainees in joint training sessions.

The training program integrated elements of general awareness of the IPPC and PCE modules with IPPC-specific technical knowledge and a range of soft skills including logframe theory and facilitation. Unlike a general training program, trainees required a baseline of phytosanitary experience and expertise on which specific technical knowledge was built to achieve the level of technical and facilitator competence necessary to effectively facilitate a PCE independent of the IPPC Secretariat.

Facilitator trainees were trained on requirements of the IPPC and ISPMs, legislative aspects of phytosanitary systems, the PCE process and modules, as well as on strategic planning tools, facilitation techniques and ethics. Different facilitation techniques used during the training included delivery of presentations, plenary and small group discussions and exercises, individual tasks, a case study and a group simulation of an actual PCE application.

The proposed approach required the IPPC Secretariat working with external experts on communications and evaluation to combine their knowledge and expertise into the training curriculum. Technical experts were trained as trainers to implement the training program. This ‘in house’ approach was used to safeguard the integrity of the PCE by exercising strong control on the content and efficacy of the training program to ensure the competency of the facilitators trained and subsequently validated, and had the added benefit of sharing the experiences of trainers in implementing PCEs with the trainees. In the past, the PCE was fully public. This resulted in a number of ‘fake’ PCEs being undertaken by individuals or organisations that were self-trained or untrained without the full knowledge on how to accurately implement the PCE. This compromised both the outcomes and benefits to the country completing the evaluation and undermined the integrity of the PCE and processes.

The ‘in house’ approach was proposed to avoid this, and elements of the facilitator training program are withheld from publication by the IPPC Secretariat to prevent misuse. Transparency is a two-edged sword. On one hand the STDF expects resources developed through its projects to be freely available. On the other hand, the integrity of the PCE process could be compromised by inappropriately trained facilitators. This report recommends that the security around the training for conducting a PCE and the related processes be reviewed with a view to increasing transparency and access, while adequately safeguarding their integrity.

The ‘in house’ approach to developing and implementing the curriculum was determined by the IPPC Secretariat’s technical team to be the most cost effective, particularly given the costs of bringing in external experts for short periods. Even so, this drew some criticism on the trainer training being provided to IPPC Secretariat staff. It is not clear whether the drivers for the ‘in house’ approach were fully appreciated by the STDF at the time the project was being considered, but it was ultimately approved for funding so was presumably accepted. A hybrid model for future training courses, involving a combination of trained phytosanitary experts and external ‘soft skills’ providers, could be used now that the curriculum and training resources have been developed. With the

imperative to undertake more training in a virtual environment, this approach will become more cost effective. This is explored later in this report.

The CDC acted as project steering committee. It's predecessor group provided input into the drafting of the project proposal and the CDC provided significant intellectual capital as the approved project was implemented. This included the development of a 'personality' test component in the trainee application form and the prioritised criteria for the assessment of applicants. They received updates on the progress of the project until it's end, which coincided with the transition of the CDC to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) of the CPM in late 2017. The CDC made recommendations on several aspects of the project, including for the promotion of the project and its outcomes to the IPPC community and the value of the PCE to the IPPC Secretariat and contracting parties.

The guide to 'Preparing a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy' is targeted to NPPOs and was developed in parallel with this project, which allowed it to be tested and validated before being published. It references the 2015 guide on establishing and NPPO that was developed under the STDF/PG/350 project. The guide is available in English, French and Spanish.

The guide introduces the PCE and takes the reader through the series of steps and analyses that enable a country to translate the outcomes of a PCE into a work plan that establishes an effective NPPO, in line with the priorities and activities of the government of the day. It is useful pre-reading for any country preparing for a PCE and will assist facilitators in their engagement with government officials and stakeholders in the country undergoing the PCE. It would be useful to further develop the guide into a pre-PCE module in the PCE package. Several interviewees referred to the 'value proposition' for the country proposing to undertake a PCE. They felt that defining the outcomes that a country wanted to achieve would help target to evaluation and direct a capacity development strategy with tangible and measurable outcomes that progressed agreed national priorities. The guide could be used as a tool to do this.

Several interviewees mentioned that many of the materials developed under STDF/PG/350 had been usefully integrated into the training and were being used as reference materials. These provide a platform for the consistent implementation of the roles and functions of NPPOs and underpin harmonisation.

Progress in implementing the project was reported to the STDF Secretariat five times over the four-year life of the project and in a final report. These reports identified risks and outlined solutions to them, presented several documents including a confidentiality agreement, assessment criteria for validating facilitators, lists of workshop participants and their feedback on course material and the training experience. As noted, project implementation reports were made at each of the biannual CDC meetings between 2014-17 [see references]. Several other update and progress reports were provided to the IPPC community through regional meetings in 2017 that were coordinated by regional plant protection organisations with the IPPC Secretariat, and at a special session of the CPM in 2019 (CPM-14, 2019).

An online forum was established on the IPP to assist trained facilitators maintain their network and share ongoing experiences. This has not been supported through a lack of Secretariat resources and is not widely used at this time.

Key activities in the project included:

1. Developing the curriculum and training materials, training trainers
2. Developing trainee selection criteria and conducting training workshops, assessing trainees using agreed assessment criteria
3. Validating successful trainees as PCE facilitators
4. Drafting the IPPC guide

The following deliverables were achieved:

- Training materials on PCE facilitation were developed (and made available in 3 FAO languages). Link: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/training-material-on-the-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation-pce/>. The facilitator training curriculum and training materials is in Annex 7. As noted above, some training material has been published on the IPP. Remaining material is accessible through the IPPC Secretariat
- A model format for a national phytosanitary action plan was developed and captured in the guidance material
- A pool of 60 individuals trained as PCE facilitators during workshops. The 40 phytosanitary technical participants from 36 countries who completed the training are listed at [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/list\\_of\\_participants\\_to\\_ippc\\_pce\\_training\\_course.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/list_of_participants_to_ippc_pce_training_course.pdf)
- 20 lawyers from 13 countries completed three to four days of the training with a focus on key PCE technical modules, including the phytosanitary legislation module. They did not participate in facilitation training in the second week of the workshops
- A sub-pool of four individuals were validated and accredited as PCE facilitators according to assessment criteria established in the project
- A roster of PCE facilitators was developed and posted on the IPP [[https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/pce\\_facilitators\\_accredited.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/uploads/pce_facilitators_accredited.pdf)]
- 4 PCEs were facilitated with newly trained facilitators, which validated their competency and their subsequent accreditation by the IPPC Secretariat as PCE facilitators and listing in the Roster
- The PCE Modules were revised in English, French and Spanish
- Trained facilitators were linked with additional opportunities to apply the PCE in practice in order to grow the roster as well as other Phytosanitary consultancy opportunities
- A fact was sheet developed [[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/04/1308302735\\_ippc-pce-flyer-single-page\\_201304232112en.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/04/1308302735_ippc-pce-flyer-single-page_201304232112en.pdf)]. IPP web pages have been updated to include information on the training program and its outputs
- Information on PCE facilitator roster has been disseminated
- The IPPC Guide “Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy” was developed and tested through the training program. It has been published and is available on the IPP in English, French and Spanish.
- A video explaining the project and its outcomes was made available on the IPPC Secretariat channels and projected during CPM-13 (2018) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gh5hdo7gRCE&t=5s>

In addition, some administrative outputs included:

- A confidentiality undertaking for participants to safeguard confidentiality of the information collected when conducting a PCE and any country information provided, and access training materials
- An assessment framework and methodology for validating facilitators was developed by the workshop trainers in collaboration with training consultants. This is in Annex 8.

By enhancing countries' access to the number of qualified PCE facilitators, the project expected that there would be an increase in the number of countries able to evaluate their phytosanitary capacity and presumably take the necessary actions to address any gaps or needs. While the proposed number of validated PCE facilitators was not achieved, the platform for their training and accreditation as validated facilitators has been developed and effectively implemented. The training provides a platform for ensuring facilitators have the necessary experience, knowledge and skills to conduct the PCE consistently and provide countries undertaking a PCE with confidence in the evaluation outcomes. A pool of candidates for subsequent validation has been established that can be used to increase the number of accredited facilitators and replace facilitators who are no longer active. Accredited PCE facilitators are sufficiently experienced that they can now supervise and mentor a trainee PCE facilitator through to their accreditation by the IPPC Secretariat and listing on the IPP. They are also trained phytosanitary experts that may be called on by the IPPC Secretariat, NPPOs or RPPOs to assist with other projects, consultancies or contracts.

The intervention logic for the project was sound and remains so. It is a valid element in achieving the overarching goal of improving national-level coordination and coherence of plant protection programmes through improved and robust needs assessment and action planning but, there are many other factors impacting on this goal and outside the control of the project team. Clearly, project goals and the measures that demonstrate progress towards them should be considered carefully to avoid overstating them and rendering them unachievable.

Did the project fail because it did not produce 10 validated PCE facilitators? The other objectives outlined in the logframe were achieved and the training curriculum and supporting resources were developed, tested and remain available to further use. A pool of trained facilitators is ready to be validated and the projected 10 validated PCE facilitators has been achieved post-project and are available to assist countries undertake a PCE. The validation of 10 facilitators would probably have been achieved if an alternative, equivalent approach to assessing and assuring their competency had been applied when it was clear that the required number of PCEs was not likely to be progressed during the life of the project. At very least, an analysis of alternatives should have been completed and the outcomes/conclusions placed on record. This report recommends that an alternative approach to validation and accreditation of PCE facilitators is developed.

Risk indicators and risk management are considered later in this report.

## **4.2 Feedback on training**

The training program included pre-learning exercises, tests and material including a case study, a guide, methods for assessing the participants and training and e-learning, all of which integrated adult learning concepts.

Responses to a participant survey after each workshop has been collated in [Annex 9](#). They are strongly positive and indicate a high level of satisfaction with the training. The participants reflected that the training improved their understanding of the PCE, its benefits and the important role it plays in phytosanitary capacity development of a country. The participants considered group exercises, a role-play and a case study very useful to understand how the actual PCE facilitation work is carried out. They felt that the training brought together presentation skills and phytosanitary knowledge necessary to facilitate PCE application.

Free comments to questions 12 to 16 of the post-workshop survey identified some issues including the benefit of accessing course material before the workshop; residual English content for some participants in languages; limitations of internet access; and the use of tests and their frequency through the workshop. These issues are relatively minor and can be addressed as appropriate given that the strength of each workshop was the intensity of training with a focussed group, isolating trainers from their day to day work and assessing trainees against the requirements for a PCE facilitator to reinforce lessons.

Participants reported that trainers assisted greatly; the range of learning methods applied through the workshop was useful and appreciated and assisted learning and group learning in the intensive residential environment established community spirit and networks. They found the PCE case study useful and relevant and the presence of lawyers was also beneficial when considering phytosanitary legislation. A number of personal testimonials were received through participant feedback surveys and by email after the events. These have also been reflected in evaluation interviews, with a number of former trainees reflecting that the training not only equipped them as facilitators but has provided them with a range of skills that has benefited their own personal development but has provided an organisational benefit.

Feedback from lawyers who participated in the training was similarly positive with some common observations about the value of selecting technical experts to train as facilitators, the benefits of small group learning with reinforcing assessment and the intensive, residential approach and the networks they enabled. They felt strongly that lawyers would benefit from completing the whole two weeks of training, even though they would not qualify as PCE facilitators. Understanding the role and function of the IPPC, international requirements for phytosanitary management as well as NPPO and country obligations under the Convention made for better legislation. Further, drafting it in partnership with technical experts and through effective engagement with stakeholders, ensures the NPPO complies with international rules and guidelines. Knowing that there is a method that can help to assess a country's phytosanitary legislation needs and understanding how it works was seen as very useful. The material related to the legal aspects of the facilitator training that was developed by FAO legal trainers in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat, continues to be used as reference material.

### **4.3 Relevance**

The objectives of the IPPC are to harmonise measures and prevent the international spread of plant pests and diseases. Contracting parties must have the capacity to implement the Convention and its standards and recommendations to participate in the safe trade of plants and plant products, as well as the conveyances and packaging used in trade of these goods.

The PCE is the primary mechanism by which contracting parties to the IPPC can identify their phytosanitary capacity and capability. It establishes a baseline measure for both and can help the country undertaking the PCE to identify gaps and development needs against the priorities of the government of the day.

Applying the PCE consistently gives the government of the PCE country, stakeholders, the NPPO and ultimately, donor organisations, confidence in evaluation outcomes and clarity on actions needed to address gaps and needs. Using accredited facilitators who have been trained to assist the evaluation process and who, themselves, are technical experts in the management of phytosanitary risks, enables and underpins this consistency. They provide a technical resource to countries undertaking PCEs.

With all PCEs facilitated in the past by the IPPC Secretariat, and recognition that this has become a bottleneck for countries wanting to undertake a PCE, the proposal to train more facilitators was a sound one. Removing the impediments posed by the availability of scarce Secretariat resources was a logical and appropriate step to take. It is unfortunate that the requirement to validate the competency of new PCE facilitators through mentoring from the IPPC Secretariat has shifted the bottleneck, but this should be addressed when accredited facilitators have the experience to take on this mentoring role. Identifying alternative approaches to assess and validate the competency of facilitators also offers a way around this bottleneck and should be progressed.

In addition to establishing a pool of validated PCE facilitators, the project has generated additional value. Documenting training has generated a range of valuable resources, including the guidance on developing a national capacity development strategy, and has promoted the use of technical



resources generated through STDF/PG/350 such as manuals for establishing and operating an NPPO. The training materials on the PCE modules themselves have been used by the IPPC Secretariat when inducting new starters as they provide a good, comprehensive introduction to the IPPC and IPPC Secretariat programs. This could also be used for newly elected members of CPM bodies including the IC and its subcommittees, Standards Committee and its technical panels and the CPM Bureau. They have also been used in other technical phytosanitary capacity projects by FAO.

The focus of developing training based on adult learning methodologies with the input of training professionals has ensured that it is fit for purpose and has the added advantage of demonstrating small group learning and facilitation tools that are themselves useful for the trained facilitators when facilitating a PCE in-country. This was acknowledged as a very useful personal skill set by trainees.

The PCE must be implemented effectively and confidentially to generate useful outcomes. It has been closely held by the IPPC Secretariat to prevent its misuse. The confidentiality of the PCE has been safeguarded in this project through the development of a confidentiality undertaking for agreement by trainees.

The use of the CDC as an intellectual resource in developing the project proposal and as a steering committee ensured that the training was integrated with the IPPC capacity development strategy and priority outcomes for the CPM and IPPC community.

#### **4.4 Coherence**

As noted above, a criterion on coherence has been adopted by the OECD-DAC for the evaluation of development projects but is yet to be captured in the STDF evaluation guidelines. Coherence refers to the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. This includes internal coherence and external coherence:

- Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres.
- External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

The training curriculum is founded on the mission and vision of the Convention and the role and function of the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat to achieve its outcomes so provides a high level of coherence with the Convention, the IPPC Secretariat and the IPPC community. The use of accredited facilitators to assist countries undertake a PCE supports cross-organisation, -government and non-government coordination of the PCE process and should lead to a high level of confidence in evaluation outcomes.

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) uses expert facilitators and technical experts to assess the Performance of Veterinary Services (the PVS Pathway). Faced with similar challenges as the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat in relation to performance evaluation in general and the PCE in particular, the OIE commissioned a think tank in 2017 to map out the evolution of the PVS Pathway. Both the think tank process and outcomes offer the IPPC community valuable insights and options for raising the profile of the PCE process; enabling more country self-evaluation by training evaluators in each country; promoting a regional approach to analysing and addressing capacity needs; introducing rigour into the training of evaluators, ensuring funding is available for developing countries to participate in performance evaluations and ensuring the PCE remains fit for purpose. A useful overview of the PVS Pathway evolution can be found by following this link to the OIE website <https://www.oie.int/solidarity/pvs-pathway/>. Greater 'coherence' or alignment with the OIE PVS

evolution would raise the profile of the PCE and potentially leverage greater interest in the process and what it offers off the back of OIE evaluation outcomes.

Like the PCE, findings are confidential to the country undertaking the PVS, but they are strongly encouraged to share findings to facilitate donor investment in training and capacity development. The OIE is establishing the Observatory of Standards, through which the OIE will be able to better support its Members in their implementation at national level. More information is available at <https://www.report2019oie.fr/en/towards-the-observatory-of-oie-standards/>. This is something that may be relevant and useful to the IPPC Secretariat and relevant CPM bodies for monitoring implementation of the Convention and its standards and recommendations.

As mentioned above, the limited transparency around the PCE process, PCE outcomes and the training of PCE facilitators, albeit for valid reasons, is impeding strong and repeated uptake of the PCE by donors and AID agencies. A range of interviewees expressed frustration that they are not able to view the PCE process and, as such, do not include it in their programs – even where a baseline capacity analysis or needs assessment would better direct investment. They are also not privy to the outcomes of the PCE, which are confidential to the country being assessed. Initiatives like the OIE Observatory could assist, as would awareness training on the PCE for countries and donors and would also enhance external coherence. This should be considered by the CPM, together with any resource implications for contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat.

#### **4.5 Effectiveness**

As outlined above, the majority of project objectives proposed in the project logframe were achieved either during or in the period after it was completed. Many of these were steps towards the training and validation of PCE facilitators, which was the main project outcome.

Several interviewees considered the project innovative and ahead of its time, particularly the use of professional educators to help develop the non-technical curriculum. Moreover, the IPPC Secretariat developed and applied innovative and robust selection criteria to identify the best experts to undertake the facilitation training. This separated this training approach from general, somewhat passive, training undertaken by technical organisations and assured the desired outcomes of facilitator competency were achieved. Several interviewees noted that it is more difficult to transfer technical knowledge learned through years of experience, than operational and personal skills like program planning and facilitation.

While the proposed number of validated facilitators was not achieved during the project term, more are being added as they are able to participate in PCEs. The CDC noted that testing facilitators through a PCE scenario rather than a real PCE would have enabled more to be validated. This was not progressed and the project outcome of 10 validated facilitators was adversely impacted by the low number of PCE applications received and progressed over the last five years. More validated facilitators are nearing accreditation as additional PCEs have been undertaken and there is significant value added to the facilitator's competency through mentoring and practice, albeit subject to IPPC Secretariat resources.

Integrating existing IPPC Secretariat resource materials into the training program raises awareness of them and further embeds their use as phytosanitary capacity development tools. Enabling participation by legal experts will have ongoing benefits as many countries seek to update their legislation in the wake of a PCE. Networks and partnerships between participating lawyers, who attain a better understanding of phytosanitary regulation needs, and phytosanitary technical experts, will improve legislation and ensure powers are applied consistent with IPPC and SPS Agreement rules and obligations on need, technical justification, pest risk and transparency.

The development and application of an assessment method to validate facilitators underpins the consistent application of competency that is repeatable as further candidates progress towards accreditation. The IPPC Secretariat should publish the assessment criteria and competency

requirements for PCE facilitators as the basis for their formal accreditation by the Secretariat. This will ensure that countries seeking an independent facilitator will have full confidence in their ability. [Recommendation]

#### **4.6 Efficiency**

As indicated in the project timeline, STDF/PG/401 was conditionally approved in late 2012 but did not commence until April 2014 under an agreed contract. The project end date was extended by a further year due to delays attributed to the protracted processes for selecting candidates and professional educator service providers who assisted the development of course material and securing venues for the workshops. Aside from this, the project largely achieved the activities and outputs in the initial proposal. As a bonus, the selection of 60 rather than 80 trainees provided savings sufficient for a fifth workshop.

Risk management strategies included identifying alternative service providers and seeking assistance from the CDC on workshop locations. While the selection processes were protracted, their focus on the candidates most suited to becoming effective facilitators has established a pool of experts that is highly competent. This minimised wastage of effort on training unsuitable candidates, although all would have benefited through new skills and knowledge that the training provided.

The intensive training approach of a two-week residential workshop at locations away from major centres and their associated distractions had both economic and training benefits. Per diem costs were reduced as accommodation and food costs could be packaged and economies of scale negotiated to generate savings. A number of trainees commented on the increased interactions they had with their trainers and each other to enhance training outcomes and establish professional and personal networks that have extended beyond the workshop period.

Even allowing for delays, the use of professionals to help develop logframe and facilitating skills content in training increased both the efficiency and effectiveness of the project. This content was not within the general skill set of the IPPC Secretariat, which was able to generate the technical program content.

Several interviewees noted that project costs would have been reduced if participants or their organisations had fully funded their attendance. Only developing country participants received allowances and/or travel consistent with STDF rules, and all separately negotiated the conditions of their absence for training with their employer. There is a balance between cost and securing the right people and the reality that developing countries do not have the depth of staffing to release staff for external training programs. Some participants were able to be funded when they would not normally be supported through STDF criteria through negotiation between the STDF and IPPC Secretariats, and through non-STDF funds.

Some interviewees commented that a number of older trainees were likely to retire and leave the NPPO that supported them. On the plus side, they may be more available to assist with PCEs if not employed by an NPPO and they are more independent. Conversely, they and others may benefit personally as independent consultants who establish themselves as professional PCE facilitators for personal gain. In either case, there is no guarantee that any of the accredited facilitators will be available when requested, and hence the need for a larger list that is actively maintained. These are risks if trained facilitators are no longer available or willing to appear on the facilitator roster. If they are willing and able to do the job, then the project outcome is achieved.

The issue of cost-effectiveness of the project was questioned by the STDF Secretariat given that it resulted in only four validated PCE facilitators rather than 10. Considering the project in three parts – (i) developing the curriculum and trainers; (ii) training PCE facilitators and (ii) their validation through four PCEs and the co-contribution of 40% of the budget from non-STDF sources, the generated legacy of 40 facilitators and 20 lawyers as IPPC advocates and resources available within their country and region, together with the lasting training materials, additional trainers and

promotional materials achieved for US\$734,000 seems reasonable when spread over the 4-5 years of the project. Since only four PCE were to be funded from within the project and the others for validation funded from other sources, the core STDF funds appear to have been spent as planned. The residual validation commitments have been met beyond the project.

A full accounting of the budget and expenditure was accepted by the STDF from FAO on completion of the project.

Additional value would be accrued with publication of training materials, within the security and safeguard constraints to maintain the integrity of the PCE processes and is recommended. Similarly, making the IPPC Secretariat's awareness course content publicly available as a general training module would increase the value from the project. [Recommendation]

Savings might have been made on accommodation costs if cheaper venues were found, although this might have compromised both the participation and quality of the training experience. Identifying countries to host the workshops appears in progress reports to have been problematic and contributed to project delays. It may have been more cost effective to have trained more trainers and conducted training at hubs within geographic regions. This might be an option for the future as accredited facilitators can fill this role.

Splitting the course curriculum to separate IPPC Secretariat's awareness training from PCE and facilitator modules would have reduced the length of any residential component. Breaking up the components would have potentially identified trainees that were unsuited to facilitation earlier and reduced the number of workshops further.

Now that the curriculum is in place and the training program is well practiced, there is likely opportunity to deliver it remotely to trainees in future. There would be a trade off in doing this as the interaction between trainees and their trainers, and the sharing of experiences would likely be more limited, and consideration given to ensuring interactions provide as much value as possible.

#### **4.7 Impact**

The overarching goal of the project was an improvement in the performance of the phytosanitary systems of countries. Measuring progress towards this goal and linking it to project activities have already been discussed earlier in this report.

The impacts of this project on measurable gains on market access, SPS capacity and progressing SDGs through facilitating safe trade will take time to realise and will start with countries who have completed recent PCEs because a validated facilitator became available. However, this is not guaranteed even with the completion of a PCE, as the outcomes of the evaluation are confidential to the country and they may or may not choose to develop and implement a national capacity development strategy.

In spite of this, the opportunity for a country to undertake a PCE is more available, as is the opportunity to use phytosanitary-aware lawyers to progress changes in country legislation through FAO Technical Capacity Projects (TCPs) and other types of projects as evidenced by progress towards new legislation in South Sudan, Togo, Guinea, Fiji, Samoa, Comoros, Madagascar and Nicaragua.

Some countries that have completed recent PCEs, such as Guinea, have been able to mobilise resources to implement aspects of their country development plan and others are being assisted in their development through donors and development agencies. The PCE being undertaken in Nepal replaces an assessment that would have been completed by the World Bank as part of a large development initiative, and so meets a need for both the Bank and the country. If this proves successful, the World Bank may use the PCE as its phytosanitary needs assessment in future.

The multiple PCEs being undertaken in the Caribbean using a small group of facilitators opens up the potential for regional analysis of PCE outcomes. This was attempted in the Pacific some years ago after 14 PCE had been completed. Confidentiality considerations prevented this, even though a

sharing of higher-level needs might have assisted regional training initiatives. This might be something that CAHFSA may be able to facilitate. [Recommendation]

Many interviewees reported the acquisition of valuable individual skills together with personal and career development as a result of the training program. Some reported that they had been able to use these skills in their job and that they had shared their increased knowledge of the IPPC and the PCE with colleagues and stakeholders.

Donor organisations interviewed expressed concerns about the cost of funding a full PCE at around US\$80,000 and the confidentiality of outcomes generally applied by the country undergoing the evaluation that made it difficult for donors to assist in circumstances with a development strategy was not completed. This issue will be discussed further in the report conclusions.

An unexpected reduction in the number of PCEs being requested impacted the ability to validate trained facilitators. The numbers of planned and progressing PCEs are increasing again but have been largely halted by travel restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic has significantly changed the global training and capacity development environment. These may be temporary or ongoing and adaptation will offer both opportunities and challenges.

Virtual and hybrid PCEs are being trialled in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The hybrids had already commenced with at least one face to face meeting in-country. Virtual PCEs will be completed fully remotely. The PCE is not set up for virtual delivery and will likely need adaptation. This might be facilitated by the IPPC Secretariat and a network of the respective facilitators and country coordinators directing the virtual evaluation. The virtual or hybrid PCEs lend themselves to a more modular process – rather than the whole package and would reduce the cost. It may require additional preparatory work to identify the priority outcomes sought by the PCE country and offering the relevant modules. The Guide developed for a national capacity development strategy will assist this process but there may be value in developing a ‘pre-PCE module’ for country coordinators. [Recommendation]

As already mentioned, several interviewees referred to the ‘value proposition’ of the PCE and suggested that a focus on a priority value chain would better engage government and stakeholders in the country during and after the PCE and would direct capacity development investment into tangible and direct investment, actions and outcomes. Further analysis and recommendations in relation to the PCE and its use are outlined later in this report.

The feedback provided by several NPPOs and from others who were interviewed and were or had been NPPO officials on the project was mixed and largely reflected the exposure they had to it and phytosanitary capacity development in general. In general, developed countries were less aware of the project and its outputs than developing countries or RPPOs with members who were still developing their phytosanitary capacity. This is likely due, in part, to the absence of experts from high income countries in the project. A further one or two workshops, or inclusion of experts at their own cost would have addressed this. While efforts were made to include developed country experts, they too experienced financial difficulties that prevented their participation.

Most of the responding NPPOs were aware of the phytosanitary resources available on the IPP and many had referred to specific guidance materials. All agreed, without reservation, that the PCE was an essential tool available to all IPPC contracting parties. The latter position provides a strong platform for future impact from this project. In its considerations of the PCE strategy, the IC noted that the lack of facilitators was an impediment undertaking more PCEs so the process for training and validating facilitators that has been established by this project will enable this impediment to be removed over the next few years.

An NPPO official of a country that had used a facilitator to assist their PCE observed that the facilitator helped supervise the in-country preparations for the PCE and added a level of assurance to the process and outcomes achieved. They were able to accelerate the PCE process and assisted in

identifying stakeholders and facilitating engagement with them. A facilitator noted that sometimes countries looked towards the facilitator for solutions that could take them beyond the facilitator role if they were not careful. Others noted that NPPO experience was useful in framing questions in a way that resonated with NPPO staff and helped them to identify their needs and solutions.

#### **4.8 Sustainability**

Whether a pool of validated PCE facilitators is sustainable over time is dependent on a number of factors. These include:

- Proving the value of validated facilitators over that of the IPPC Secretariat staff in PCEs
- Retaining the list of trained facilitators and maintaining their knowledge and skills until they can be validated through a PCE
- Securing ongoing funding for countries to undertake a PCE. The requirement to undertake a PCE to validate facilitators has shifted the bottleneck from IPPC Secretariat resources to donor funding of PCEs
- Employer support for facilitators to remain on the roster and be released/deployed for PCEs when required. A number of facilitators no longer work for NPPOs nor are involved in capacity development and may not be available
- The need for an update course and/or another full course(s) to top up the list
- IPPC Secretariat budget allocation to maintain training packages, advisory and mentoring support to validated and validating facilitators, promotion of the PCE
- The level of pull through created by countries demanding a PCE
- The positioning of the CPM on the PCE as a core method to assess and address phytosanitary capacity impediments to implementing the IPPC and its standards and allocation of budget resources to achieve this
- The broader benefit to the IPPC community from using the training and other support materials generated by this project
- Modifications to the PCE tool to reduce costs or improve outcomes, potentially through a modular approach or virtual/hybrid application
- Updating the online PCE tool to improve its reliability.

The benefits from this project will accrue for a bit longer, but it is clear that ongoing investment will be required to ensure the pool of validated PCE facilitators remains viable. This can be extrapolated from the list of factors ie. Refresher/top up training, maintaining the numbers of trained facilitators, increasing the number of validated PCE facilitators, demonstrating the benefits of the PCE to maintain the demand for evaluations, reviewing and revising training content and improving the functionality of the PCE tool, improving PCE utility and ensuring it progresses through to national strategies that can be used to secure donor funding and actions to address needs.

Some elements of these ongoing needs are included in the PCE strategy, that was approved by IC in May 2019 [ref. report of IC #4]. However, others are missing and should be considered. An urgent and pressing need is for the CPM to articulate a clear commitment to the PCE as a core IPPC tool that is available to all contracting parties, including clear expectations on how and when it should be used, and ensure it is adequately funded – to ensure ongoing improvements so that it remains fit for purpose and access to accredited facilitators to meet demand for evaluations. Articulating and demonstrating the benefits of a PCE to IPPC contracting parties and capacity development donors is also crucial to drive ongoing demand for PCE and ensure that the evaluation translates into action and improved capacity. [Recommendation]

Opportunities for innovation in applying the PCE need to be actively explored, assessed and implemented. At very least, the PCE and processes need to rapidly adapt to a COVID-19 world. [Recommendation]

The sustainability of the project was likely assessed against considerations in 2012 when the proposal was developed. At that time, there had been a steady stream of PCEs completed and the expectation would have been for more of the same. There was a common understanding that to assess phytosanitary capacity development needs you had to do a PCE. That being the case, the value of a pool of trained facilitators would have been clear and compelling.

The world has changed since then, although the role and recognition of the PCE remains the same. Some recommendations are made in this report to sustain benefits accrued from this project.

#### **4.9 Other issues**

Of the 40 technical experts who are listed as facilitators on the IPP, fifteen are women. More than half of these were selected as priority individuals to progress to validation. Eleven of the lawyers who participated in training were women and six of the nine trainers are also women. This proportion of representation is generally reflective of the participation of women in phytosanitary sciences and NPPOs, although this can vary significantly by country and culture. Since the assessment of candidates for training was weighted to NPPO experience and technical expertise, successful applicants were more likely to be mid-career officials from NPPOs and this is likely to have skewed gender representation more towards men. As women progress through their organisations, this will likely be addressed over time. The development of women within NPPOs through other programs will also assist in this.

The IPPC aims to prevent the international movement of plant pests. It does not generally distinguish between pests of agriculture, social amenity, biodiversity or natural ecosystems – largely because most plant pests cross these boundaries in their search for plant hosts. Some principles and processes supported by the IPPC facilitate safe trade of (primarily) agricultural goods as this is a frequent means of introducing pests to new areas. Additional PCE modules could be developed for environmental pests and ecosystems as they could for food security. This has been flagged in the PCE strategy. However, the base operations of an NPPO, as evaluated by the PCE, do not distinguish between these outcomes and would add little value – particularly for developing countries that are focussed on getting the basic fundamentals right first.

#### **4.10 Risk management**

Project risks have been identified and explored earlier in this report. The logframe documented risks that were mostly related to individual and country interest in being trained/releasing trainees, and subsequently in being used/using the validated facilitators to undertake PCEs. There were valid risks although arguably the risk of countries not wanting to use facilitators being validated by PCE in the project was mitigated by the project funding that support them. Several interviewees noted that the additional cost of a facilitator, on top of the cost of the PCE to the country, and the multiple missions to complete a PCE may provide a disincentive to use an independent facilitator. However, several of the validated facilitators are well known, experienced and respected in phytosanitary circles so this risk will reduce with time as the IPPC Secretariat also reduces its direct involvement in evaluations.

As noted at length in this report, the drop in PCE requests was not identified as a project risk and probably should have been, given the requirement for validation through PCEs. This should have been added to the logframe when it was recognised as a risk and this may have helped drive an alternative validation approach. The final project report recommends that *“The Logical Framework of the project should be revised to take into account the changes in the situation. At project inception and during the project’s implementation period, the Logical Framework should be revised to take into account the actual situation of projects and funds within the implementing institution... The indicators specified in the project document should be closely monitored by the implementing institution in order to anticipate discrepancies.”* There is little evidence through project documentation and reports that the performance indicators in the logframe were applied and reported against. This is unfortunate as it cannot support assumptions on impact and success. The

STDF Working Group might consider whether more attention should be paid to this aspect of project management in future studies since the collection and analysis of data has costs attached to it.

[Recommendation]

A strength of the project that helped identify and address risks before they became an issue was the strong planning processes that ensured the project progressed in line with the logframe. This, together with the significant intellectual capital provided by the CDC ensured that project outcomes were largely achieved.

A number of operational risks and actions were identified through project updates to the STDF Secretariat and to the CDC, which also had an STDF representative observing. These included delays in developing the training curriculum and content due to illness of providers, difficulties in securing locations for the workshops and the extended time for developing the selection and assessment criteria for trainees. While these were addressed by changing the sequence of activities in some cases or wearing the delays and extending the project (at no extra cost), they did not significantly impact the project outcomes. The selection and assessment criteria were considered by a number of interviewees to strengthen the outcome as the most qualified participants were selected and most likely to successfully completed the training.

## **5. Key findings and conclusions**

The key findings and conclusions from this evaluation are presented in three sections, relevant to the objectives outlined in the ToRs. They apply to the project, the PCE and the CPM and the IPPC Secretariat and to the use of facilitators more widely in SPS capacity development.

Recommendations and next steps are consolidated in subsequent chapters.

### **5.1 Project planning, implementation and outcomes**

The project application clearly articulated the goal, purpose, outputs and activities of project. The approach to training and validating PCE facilitators with a high level of knowledge of the IPPC and phytosanitary technical knowledge and facilitation and project management skills was comprehensive and supported by a strong assessment and validation process to ensure the competency of trained facilitators is equivalent to that of IPPC Secretariat staff who facilitate PCEs. The goal aligned with capacity development priorities of both the STDF and CPM, although project impact on the phytosanitary capacity of developing countries is realistically more likely to be achieved in the medium to long term.

The use of intensive residential-style training complemented the strong focus on adult learning and enabled strong connections between trainers and trainees. Since trainees were selected on the basis of their phytosanitary experience and knowledge, the sharing of their personal experiences added significant value in each of the training cohorts.

Course materials are very valuable, both in the preparation of PCE facilitators and more broadly for educating IPPC Secretariat staff, CPM office holders, donors and others on the IPPC, its provisions and obligations, outcomes, standards and programs. They should be made more widely available to raise awareness of the IPPC and as a further platform of common understanding of the Convention leading to the harmonising key elements of its implementation, including standards and measures to facilitate safe trade. [Recommendation]

As discussed above, the need to assess and validate trained facilitators by undertaking a PCE has become a rate-limiting step, although the impact of this requirement is reducing with each PCE that progresses trained facilitators through to accreditation. There is still merit in considering alternative validation processes to overcome this limitation and this should also accommodate any shift to more virtual or modular PCEs in the future. [Recommendation]



There is much of value from this project, in terms of both approach and process. Using the CDC as a technical resource added significant value and rigour as well as ensuring that the project continued to align with CPM capacity develop priorities and objectives.

The logframe visibly connects actions and risks to outcomes and objectives. It could have been used more effectively in this project as the basis for more effective monitoring of progress, risks and performance indicators. The use of logframe approaches may have matured since 2012-13, when this project was conceived, but guidance on the use of the logframe as a monitoring and reporting framework by the STDF Secretariat could be developed, if it does not already exist to assist project leads who are unfamiliar with it. [Recommendation]

In conclusion, the project was innovative for its time and will address a significant barrier to countries wanting to undertake a PCE as the basis for analysing their phytosanitary system and developing a national capacity development strategy to address identified needs and achieve national priority outcomes. There were a number of lessons learned in planning, implementing and managing risks in this project that may be of interest to the STDF Working Group and others undertaking an STDF project.

## 5.2 PCE and the IPPC

The sustainability of the outcomes of this project rests with the ongoing investment by the IPPC community in the facilitators and the PCE process. There is strong support for the PCE as a tool for contracting parties, but it is under-utilised and could have much broader application and impact on directing capacity development to areas of greatest need and in support of country priorities.

In developing the PCE strategy, the IC (Ref. section 8 of IC#3 report) started a conversation on the wider use and application of the PCE that needs further consideration by the CPM and Bureau. Four issues were identified and analysed by the IC. These were

1. A lack of knowledge of the benefits, process and financial aspects of the PCE application among countries, NPPOs and RPPOs – the PCE is poorly understood
2. There is a lack of donor knowledge in the application of the PCE when considering funding of projects
3. The PCE tool lacks regular revision
4. The PCE lacks a process for feedback and follow up on the use of the PCE and outcomes achieved by the IPPC Secretariat and the contracting party that undertook the evaluation.

The IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 [FAO, 2020] refers to the PCE. Section 6.2 of the Framework states that capacity development projects can have a major positive impact on the ability of NPPOs to discharge their responsibilities if their needs are well defined through the IPPC Secretariat's phytosanitary capacity evaluation system and proposes in a key result area that by 2030 *"The phytosanitary capacity evaluation process has been widely used by contracting parties to understand their strengths and weaknesses and develop plans to address capacity deficiencies."* The magnitude of 'widely used' is not defined in the Framework but might be considered by the IC for endorsement by CPM as a way of expanding the use and application of the PCE. This would also inform the question of how many facilitators are needed to service the demand for PCEs.

As noted earlier in this report, the OIE has been down this pathway to evolve their performance evaluation tool and associated processes. The CPM should consider a similar 'think tank' exercise and develop a more comprehensive PCE strategy that will drive the use and application of the PCE as the highly valuable, contemporary tool that it was intended to be. [Recommendation]

The PCE is currently reliant on a few individuals in the Secretariat to maintain it, and this makes it vulnerable if these people were to leave their positions. This risk to the PCE method is being addressed through this project but the online tool that enables the evaluation process is unstable,

slow and a source of frustration to users. If the PCE is recognised as a core tool, as the Framework proposes, the PCE needs investment and resources allocated to fully update and modernise it, including integrating options for virtual application and the IT applications to support them; consider separating modules to enable modular application of the PCE against specific value chains identified by the country; add a module that leads the country through the development of a national strategy and action plans; add any other modules that are considered useful by contracting parties such as border services to comply with the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement or risk-based sampling, review confidentiality and implement controls to safeguard processes and content using contemporary security and intellectual property controls. [Recommendation]

Issues raised by the IC notwithstanding, the extreme confidentiality that surrounds the PCE, its use and evaluation outcomes is a source of frustration for a number of interviewees who participated in a range of roles in the project. While acknowledging that evaluation findings are confidential to the country undertaking the PCE, restricted access to information on PCE methods is impeding its wider use and recognition of the value it can provide.

Some facilitators felt that the confidentiality surrounding the PCE processes constrained their preparations for assisting with a PCE and donors felt very strongly that they could not engage in either the PCE processes with the country undertaking the evaluation or in the development of an action plan based on PCE outcomes. They did not have visibility of the evaluation process and could not apply it as a pre-requisite for investment in capacity development. This prevents the development of a comprehensive development agenda based on critical analysis and an evolutionary development plan that incorporates the priority ambitions and outcomes for the country.

Confidentiality of the PCE is deeply embedded in the IPPC Secretariat. There are valid reasons for this, but it would be timely to review the nature of risks to the PCE and its operation and validate the application of confidentiality now that that PCE has been used for many years. [Recommendation]

If a country chose not to disclose the outcomes of a PCE then they are arguably limiting their value in attracting and directing external AID or other resources to addressing priority needs. The preferred method of reporting is in the national phytosanitary capacity strategy and every PCE undertaken should produce one or it is not recognised as having been completed. Similarly, without some sort of reporting of PCE outcomes and feedback mechanism, even in a desensitised or summary format, the IPPC community could not identify and act to address common development priorities in the form of guidance, manuals and training programs. It might, instead, continue to rely on the biennial 'call for topics' process to identify problems and their solutions. The OIE is establishing the Observatory of Standards, through which the OIE will be able to better support its Members in their implementation at national level. This is something that may be relevant and useful to the IPPC Secretariat and CPM for monitoring implementation of the Convention and its standards and recommendations. [Recommendation]

The IC has recently established a PCE Team that will be responsible for progressing the PCE Strategy. It will need to be assisted in this work by the IPPC community and adequately resourced.

In conclusion, there is widespread recognition and support for the PCE as a management tool within the IPPC community. It is identified as an important process in the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030). However, the PCE and its implementation is under-resourced and needs to be reviewed and revised, as necessary, to ensure it achieves the breadth of purpose for which it was developed and is fit for the contemporary operating environment.

### **5.3 Facilitators for SPS capacity development**

There will be many situations in capacity development and technology transfer programs where the use of facilitators is cost effective and of benefit. However, the factors that impact the sustainability

of the development and use of facilitators should be carefully considered and weighed against alternative delivery models. [Recommendation]

The most sustainable model would be where the process to be facilitated is mandated in some way. This likely increases the frequency the activity and the resultant need to service it from more than a small number of existing, trained experts. The more often the activity is done, the more resources it will attract, but also the easier it is to maintain through continuous improvement of content and processes through practice. The more people providing the service, the more that are available to mentor and train others and collectively establish a supporting network of practitioners.

Facilitated capacity development can improve development outcomes through a combination of push and pull-through processes to achieve an outcome. For example, using a PCE facilitator helps to coach the country coordinator on the process, helping them prepare for the evaluation and enabling PCE participants to complete the needs analysis in a way that secures their ownership of the process and its outcomes. This can be enriched by a facilitator who has strong technical knowledge as they challenge the PCE participants on their phytosanitary processes and ambitions.

Access to trained technical experts who can also facilitate training and achieve development outcomes by spreading the capacity development load to achieve organisational outcomes for both the developer and 'developee' where this is limited by a shortage of facilitators due to human resource constraints.

Not all technicians make good facilitators so an assessment process that applies clear criteria for effective facilitation skills is necessary. For the facilitators with strong technical knowledge, there is a fine line between helping their audience through a process of identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and future directions, risks etc. without being drawn too far into teaching mode – telling the country what to do. Managing the expectations of the country that may see them as development trainers rather than facilitators is something that they must be conscious of and manage.

The assessment process for PCE facilitators described in [Annex 8](#) is both comprehensive and complex. Having been developed with professionals it was technically robust, but with a large number of candidates, it was time consuming and the ongoing testing was difficult for some candidates. However, it is potentially a useful platform for others considering using facilitators in their capacity development programs. [Recommendation]

To be sustainable, and as evidenced by the PCE case study, the training, trainers, trainees and content must be maintained, to ensure currency. This comes at both a financial and staff cost that must be resourced through budget allocation. There must be sufficient drivers for using facilitators and ensuring supporting resources are available to do this. The OIE requires that veterinary services are maintained and improved. There is no such obligation within the IPPC, but there is an expectation that contracting parties meet their Convention obligations and implement international standards. Any countries that are signatories to the WTO SPS Agreement have more binding obligations in this regard.

Ensuring that the process being facilitated is recognised and supported as a core function will enable the allocation of resources to maintain and use it. An 'orphaned' process is unlikely to be sustainable in the medium to long term. [Recommendation]

In conclusion, this project offers some useful insight into one mechanism for training and deploying facilitators to assist the implementation of SPS capacity development. There are a number of considerations that will inform others of the potential value and risk of going down this path.

## **6. Lessons learned**

This project was designed and implemented over an extended period and a lot has been learned along the way by the IPPC Secretariat. Many lessons were captured in the project final report and are listed below. These lessons may also inform future STDF projects, recognising that applying lessons to benefit other projects relies on making those lessons and the context in which they were learned available to others in a way that resonates and engages.

Initiatives that may benefit from lessons learned in this project would include (i) training programs that integrate adult learning methods to develop new skills and (ii) the development and use of technical experts as facilitators to enable an outcome.

This project was well designed, with a clear view of the desired outcomes. It used external experts to develop training materials outside the areas of expertise of the IPPC Secretariat. Finding and selecting external educators took time and the development of course material was, necessarily, an iterative process. With many training service providers available around the world, an alternative model to developing trainers within the Secretariat might have been to form a training alliance that set facilitation skills taught by an external expert, within the technical context of the PCE, provided by the IPPC Secretariat.

Many interviewees cited the lack of access to information on the PCE that is available to them and the overriding confidentiality of the process and outcomes as impediments to the wider use of the PCE. Donors had little or no awareness of the PCE and its potential to identify capacity development needs that they could address through funded programs. The strong controls on the access and use of PCE also prevented individuals outside of NPPOs or RPPOs becoming conversant with the PCE and its potential use, and training as facilitators. The STDF project was directed at developing countries and excluded potential facilitators from developed countries. Assessing the use of contemporary security tools to address integrity concerns in relation to the PCE process, PCE tool, training and deployment of facilitators and PCE outcomes is an urgent priority. It is likely that other organisations have similar concerns and may be able to offer useful solutions or partner in the assessment.

The use of facilitators must be an integral part of progressing organisational goal and it must be appropriately resourced to ensure facilitator skills and knowledge are maintained through ongoing refresher training. Integration will also direct the number of facilitators necessary to service ongoing demand and the resources needed to maintain that pool of individuals.

Using the CDC as a steering committee provided not only intellectual capital to the project development and early implementation, it also ensured that the project remained connected to the core business of the IPPC Secretariat.

Strong governance and reporting requirements will have helped to keep the project focussed as it progressed. While often considered a cost and impost, in this case it has provided a framework for continuity as IPPC Secretariat staff have moved in out of the project and the CDC also evolved its role.

Generating a culture of risk-based review against project outcomes will direct timely adaptation of the project, as appropriate, to changes in the operating environment and ensure the project remains on track and is ultimately successful.

Project-specific lessons identified in the final report that are worth repeating include:

- Selecting a training venue that is self-contained and sufficiently removed from distractions as to keep participants focused on the workshop
- Intensive training, including evening sessions and testing to reinforce learning was not preferred by all, but many commented that this enabled closer contact with trainers and helped to establish a strong network within the workshop cohort
- The training applied interactive adult learning methods and encouraged the contribution of trainee experiences to enrich lessons

- Thorough and engaging pre-learning exercises prepared trainees for their workshop program
- Technical materials developed through the STDF/PG/350 project were integrated into the training thereby gaining further value from these resources
- Drafting the guide to assist development of a national capacity development strategy in English, French and Spanish in parallel with developing and revising PCE course material increased the project legacy and provided an element of the PCE process that had been missing
- A consistent method for assessing participants to evaluate candidates on a fair and equal basis and on a wide spectrum of skills is desirable and should be used for similar IPPC Secretariat activities in the future
- All training material should be translated if time and resources allow it
- The inclusion of legal experts in the workshops added another dimension to discussions and enriched training for both legal and technical expert, recognising that legislation is a critical element in operating an NPPO
- Trainees should be encouraged to continue sharing information and experience through the "PCE facilitators network"
- A web forum provides a support mechanism for a facilitators network and should be actively used to ensure ongoing connections within and between facilitator cohorts
- Using the log frame during the project to monitor, review and revise indicators, risks and outputs as warranted.

The IPPC Secretariat, with the CDC/IC has endeavoured to raise awareness of this project and its outcomes through fact sheets, update web information, promoting the availability and use of trained PCE facilitators, regional workshops and hosting a special session at CPM, in which the project was featured. Feedback indicates that many who need to know are aware of the project – at least to the extent that there are trained facilitators outside of the IPPC Secretariat, who can assist them undertake a PCE. If the recommendation to the CPM regarding the recognition of the PCE as a core tool is progressed, then there will be additional opportunities to consider the outcomes of this project and actions to ensure they are well used and sustained.

The STDF will identify projects that could benefit from the experiences of this project through applications and can direct proponents to the IPPC Secretariat, the IPP, this report and other relevant project material that the STDF Secretariat holds. There may be sufficient information for a fact sheet or advisory information that could be provided to applicants proposing a training activity or the use of facilitators.

The time lag between completion of the project and this evaluation has enabled a clearer view of the application of project outcomes that would not have been evident in 2017. The validation of facilitators has continued and the number and use of them has increased with each PCE undertaken. A number of interviewees contributed insights into the impact of COVID-19 and its impact on travel, on preparing for and undertaking PCEs, and what this can offer in the way of innovation and evolution of the PCE processes and implementation. These are touched on in this report and are considered further in the 'where to from here' section.

## **7. Recommendations**

The following recommendations are drawn from the analyses in this report, so it is best read in full to ensure the context of each recommendation is interpreted correctly.

They are primarily made in relation to the project and its administration as well as the ongoing evolution of the PCE and process for consideration by the CPM, the IPPC Secretariat and the IC, donors and ultimately the IPPC community; and for others, including the STDF Secretariat, who may be considering developing facilitators to implement SPS capacity development.

## **The project**

### Outcome:

The resource materials developed by this project are extremely valuable and should be used more widely to train IPPC Secretariat staff, CPM participants, NPPO staff and members of CPM bodies, donor and capacity development organisations. Training should cover an overview of the IPPC, the international phytosanitary framework including the CPM, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat and NPPO operations with reference to Convention obligations and the implementation of international standards.

### Recommendations:

1. Training materials developed by this project should be published by the IPPC Secretariat, with appropriate security and safeguards to maintain the integrity of the PCE processes
2. The IPPC Secretariat training content should be consolidated by the IC as a general training module for on-line training or for use in training programs by trainers accredited to use it. It should be made widely available to raise awareness of the IPPC and as a platform of common understanding of the Convention that drives harmonisation of standards, measures and implementation for safe trade
3. Training partnerships between technical experts in the IPPC community and expert training organisations should be brokered by the IPPC Secretariat to enable specialist skills training such as facilitation, within the IPPC context. This would be more efficient and control over the technical content would be retained by the IPPC Secretariat.

## **IPPC and the PCE**

### Outcome:

The PCE is the primary means of evaluating phytosanitary capacity and identifying development needs against the rights and obligations of contracting parties to the Convention. It is enabled by a stable, robust and effective IT application and is adaptable to the contemporary operating environments of governments, NPPOs and donor organisations. A national capacity development strategy is the primary output from each PCE and directs actions and investment to address capacity needs of the PCE country. It forms the basis for sharing the outcomes of a PCE.

### Recommendations

4. The CPM should articulate a clear commitment to the PCE as a core method of providing information about the IPPC and for helping to evaluate national phytosanitary systems, including clear expectations on how and when it should be conducted, and ensure it is adequately funded. Articulating and demonstrating the benefits of a PCE to IPPC contracting parties and capacity development donors is also crucial to drive ongoing demand for PCE and ensure that the outcomes of this project are sustained and achieve improved phytosanitary capacity by contracting parties.
5. The CPM should request that the Bureau with the assistance of the Strategic Planning Group work with the IC and:
  - Take a lead from the OIE and with regard to issues raised by the IC, define the evolution of the PCE and capture this in a revised PCE strategy that is prepared for adoption by CPM

- Review and revise confidentiality provisions surrounding the PCE, its use and outcomes to ensure they are relevant and appropriate while optimising transparency of the PCE and the evaluation process and providing options for countries to report evaluation outcomes
  - Develop a mechanism for reporting and sharing the outcomes of PCEs such that confidentiality and sensitivities of contracting parties are safeguarded but intelligence generated from evaluations can guide capacity development options and opportunity at national, regional and international levels. A concept similar to the OIE's voluntary Observatory of Standards may be relevant and useful to the IPPC Secretariat for monitoring implementation of the Convention and its standards and recommendations
  - Upgrade the PCE, including the on-line tool to ensure it is stable, robust and fit for purpose and allocate resources for ongoing maintenance and enhancement. The upgrade should integrate options for virtual application; consider separating modules to enable modular application of the PCE against specific value chains identified by the country; add a module that leads the country through the development of a national strategy and action plans; add any other modules that are considered useful by contracting parties such as border services to comply with the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement or risk-based sampling, review confidentiality and implement controls to safeguard processes and content using contemporary security and intellectual property controls
  - Promote the PCE and the benefits from its use to contracting parties, donor organisations and capacity development providers
  - Establish arrangements, including resources, to increase the number of validated facilitators to meet future demands for PCE as a way to conduct a needs assessment as well as a method to monitor capacity development
  - Direct sufficient resources from the Regular Program Budget to maintain the PCE tool as a core process
  - Review and revise the PCE strategy to integrate CPM decisions on the PCE and future actions to evolve the PCE.
  - Request the IPPC Secretariat to publish the assessment criteria and competency requirements for PCE facilitators as the basis for their formal accreditation by the Secretariat. This will ensure that countries seeking an independent facilitator will have full confidence in their ability.
6. The IC and IPPC Secretariat, with input from PCE facilitators, should review and adapt the PCE and its processes for virtual delivery. This would be informed by virtual and hybrid (part virtual - part face-to-face) PCEs that are being trialled in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The virtual PCE should be modular and include a new 'pre-PCE' module to guide countries through a process of defining priority and targeted outcomes as the value proposition that the national capacity development strategy will achieve. A project to develop and implement a transition plan, based on this network of facilitators and current experiences, is both timely and warranted. It might also be informed by this report.
  7. Similarly, opportunities for innovation in applying the PCE need to be actively explored, assessed and implemented by the PCE Team. At very least, the PCE and processes need to rapidly adapt to a COVID-19 world.
  8. The PCE facilitator training may need to be adapted for remote learning. However, the first priority should be for the IC to consider alternative validation processes that are aligned with but independent of a PCE in order to validate/accredit as many facilitators as possible from the first facilitator cohort.
  9. Options for sharing higher-level needs identified by multiple PCEs undertaken in a region to analyse and respond to address regional capacity needs would be informed by the recent

PCEs in Africa and the Caribbean. A small group of facilitators who were involved in these PCEs should be invited by the PCE Team to share their experiences and recommend a mechanism for sharing outcomes with due regard to confidentiality considerations. This might be something that CAHFSA could facilitate and discuss through the RPPO Technical Consultation forum.

### **Using facilitators for capacity development programs**

#### Outcome:

Facilitators are used to implement capacity development and technology transfer programs where it is cost effective, sustainable and beneficial.

This project and evaluation should provide an insight into the benefits and challenges of training and deploying facilitators. There are a number of factors that impact the sustainability of this approach that should be carefully considered and weighed against alternative delivery models.

#### Recommendations:

10. The drivers for using facilitators, as opposed to other approaches, should be defined and an analysis undertaken by the proposing organisation to determine whether they are the best solution. A benefit:cost analysis might be useful in weighing the up the cost of selecting, training and maintaining a pool of facilitators. If the use of facilitators is supportable for efficiency and is sustainable in the medium-term, the approach taken in this project offers a useful method of developing facilitation skills in technical experts
11. Ensuring that the process being facilitated is recognised and supported by the proposing organisation as a core function will enable the allocation of resources to maintain and use it. An 'orphaned' process is unlikely to be sustainable in the medium to long term
12. Depending on the structure and functions or processes of the proposing organisation, a hybrid model for implementing training may be more cost effective – that is using technical expertise of the program with input and training in facilitation and other 'soft skills' by external providers with expertise in this area
13. A post-COVID world may drive a change the role of a facilitator to more of a mentor or trainer of in-country coordinators of capacity development projects, rather than a 'fly-in' expert and this should be taken into account when considering the benefit:cost and sustainability of using facilitators
14. The assessment process for PCE facilitators described in [Annex 8](#) is both comprehensive and complex. Having been developed with professionals it was technically robust, but with a large number of candidates, it was time consuming and the ongoing testing was difficult for some candidates. However, it is potentially a useful platform for others considering using facilitators in their capacity development programs.

### **STDF Working Group and Secretariat**

#### Outcome:

Contemporary project management tools ensure projects integrate best risk management practices for monitoring and measuring progress against project outcomes.

#### Recommendations:

15. The logframe is a valuable tool. To ensure it is used most effectively, the STDF Secretariat should develop or refer to existing guidance on its use as a monitoring and reporting framework to assist project leads who are unfamiliar with the tool.



16. The STDF Working Group should pay particular attention to the risks and performance indicators identified for projects and ensure that both are monitored. They should be realistic, measurable and reported against. If it has not already done so, the Working Group might consider whether more attention should be paid to this aspect of project management in future studies since the collection and analysis of data has costs attached to it.

## 8. Where to from here?

In commissioning this evaluation, the STDF Secretariat requested some commentary on next steps or 'where to from here'. Suggestions, thoughts and recommendations occur throughout this report but the most important and potentially time-critical are presented here together with a 'Future state' or vision that might be pursued by the relevant parties.

### *PCE as an essential method to be used by the IPPC Secretariat and IPPC contracting parties*

The PCE was developed by the IPPC Secretariat many years ago as a method to assist countries assess their phytosanitary capacity and identify any development needs against their rights and obligations as a contracting party to the Convention. The Convention does not mandate reporting of capacity or compliance by each contracting party but International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 13 [FAO, 2001] provides guidance on reporting and addressing non-compliance. Over the last decade, dispute settlement, as outlined in the Convention, has been transitioning to the concept of 'dispute avoidance', which places more emphasis on building compliance so that disputes are avoided.

The PCE has generally been applied across the entire scope of a country's phytosanitary capacity, resulting in a comprehensive analysis of strengths and needs. The process takes in between six months and one year and has both a financial and operational cost, that may or may not ultimately be offset by benefits arising from it. Addressing the outcomes of the analysis is even more costly and results are confidential to the country undertaking the review, unless they choose to release them, because of concerns over adverse actions to the PCE findings by trading partners.

Undertaking a PCE is optional and voluntary. However, there are significant benefits for the IPPC community from its wider and more frequent use. The PCE offers an objective and consistent process to assess and measure capacity. If repeated periodically it can measure changes in the capacity and capability of a phytosanitary system over time. This would give donor agencies the ability to measure changes in capacity as a result of their programs as well as enabling the CPM and its bodies to measure global implementation of the Convention and identify and develop standard approaches to addressing capacity needs arising. This standardisation would promote harmonisation of systems and measures, which is a primary objective of the Convention.

### **Future state**

The full PCE is undertaken by each contracting party and an outcomes-based national capacity development strategy developed. An implementation plan is drafted and shared with the IPPC Secretariat and the IC, donors and development partners. A condensed or short form PCE is completed every three years to evaluate capacity against the national strategy and implementation plan. Additional, outcome specific PCE modules are used to direct investment in priority projects of the country, such as targeted market access, phytosanitary legislation, etc. The full PCE is repeated after three progress evaluations to re-base capacity against the Convention. Development needs from country PCEs are analysed by RPPOs for regional development priorities and the IC for global priorities. Where possible, development programs are designed to standardise capacity and capability, and promote harmonisation.

The frequency of undertaking PCEs will require an increase in the number of accredited PCE facilitators to at least 40, with additional capacity developed in each country to progress short-form or modular evaluations.

To progress this future state:

- The CPM should formally endorse the PCE as the main method for analysing, addressing and reporting phytosanitary capacity. The issues raised by the IC should be considered by the CPM with input from the CPM Bureau, IC and the SPG and addressed, and the PCE Strategy, as amended by the former work, should be fully implemented.
- Action should be taken to better balance transparency of the PCE and measures to safeguard the integrity of the PCE and related processes, and consideration given to developing mechanisms for documenting and sharing PCE outcomes that are not detrimental to the interests of the PCE country. There may be lessons for the IPPC Secretariat from the OIE Observatory function. The national capacity development strategy should become the standard means of capturing the outcomes of the PCE.
- Consideration should be given to mandating the use of a 'short form' PCE as the basis for reporting compliance with Convention requirements and relevant SPS Agreement obligations and documenting capacity development needs.
- The efficiency of conducting the PCE should be enhanced to enable modular implementation and updated to accommodate the majority of implementation by electronic/remote means. Like the OIE, consideration should be given to using the PCE modules within a region to identify and address regional capacity needs and implementation variation to the benefit of the entire region. This is also a platform for harmonisation and sharing of technical resources within a group of countries that may have similar health status, cultures and trading block priorities.
- Opportunities for innovation in applying the PCE need to be actively explored, assessed and implemented. At very least, the PCE and related processes need to rapidly adapt to a COVID-19 world.
- An additional pre-PCE module should be developed that is based on the guide for "Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy" that steps the PCE country through the process of defining priority outcomes of highest importance to the government and documenting this as a value proposition for the PCE and the resultant development strategy. The subsequent PCE process would then be directed to identify development needs to enable that priority outcome. The entire PCE may not be warranted or needed. It becomes outcomes driven, has a solid platform for engagement across Government and with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, becomes measurable and targeted to success. A targeted and modular PCE should reduce PCE costs or at very least, achieve a better benefit:cost ratio.
- Additional modules should be developed to support implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework and other international treaties including the SPS Agreement and the Trade Facilitation Agreement.
- The CPM, with advice from the IC, IPPC Secretariat, SPG and the Bureau, should agree the role and function of the validated facilitators, including how many will be trained and maintained, as well as how the training and maintenance will be resourced sustainably. This would be informed by discussions with the OIE and would be facilitated by a similar 'think tank' approach as used by the OIE.

#### *Optimising the outcomes of this project*

This project established a platform for increasing access to PCE for IPPC contracting parties as the basis for directing phytosanitary capacity development and flow-on benefits from improved trading opportunities and economic development.

### **Future state**

The facilitator training model is applied across more IPPC Secretariat programs. It is used as the base technical module on the IPPC and is overlaid with skills-based training provided by external providers to a standard established and maintained by the IC. Base module training is implemented through combination e-learning and regional face-to-face forums from a standard curriculum by trainers accredited by the IPPC Secretariat to an agreed standard. Base training is available to NPPO staff, IPPC Secretariat staff and CPM committee members, as well as external organisations. The latter is on a cost recovery basis.

To progress this future state:

- Technical content of training should be consolidated into a base program for a broader training program on the IPPC for Secretariat staff, NPPO contact points and country representatives, permanent representatives to the FAO and members of all CPM bodies including the CPM Bureau, Standards Committee, IC and Secretaries of RPPOs. Training should be available through trained trainers in accredited organisations so that it does not drain Secretariat resources and is available on demand. The integrity of the training would need to be supported by appropriate controls and be appropriately funded. A common understanding of the IPPC provides a stable basis for harmonisation and consistent implementation of the Convention and its standards.
- The IC should consider engaging non-technical experts to conduct non-technical (eg. facilitation and assessment) skills training based on the current curriculum. Content should be reviewed and revised, as necessary, to ensure it is current and remains fit for purpose. Other skills-based training might also be developed in response to contracting party requests and implemented through a similar process by accredited experts.
- The bottleneck around validation from the requirement for evaluation through a PCE must be addressed. The CDC suggestion to test facilitators through a PCE scenario rather than a real PCE would enable more to be validated and should be revisited. Resources will be needed to establish the validation process outside a PCE. It will need to accommodate the current assessment criteria and meet accreditation requirements.

### *Covid-19 and the new 'normal'*

A number of interviewees contributed insights into the impact of COVID-19 and its impact on travel, on preparing for and undertaking PCEs, and what this can offer in the way of innovation and evolution of the PCE, processes and implementation.

They observed the need for:

- Remote implementation of PCEs and supporting training, assuming there will be no in-country missions in the short to medium period. This will require adaptation of content for delivery through remote means impacting training, preparation, stakeholder engagement and conduct of the PCE
- Additional training for all PCE roles in the use of the PCE tool, content and video facilitation
- Transition to hybrid or fully virtual PCEs as well as smaller, quicker and more targeted evaluations
- Alternative methods for monitoring engagement of stakeholders and progress between virtual meetings
- Enhanced training of the country coordinator, who play a critical role in driving the evaluation in-country
- Countries to effectively prepare for a PCE through development of a value proposition that is based on priority outcomes for the government, stakeholders eg. Capacity development targeted to trade, economic development goals

- The PCE tool, including the online application to be more robust, stable and networked to participants
- Expanding the pool of validated facilitators to one per country as a resource to drive phytosanitary capacity development through the national strategy and act as a liaison with donor organisations
- Ensuring a network of trained facilitators within a region as a shared resource.

### **Future state**

Global recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic will likely occur over a number of years and be reflected in a new 'normal'. International travel will re-establish slowly and the role of vaccination in facilitating the international movement of people is far from clear in early 2021.

PCEs are predominately virtual. The country coordinator role is critical and PCE facilitators will take on a strong mentoring role to support the coordinator. PCE preparations demand a stronger focus on country priorities and targeted outcomes and documented in a value proposition that is the focus of government and stakeholder engagement in the PCE process.

Capacity development training also becomes modular, with standardised e-learning and in-country facilitated training drawn from an international curriculum that is coordinated by the IC but developed in partnership with donors.

RPPOs will play a role in identifying and coordinating regional training to improve phytosanitary capacity in member countries. The Technical Consultation of RPPOs will share information on capacity needs to identify global challenges that are best addressed through international curricula.

The IPPC community, with leadership from the CPM and its Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat, will need to monitor and respond to a future state that is shaped by COVID-19 and the global response to it. 'Business as usual' will not be the case for some time and may never return. Opportunities to improve the efficiency and efficacy of IPPC Secretariat programs through innovations in development, implementation and maintenance must be identified and actively pursued.

As noted in the report, multiple PCEs are being undertaken in Africa and the Caribbean and the World Bank is funding a fully virtual PCE in Nepal by the IPPC Secretariat. The PCE facilitators leading these PCEs are well placed to identify opportunities for virtual PCEs and the adaptation that is/will be required to transition to this state. A project to develop and implement a transition plan, based on this network of facilitators and current experiences, is both timely and warranted. It might also be informed by this report.

## **9. References**

CPM-14. 2019. Special Topics Session on Plant Health and Capacity Development – information note [CPM 2019/Inf/22]

[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/03/INF\\_22\\_CPM\\_2019\\_Specialtopics\\_session\\_info-2019-03-22.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/03/INF_22_CPM_2019_Specialtopics_session_info-2019-03-22.pdf)

FAO. 2001. ISPM 13: Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action.

[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/01/ISPM\\_13\\_2001\\_En\\_2015-12-22\\_PostCPM10\\_InkAmReformatted.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/01/ISPM_13_2001_En_2015-12-22_PostCPM10_InkAmReformatted.pdf) Rome, IPPC, FAO.

FAO. 2018. IPPC Guide "Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy"

[https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing\\_strategy\\_YT9IUD4.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing_strategy_YT9IUD4.pdf)

FAO. 2020. Strategic framework for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2020–2030. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat. Link:

[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/12/IPPC\\_Strategic\\_Framework\\_2020-2030\\_2020-12-09.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/12/IPPC_Strategic_Framework_2020-2030_2020-12-09.pdf)

IPPC. 2019. Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Strategy for 2020-2030. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/10/PCE\\_Strategy\\_2019-05\\_TuYyEc5.docx](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/10/PCE_Strategy_2019-05_TuYyEc5.docx)

IPPC. 2013. CDC Report. 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 3 – 7 December 2012. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/04/1358775757\\_report\\_cdc\\_2012-12\\_final\\_201304232120en.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/04/1358775757_report_cdc_2012-12_final_201304232120en.pdf)

IPPC. 2013. CDC Report. 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 27 – 31 May 2013. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/25/cdc\\_report\\_2013-05\\_forposting-v1.docx](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2013/06/25/cdc_report_2013-05_forposting-v1.docx)

IPPC. 2014. CDC Report. 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 25 – 29 November 2013. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/03/25/final\\_report\\_cdc\\_3rdmeeting\\_forposting.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/03/25/final_report_cdc_3rdmeeting_forposting.pdf)

IPPC. 2014. CDC Report. 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 2 – 6 June 2014. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/06/23/finalreport\\_4th\\_cdc\\_forposting.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/06/23/finalreport_4th_cdc_forposting.pdf)

IPPC. 2014. CDC Report. 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 1 - 5 December 2014. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/12/19/5th\\_cdc\\_meeting\\_report.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publications/en/2014/12/19/5th_cdc_meeting_report.pdf)

IPPC. 2015. CDC Report. 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 1 – 5 June 2015. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2015/06/6th\\_CDC\\_meeting\\_report\\_final\\_kaseYT8.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2015/06/6th_CDC_meeting_report_final_kaseYT8.pdf)

IPPC. 2016. CDC Report. 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 30 November – 2 December 2015. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/02/7th\\_CDC\\_meeting\\_report.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/02/7th_CDC_meeting_report.pdf)

IPPC. 2016. CDC Report. 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 23 – 27 May 2016. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/06/Report\\_CDC\\_8th\\_Meeting\\_Final\\_2016\\_06\\_08.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2016/06/Report_CDC_8th_Meeting_Final_2016_06_08.pdf)

IPPC. 2017. CDC Report. Ninth meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 5 – 9 December 2016. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/01/9th\\_CDC\\_Report\\_tZnqz2A.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/01/9th_CDC_Report_tZnqz2A.pdf)

IPPC. 2017. CDC Report. Tenth meeting of the Capacity Development Committee, 15 – 19 May 2017. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/06/CDC\\_2017\\_May\\_Report\\_SOsilu9.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/06/CDC_2017_May_Report_SOsilu9.pdf)

IPPC. 2018. IC Report. 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, 11 – 15 December 2017. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/03/First\\_IC\\_meeting\\_report\\_final.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/03/First_IC_meeting_report_final.pdf)

IPPC. 2019. IC Report. 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, 26 – 30 November 2018. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/03/Report\\_IC\\_November\\_2018-12-20\\_REV01\\_ha5lgva.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/03/Report_IC_November_2018-12-20_REV01_ha5lgva.pdf)

IPPC. 2019. IC Report. 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, 13 – 17 May 2019. Link:  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/06/IC\\_4th\\_May\\_2019\\_meeting\\_report\\_2019-06-21.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2019/06/IC_4th_May_2019_meeting_report_2019-06-21.pdf)

IPPC. 2014. Findings of the general survey of the International Plant Protection Convention and its Standards Survey results from October 2012 – February 2013.  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/04/IRSS\\_IPPC\\_General\\_Survey\\_review\\_2014.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/04/IRSS_IPPC_General_Survey_review_2014.pdf)

IPPC. 2017. 2016 IPPC GENERAL SURVEY: A report of findings of contracting party implementation. [DRAFT]  
[https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2017/04/01/2016\\_IPPC\\_General\\_Survey\\_Findings\\_EN.pdf](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2017/04/01/2016_IPPC_General_Survey_Findings_EN.pdf)

Video on the PCE: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gh5hdo7gRCE&t=127s>

PCE outcomes: <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/implementing-the-ippc-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation-helps-nicaragua-approve-their-revised-phytosanitary-law-in-record-time/>

IPPC news item. <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/the-ippc-holding-the-second-pce-facilitators-training-in-thailand/> 30/9/2016

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**EX-POST EVALUATION OF THE STDF PROJECT**  
**"TRAINING OF PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY EVALUATION FACILITATORS"**  
**(STDF/PG/401)**

## 1. BACKGROUND

In October 2012, the Working Group of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) approved a project application entitled "Training of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Facilitators (STDF/PG/401)"<sup>4</sup> subject to some conditions.<sup>5</sup> The project application was submitted officially by the Governments of four developing countries (Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan and the Philippines). Although the Governments of these countries officially submitted this application, the Working Group concurred with the STDF Secretariat that the application must in effect be regarded as a proposal developed and submitted by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat. The Working Group also decided that paragraph 79 of the STDF Operational Rules<sup>6</sup> should be applied in future to any applications submitted by the IPPC Secretariat. In practice, this meant that future IPPC applications would not be reviewed by the STDF Secretariat but by an independent consultant/expert designated by the Secretariat.

In October 2013, the STDF Working Group approved an extension to the contracting period until March 2014 to allow the Secretariat to revise the project document to incorporate the required conditions and finalize contracting arrangements for the project with the IPPC Secretariat.<sup>7</sup> On 24 March 2014, the WTO signed an implementation assignment with the FAO defining the terms and conditions for implementation of this project<sup>8</sup> by the IPPC Secretariat, housed by FAO. The STDF contribution to the project amounted to US\$734,088. The total project value was US\$1,194,404. The project started on 1 April 2014 with an initial end date of 30 September 2016. In March 2016, the STDF Working Group agreed to IPPC's request to extend the project, at no additional cost, by one year until 30 September 2017. In July 2017, the STDF Secretariat approved a second final request for a three month, no-cost extension until 31 December 2017.

The project goal was to help National Plant Protection Organization (NPPOs) improve national coordination and coherence of plant protection programmes through more robust needs assessment and action planning. Specifically, this was to be achieved by establishing a pool of up to ten individuals trained and validated to facilitate phytosanitary needs assessment using the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)<sup>9</sup> tool designed by the IPPC. Briefly, the PCE is a management tool that can help NPPOs evaluate and improve their phytosanitary system. It helps IPPC Contracting Parties identify and develop the best legislative, technical and administrative measures to help them meet their IPPC obligations. It is a process that brings together both public and private stakeholders.

---

<sup>4</sup> See: [www.standardsfacility.org/PG-401](http://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-401)

<sup>5</sup> The application was approved subject to the following conditions being met (to the satisfaction of the STDF Secretariat): (i) inclusion in the application of relevant experiences and lessons learned in training of OIE's Pathway to Veterinary Services (PVS) facilitators; (ii) further clarification of activities under output 2 and 3 (including the selection of participants, selection of countries for the national workshops, terms of reference for lead experts if workshops under the project were not carried out by IPPC Secretariat; (iii) improvement of the logical framework; and (iv) revision of the budget, including clarification of the (in-kind) contribution of the IPPC Secretariat.

<sup>6</sup> See: [https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_139rev4\\_EN\\_0516.pdf](https://standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_139rev4_EN_0516.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> See: [https://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Report\\_STDFWGmeeting\\_Oct-13\\_0.pdf](https://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Report_STDFWGmeeting_Oct-13_0.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Revised Project document was supported by The Governments of Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Republic of Nauru, Australia, The Cook Islands, Burundi and The Food and Environment Research Agency, UK and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/>

The project aimed to increase the pool of PCE facilitators, approved and validated<sup>10</sup> by the IPPC Secretariat. Specifically, the project included the following activities: (i) improving and testing the PCE training package<sup>11</sup>; (ii) phase one of the project under which training to a pool of 40 phytosanitary experts and 20 lawyers<sup>12</sup> on the PCE tool was provided; (iii) phase two which compromised validating ten PCE facilitators (from the pool of trained experts under phase one) and; (iv) applying the PCE in four developing countries. Countries where the PCE would be applied were selected on the basis of their willingness, existing relevant projects availability of funds in order to have a cost-sharing approach.<sup>13</sup>

Notably, while the project was designed to validate at least ten PCE facilitators, only four facilitators were validated by IPPC in the project's lifetime. The following individuals were validated as facilitators:

Ms Alphonsine Louhouari conducted a PCE in **Madagascar** under the supervision of Ms Sarah Brunel (IPPC Secretariat). The PCE was funded under the Africa Solidarity Trust Fund and STDF/PG/401.

Mr Chiluba Mwape conducted a PCE in **Kenya** under the supervision of Mr Orlando Sosa (former staff of the IPPC Secretariat). The PCE was funded through the project with a cost sharing approach with the NPPO of Kenya.

Mr Fitzroy White conducted a PCE in **Barbados** under the supervision of Ms Sarah Brunel. The PCE was funded through the project and a cost sharing approach with the NPPO of Barbados.

Mr Mekki Chouibani conducted a PCE in **Guinea** under the supervision of Ms Ana Peralta (former staff of the IPPC Secretariat). The PCE was funded under the project with a cost sharing approach with the NPPO of Guinea.

The project also built on existing work and resources to support training on application of the PCE tool by plant health practitioners. Specifically, the project was used to review and validate a number of existing resources and develop new ones that address core functions of the IPPC, effective NPPO management and practical material to support implementation of the PCE tool. A list of technical resources developed and/or refined through the project is available in the final project report.

According to project reports, the project budget was spent as planned. Moreover, the project's activities led to several results. A PCE facilitators training package<sup>14</sup> was made available for use by IPPC contracting parties in three languages (English, Spanish and French). The project was used to develop a guide entitled "Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy".<sup>15</sup> The PCE tool was updated in English, French, Spanish and Russian. Advocacy and awareness raising for the PCE tool was carried out. Four PCE facilitators were validated and a broader network of plant health practitioners trained on PCE was created. The project also trained 20 lawyers on the PCE tool.

Implementation of the project was led by the IPPC Secretariat, housed at the FAO. The IPPC's Capacity Development Committee (CDC), which comprised of technical representatives from various

---

<sup>10</sup> A trained PCE facilitator is considered to be individual who has successfully passed the evaluation from the face-to-face training and workshops (held under the project) and must facilitate the PCE and assist the NPPO to develop a draft national phytosanitary action plan in order to be included in the IPPC roster as a "validated" PCE facilitator. During this validation phase, the facilitators will be closely coached by the IPPC Secretariat (source project document, page 9).

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/training-material-on-the-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation-pce/>

<sup>12</sup> 20 lawyers from 13 countries, as well as 6 FAO staff.

<sup>13</sup> See 6<sup>th</sup> progress report for STDF/PG/401.

<sup>14</sup> See : <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/training-material-on-the-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation-pce/>

<sup>15</sup> [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing\\_strategy\\_YT9IUD4.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing_strategy_YT9IUD4.pdf)



regions, acted as the steering committee.<sup>16</sup> In this role, the CDC reviewed work plans, developed criteria for the selection of candidates (to receive training under the project), provided direction related to project implementation, and selected the resources to be developed/reviewed/validated under the project. The Implementation Facilitation Lead Officer of the IPPC Secretariat acted as the Lead Technical Officer for the project. The IPPC Secretariat acted as the Lead Technical Unit of the project. The IPPC Secretariat reported on progress in implementation through an inception report, six progress reports and a final project report.

In March 2018, the STDF Working Group selected this project for an independent ex post evaluation. The Working Group recognised that an evaluation of project STDF/PG/350 "Global phytosanitary kits" (also implemented by IPPC) was about to start. To minimize the burden on the IPPC, the evaluation of STDF/PG/401 should only start after completing the evaluation of STDF/PG/350.

This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the Consultant to carry out this evaluation.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF TASKS

Under the overall supervision of the STDF Secretariat, and in cooperation with the IPPC Secretariat, and other key stakeholders involved in this project, the Consultant shall carry out an independent ex-post evaluation of project STDF/PG/401, in accordance with the STDF Evaluation Guidelines (**Appendix 1**). In particular, the consultant shall:

### Documentation

**Review all available documentation** related to the project, which will be provided electronically by the STDF and IPPC Secretariats, together with a list of key stakeholders involved in the project and their contact details.

**Contact stakeholders** involved in project implementation to obtain any other relevant information or documents, as appropriate.

### Evaluation framework

**Develop the evaluation framework**, which should be discussed with the STDF Secretariat prior to its finalization and use. This framework should:

- Clearly elaborate the questions to be asked during the evaluation, based on the key evaluation criteria as set out in **Appendix 1** (i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and key lessons learned), as well as the indicators identified in the project document to measure performance.
- Include criteria to assess the reach, use and value of project outputs/resources (training materials and guidance on carrying out PCE etc.) for NPPOs and plant health practitioners globally.
- Identify and elaborate the methods and tools (e.g. survey questionnaires, key questions for face-to-face/virtual interviews, analysis of the use of the training materials developed under the project, etc.) to be used to conduct the evaluation.
- Identify key individuals to be consulted during the evaluation including - but not limited to the: (i) IPPC Secretariat; (ii) members of the CDC/IC involved in project oversight; (iii) experts who developed/reviewed/validated the resources under the project; (iv) PCE facilitators trained under the project; (v) four validated PCE facilitators; (vi) lawyers trained under the project; (vii) representatives of the four countries where the PCE tool was applied under the project and; (viii) any other relevant stakeholders (notably NPPOs, donors/consultants involved in the delivery of phytosanitary capacity building

---

<sup>16</sup> In 2017, the CDC ceased to exist and was succeeded by a new body, i.e. IPPC's Implementation Committee (IC).

programmes, development partners<sup>17</sup>) with relevant ongoing work in phytosanitary capacity development and needs assessment.

- Outline a timeframe to conduct the evaluation and finalize the evaluation report.

### Conduct evaluation

**Contact** project stakeholders, beneficiaries and other relevant organizations (using methods identified in the evaluation framework) to obtain their views and feedback about the project, addressing, *inter alia*, key questions related to the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and key lessons learned. These consultations should collect as much information as possible to enable a detailed assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project, including its outputs and outcomes.

### Evaluation report

On the basis of all the information collected and feedback received from the stakeholders consulted, **draft a detailed evaluation report** that documents, analyses and assesses the overall performance and results of the project (linked to the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and key lessons learned) and sets out key findings and recommendations.

As part of the report, the evaluator should:

- pay close attention to the pedagogical method used to train facilitators under the project, assess whether this training was effective, built requisite skills (both soft and technical) and contributed to countries having access to a larger pool of technical resource persons trained on the PCE.
- assess the use and effectiveness of the training materials which were planned and/or produced under the project (with particular attention to the IPPC Guide "Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy", its number of users over time, downloads, usability, etc.)
- assess why the project fell short of validating ten facilitators and to what extent the four validated PCE facilitators continue to contribute and participate in PCE evaluations worldwide. Provide an understanding of to what extent the four validated facilitators are receiving remuneration to apply PCE in countries and whether such a set-up is sustainable. Evaluate the usefulness of training 20 lawyers (including six legal staff from FAO) and whether these lawyers continue to participate or play a role in ongoing or new PCE evaluations.
- identify the number of validated PCE facilitators today (i.e. 2020) and assess efforts by the IPPC Secretariat to further increase this number (including from the existing pool of 36 experts, from public sector and other organizations such as the private sector, think tanks, consultancy firms etc.).
  - analyses if and how the project contributed to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Strategy 2020-2030.<sup>18</sup>
- considers the linkages and synergies between the outputs of this project and the IPPC's Project "Global Phytosanitary Kits".<sup>19</sup> Moreover, look at linkages (if any) to other related projects/programmes, opportunities created by the project and/or any challenges faced, as well as any follow-up actions or outstanding needs, etc.

---

<sup>17</sup> For instance CABI, COLEACP, IICA etc.

<sup>18</sup> PCE strategy (2020-2030): <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/>

<sup>19</sup> See: [www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350](http://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350)

## Recommendations and lessons learned

The report should seek to make recommendations specific to the activities conducted under this project, as well as more general recommendations that may be useful to improve the design and delivery of future projects that address SPS-related trade capacity building (for instance by focusing on rolling out technical materials, guidelines, manuals and training materials). As part of this, examine and make recommendations on how the approach to train facilitators in various SPS related needs assessments/tools can be improved and further refined. The report should also assess to what extent the project outputs have remained relevant and sustainable after the end of the project and, where appropriate, make recommendations to enhance their relevance and sustainability in the future.

### **3. Timeline**

The report should be drafted in accordance with the criteria indicated in Appendix 1 and use a range of methods to present findings/data (including graphs, tables, quotations and photographs). The first draft should be submitted to the STDF Secretariat no later than **15 November 2020**. The Consultant may revise the report taking into consideration the Secretariat's comments and suggestions (several rounds of comments can be expected). The deadline for finalising the report is **31 December 2020**.

Provide to the STDF Secretariat electronic/hard copies of documents relevant to the evaluation, for inclusion in the STDF Virtual Library.

### **4. Remuneration**

3.1 The Consultant will be paid a lump sum of US\$9,000 for her honorarium, corresponding to 15 working days at the rate of US\$600 per day. In addition to the honorarium, the Consultant will be paid a lump-sum amount of US\$500 for miscellaneous operating expenses, including communication costs.

3.2 The Consultant may be invited by the STDF Secretariat to present the findings of the evaluation (either virtually or in person) to the STDF Working Group (at a date to be specified). In case physical participation is required, the Consultant commits to make himself/herself available for this travel. The STDF Secretariat will cover cost of travel (most direct route, economy class) and DSA.

### **5. Required qualifications**

The consultant shall meet the following minimum requirements:

- Good knowledge and understanding of problems faced by developing countries in the implementation of international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards and requirements, especially in the field of plant health;
- Experience in project monitoring and evaluation, including data collection (including through survey questionnaires, consultations and interviews involving multiple organizations and participants) would be an advantage;
- Good knowledge of multi-partner/beneficiary initiatives, including understanding of the political and diplomatic dimensions, and managing a review process in that context; and
- Excellent analytical, drafting and communications skills in English.

## APPENDIX 1

### GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE STANDARDS AND TRADE DEVELOPMENT FACILITY (STDF)

#### INTRODUCTION

As described in the STDF Medium Term Strategy (2015-2019), the STDF provides a limited number of project grants to strengthen SPS capacity in developing countries, in line with beneficiary's priorities. Both public and private sector stakeholders benefit from projects that address key SPS challenges or opportunities, which influence their ability to gain and/or maintain market access. Projects also have a key role to play in enhancing the effectiveness of SPS capacity building through the identification and dissemination of good practice, and promotion of synergies and collaboration among different stakeholders including government authorities, the private sector, and international, regional and bilateral organizations.<sup>20</sup>

The STDF's Operational Rules require at least two STDF projects completed every year to undergo an independent ex-post evaluation.<sup>21</sup> Projects to be subjected to an external evaluation are selected by the Working Group chairperson, during the first meeting of the Working Group in the year after project completion, using the method of ordinary random selection, unless the Working Group decides otherwise.

These Guidelines set out the overall framework for independent ex-post evaluations of STDF projects, based on the STDF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.<sup>22</sup> They draw heavily on the OECD-DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance.<sup>23</sup>

#### OBJECTIVE

The objective of an independent ex-post evaluation of an STDF project is to:

- verify whether the project achieved the objectives set out in the project document;
- identify if the project contributed to any of the higher level objectives of the STDF (e.g. measurable impact on market access, improved domestic (and where applicable) regional SPS situation, poverty reduction) identified in the logical framework attached to the STDF Medium Term Strategy for 2015-2019, including the linkage and contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) ;
- identify key experiences, good practice and lessons of interest to the beneficiaries of the evaluated project, as well as to STDF Working Group members and development partners more broadly (including for future STDF programme development).

#### STRUCTURE

Projects funded by the STDF include a logical framework (logframe) matrix, which identifies the overall project goal, as well as the expected lower-level results (outcomes and outputs) of the project. Indicators to measure progress at different results-levels should be included in the logframe, as well as key risks and assumptions. This project logframe – and indicators – should be used as the basis for the project evaluation.

Evaluations should typically be organized around the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and lessons learnt. In this regard, the evaluation questions identified below provide the overall framework for the evaluation process and a basis to reach a clear set of conclusions and recommendations. Additional, more specific evaluation questions

---

<sup>20</sup> STDF Medium Term Strategy (2015-2019). Available at: [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Mid\\_term\\_Strategy\\_2015\\_2019\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Mid_term_Strategy_2015_2019_EN.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> STDF Operational Rules (STDF 139 rev.4 – FINAL). Available at: [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF\\_139rev4\\_EN\\_0516.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/STDF_139rev4_EN_0516.pdf)

<sup>22</sup> STDF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (STDF 509 Final). Available at: [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/ME\\_Framework\\_EN.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/ME_Framework_EN.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> See the DAC Principles for Effective Aid ([www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf)).

related to the individual project to be evaluated should be elaborated by the project evaluator, in cooperation with the STDF Secretariat.

Evaluations may be conducted as desk studies or may require travel to collect and review information in the beneficiary country or region. The evaluator will review project progress and final reports, as well as any other relevant documents, against the project document approved by the STDF Workshop Group. This literature review will normally be supplemented by survey questionnaires and/or interviews with relevant project stakeholders (e.g. beneficiaries, implementing organization(s), other collaborating or relevant organizations). Other methods such as case studies or cost-effectiveness analyses may also be applied, depending *inter alia* on the size and complexity of the project.

## **KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

### Relevance

1. Was the project the right answer to the SPS related needs of the beneficiary?
2. What was the value added of this project, compared to other support programmes?
3. Were local contexts, ownership, processes and stakeholders adequately taken into account in the design and implementation of the project?

### Effectiveness

4. To what extent were the project objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved (based on the indicators for expected outputs and outcomes identified in the project's logframe)?
5. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives, outcomes and outputs?
6. To what extent were horizontal issues (particularly related to gender and environment) adequately addressed in the project?

### Efficiency

7. Were the activities and outputs delivered according to the project document (i.e. on time and within the budget)?
8. What changes and risks, if any, occurred during project implementation, and how was the project able to adapt to these changes and manage risks?
9. Was the project a cost-effective contribution to addressing the needs of the beneficiary?

### Impact

10. To what extent did the project contribute to higher level objectives of the STDF programme such as a measurable impact on market access, improved domestic, and where applicable regional, SPS situations, and/or poverty reduction?
11. What real difference (expected and/or unexpected) has the project made or is likely to have on the final beneficiaries?
12. What was the role of the project, if any, in raising awareness on SPS challenges and/or mobilizing additional resources for SPS capacity?

### Sustainability

13. To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the end of STDF funding?
14. Do the recipients of the project have the necessary capacity to sustain the results?
15. What follow-up activities, if any, are planned and/or required to sustain these results over time?

16. What are the major factors which influenced sustainability of the project?
17. Was sustainability (including follow-up activities, scaling up and dissemination of results) adequately considered at the project design phase and throughout the project?

### Lessons learned

18. What lessons can be learned from the project regarding the process of project design and implementation?
19. What lessons can be learned from the project, which may be of importance to the broader donor community and which should be disseminated more widely?
20. What actions have been taken by the beneficiary, STDF partnership or others to disseminate, learn and follow-up on the outcomes of the project? How could STDF increase the sharing of good practice on SPS capacity building coming out of this project?

## **REPORTING**

The evaluation report shall be clear, as free as possible of technical language, and normally no longer than 15 pages. It shall be written in the same language as the project documents. Additional information shall be confined to annexes. The report shall take account of the draft OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards<sup>24</sup> and shall follow the outline below:

6. Executive summary (1 page)
  - Overview of the report, which highlights the main conclusions, recommendations and key lessons learned.
7. Introduction (2 pages)
  - Description of the policy context and institutional environment within which the project was implemented, including the role of the STDF, implementing organization(s), other donors and project partners as well as the private sector, consumer organizations and NGOs, as relevant.
  - Summary of the project including its objectives, activities, inputs (budget), outputs and outcomes.
  - Objective of the evaluation.
  - Indication of the evaluator's independence to carry out the project evaluation, addressing previous collaboration (if any) with the STDF, project partners and/or beneficiaries, including a description of conflicts of interest, if any.
8. Methodology (2 pages)
  - Explanation of the evaluation method used, its validity, reliability and limitations, including an explanation of the methods and techniques used for data and information collection and processing.
  - Description of the sources of information used (documents, respondents, literature, etc.).
  - Description of the stakeholders consulted, their relevance, and the criteria for their selection.
9. Findings and analysis (8 pages)
  - Answers to each evaluation question, including clear references to evidence and an analysis for each.

---

<sup>24</sup> See <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/34/21/37854171.pdf>

- Overall judgement, which shall cover:
  - relevance to needs and overall context, including the extent to which the project suited the priorities and policies of the target groups and the objectives of the STDF (SPS capacity to facilitate market access);
  - effectiveness in terms of the extent to which the objectives and outputs were achieved (or are likely to be achieved in the near future);
  - efficiency in terms of the extent to which funding, staff, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievement of results;
  - impact in terms of the established and unforeseen impacts of the project, particularly how the project contributed to the higher-level objectives of the STDF (market access, domestic/regional SPS situation, poverty reduction, etc.), as well as any other unintended positive or negative consequences (spillovers) of the project;
  - sustainability related to whether the results of the project can be maintained over time without STDF funding or other donor support;
  - cross-cutting issues in terms of how the project contributed to cross-cutting objectives, including related to gender equality and the environment (whether planned or not);
  - risk management in terms of the risks that were faced during project implementation and the extent to which they were approximately managed.

#### 10. Conclusions and recommendations (2 pages)

- Main conclusions following from the findings and analysis.<sup>25</sup>
- Recommendations including actionable proposals for concerned stakeholders in the project country/region (e.g. government authorities, private sector, regional economic communities), the STDF, and/or the wider community of donors and development partners.

#### 11. Lessons learnt

- Key lessons learned which are of relevance for wider use and future programme development, both on process and substance.

### QUALITY

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed on the basis of the criteria below.

### DISSEMINATION

The evaluation report shall be discussed by the STDF Working Group and further disseminated through the STDF website and other fora, as appropriate.

### Quality criteria for STDF evaluation reports

Theme	Criteria
<b>Context</b>	<p>The context and object of the evaluation are adequately described in the evaluation report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The context of the project is adequately described (context, stakeholders)</li> <li>• There is a clear description of the project to be evaluated (object of the evaluation)</li> </ul>

<sup>25</sup> Please note that any conclusions and recommendations should be based on the findings and analysis included in the previous section of the report.

<b>Purpose</b>	The report clearly describes the evaluation's objective, purpose and scope
<b>Methodology</b>	<p>The report adequately describes and explains the evaluation methodology and its application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report clearly explains what approaches/methods/tools that were used and why they were selected</li> <li>• The logic and consistency of the project results framework and/or theory of change is assessed</li> <li>• The validity and reliability of information sources are adequately addressed</li> <li>• The report adequately addresses limitations to the methodology</li> <li>• The report clearly lists the evaluation questions (e.g. in an appendix)</li> <li>• The STDF evaluation guidelines are mentioned</li> <li>• Surveys used (if any) are attached as an appendix</li> <li>• The response rate to any surveys is clear</li> <li>• The report explains whether field visits were carried out, with details on the timing, stakeholders met, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting</b>	Gender, the environment and any other relevant crosscutting issues are adequately addressed
<b>Findings, recommendations and lessons learned</b>	<p>The report presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately, clearly and logically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report adequately addresses all the evaluation criteria and questions</li> <li>• Findings are clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence</li> <li>• The report analyses the main external factors facilitating or hindering implementation of the project, and assesses whether risks were appropriately managed</li> <li>• Conclusions are clearly substantiated by findings and analysis</li> <li>• Recommendations are well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported, clearly stated and realistic</li> <li>• Lessons learned are correctly identified and relevant</li> <li>• The report can be used reliably to extract good practices and lessons learned for STDF</li> </ul>
<b>Structure</b>	The report is well structured, logical and clear



## LOGFRAME MATRIX [Extract: Final project report]

Objectives	Performance indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions/Risks
<b>Goal:</b> Performance of phytosanitary systems of countries improved.	Increase in reports of contracting parties showing active participation in IPPC activities.  Improved implementation of IPPC and ISPMs.	Statistics and databases of FAO, World Trade Organization, World Bank, UNCTAD, etc.  IRSS data.	No significant change in global economic and climatic parameters that exacerbate pest situations and hamper the current phytosanitary situation.
<b>Purpose:</b> To enhance capacity of countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacities.	Country development plans increasingly adopting strategies derived from PCE.  Improved budgetary support to phytosanitary capacity development.  At least 10 action plans produced and published.	PCE evaluation reports.  IRSS data.  CPM reports.  RPPO reports.	Approved facilitators not honoring commitment to serve when needed by countries.  Decision-makers are sensitized and support resource allocation to NPPOs.  Countries use PCE facilitators for training and advice on evaluating their phytosanitary systems.
<b>Output:</b> IPPC contracting parties and technical assistance providers have access to a growing pool of validated PCE facilitators.	At least 10 facilitators validated, approved and listed in the roster of experts by the IPPC by the end of the project.  At least 10 PCEs facilitated by approved facilitators by the end of the project.	Project reports.  IPPC annual reports to CPM.  CDC reports.  IPPC phytosanitary resource page roster of experts' logs.	Lack of will of countries to identify and nominate suitable potential PCE facilitators and subsequently engage them in training their NPPO staff.  There is sufficient interest by experts meeting the selection criteria to participate in the training programme to establish an adequate pool of expertise.

Objectives	Performance indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions/Risks
		STDF and other partner reports.	
<p><b>Activity 1:</b> Pool of professionals selected and trained on the PCE.</p> <p><b>Activity 2:</b> Trained experts validated as PCE facilitators.</p> <p><b>Activity 3:</b> Training package improved, tested and PCE applied in at least 4 countries.</p>	<p>PCE facilitators training package available in at least 5 FAO languages.</p> <p>PCE tool updated and available in at least 5 FAO languages.</p>	<p>Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPO) reports.</p> <p>IPPC CPM reports.</p> <p>CDC meeting reports.</p> <p>Training evaluation reports.</p> <p>Reports to STDF.</p>	<p>Contracting parties respond to IPPC call for nominations of experts.</p> <p>Selected trainees successfully complete the training and qualify to serve countries as PCE facilitators.</p> <p>Countries agree to apply the PCE and support the trainee facilitator.</p>

## Evaluation Matrix

Task	Evaluation themes	Approach	Consultation	Output
Pedagogical method used to train facilitators under the project, assess whether this training was effective, built requisite skills (both soft and technical) and contributed to countries having access to a larger pool of technical resource persons trained on the PCE.	<p>Relevance of approach and materials</p> <p>Effectiveness of training to STDF goals, IPPC outcomes, participants</p> <p>Efficiency – planning, resource use</p> <p>Sustainability of approach used with reference to goals</p>	<p>Understand the approach used:</p> <p>Train the trainer – course materials development, training of trainers, assessment methods and practices</p> <p>External bodies used – role</p> <p>Facilitator training method</p> <p>Selecting and approving candidates (personal attributes – soft)</p> <p>Adult learning</p> <p>Assessment techniques</p>	<p>Sarah Brunel</p> <p>Orlando or Ana</p> <p>4 validated facilitators</p> <p>Sally Jennings re role of CDC, questionnaire</p> <p>Feedback from participants in progress report #3</p>	<p>Training elements</p> <p>Benefits for starting from scratch – fully integrated program</p> <p>Analysis of assessment criteria – very comprehensive – technical and personal skills</p> <p>Adult learning methods integrated</p>
Assess the use and effectiveness of the training materials which were planned and/or produced under the project (with particular attention to the IPPC Guide* “Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy”, its number of users over time, downloads, usability, etc.)	<p>Impact of materials used and developed</p> <p>Relevance of materials to the project and its goals</p>	<p>Questions of trainers and facilitators</p> <p>PCE facilitators – how effective, fit for purpose, feedback and review processes</p>	<p>Secretariat – web page analysis (Paola?)</p> <p>Review a selection of training materials with reference to the Guide</p>	<p>Alignment with national PCE strategy guidance – developed in parallel</p>

Task	Evaluation themes	Approach	Consultation	Output
	Effectiveness of materials as integrated into training	Correlate course material with the framework in the guide – alignment, use		
*IPPC Guide “Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy” <a href="https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing_strategy_YT9IUD4.pdf">https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/06/Preparing_strategy_YT9IUD4.pdf</a>				
<p>Assess why the project fell short of validating ten facilitators and to what extent the four validated PCE facilitators continue to contribute and participate in PCE evaluations worldwide.</p> <p>Provide an understanding of to what extent the four validated facilitators are receiving remuneration to apply PCE in countries and whether such a set-up is sustainable.</p> <p>Evaluate the usefulness of training 20 lawyers (including six legal staff from FAO) and whether these lawyers continue to participate or play a role in ongoing or new PCE evaluations</p>	<p>Impact of facilitators on PCEs within and after the project</p> <p>Risk management of PCEs to validate facilitators</p> <p>Sustainability of the facilitator resources</p> <p>Relevance of lawyer training</p>	<p>Immediacy of PCEs to be completed</p> <p>Scheduled PCEs and pairing to validate others</p> <p>Getting paid? How does this work? Time off from work?</p> <p>Lawyers – rationale, role in PCEs</p> <p>In practice – raising awareness, establishing a network</p>	<p>Sarah Brunel</p> <p>One or two lawyers</p> <p>4 validated facilitators</p> <p>Trained – current status, engagement, maintenance of knowledge</p> <p>Facilitator training vs lawyer training – facilitation vs awareness?</p>	<p>In practice – value, efficacy, availability, operations (selection, funding)</p> <p>Reality - how many facilitators are needed?</p> <p>Awareness vs facilitation of PCE</p> <p>Legal vs technical vs non NPPO/RPPO facilitators</p>
<p>Identify the number of validated PCE facilitators today (i.e. 2020) and assess efforts by the IPPC Secretariat to further increase this number (including from the existing pool of 36 experts, from public sector and other organizations, such as the private sector, think tanks, consultancy firms etc.).</p>	<p>Sustainability of facilitators, availability, maintenance and updating expertise, resources</p>	<p>Numbers: validated, in process, waiting on PCEs</p> <p>Increasing beyond trained facilitators – developed countries, considerations</p>	<p>Sarah – confirm numbers</p> <p>How much is enough?</p> <p>Using non-NPPO/RPPO facilitators, consultants, retirees</p>	<p>Numbers</p> <p>Generating demand for PCE to support validation and sustain benefits of using facilitators</p>

Task	Evaluation themes	Approach	Consultation	Output
	Risk management of process, pool of facilitators, skills maintenance	(using facilitators from developing countries) Status of trained facilitators pending validation		
Analyse if and how the project contributed to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Strategy 2020-2030 . <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87701/">https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/87701/</a>	Sustainability of the program within the IPPC work program, budget, priorities and strategic framework  Ongoing impact	Review the PCE strategy, alignment of facilitator pool to enable proposed outcomes	Refer to the strategy	Not mentioned but an element of needs analysis and implementation plan  Benefit from consistent approach, credible outcomes and structured implementation plan based on systematic analysis for needs and measurable outcomes
Considers the linkages and synergies between the outputs of this project and the IPPC's Project "Global Phytosanitary Kits". <sup>26</sup>  Look at linkages (if any) to other related projects/programmes, opportunities created by the project and/or any challenges faced, as well as any follow-up actions or outstanding needs, etc.	Broader impact of the project on related projects and programs  Needs as related to sustainability, effectiveness and efficiency in areas of capacity	Linkages between Project 350 and 401 outputs  Other projects ? Strategic Framework?  Needs and actions	STDF 350 evaluation report	Framework for achieving capacity to implement the IPPC: needs (PCE); development strategy (implementation plan); resources; review; help desk/call – feedback into global needs analysis for development of IPPC resources. Help define

<sup>26</sup> See: [www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350](http://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350)

Task	Evaluation themes	Approach	Consultation	Output
	development and supporting guidance			Sec/IC/donor/CP roles and responsibilities
Make recommendations specific to the activities conducted under this project, as well as more general recommendations that may be useful to improve the design and delivery of future projects that address SPS-related trade capacity building (for instance by focusing on rolling out technical materials, guidelines, manuals and training materials). As part of this, examine and make recommendations on how the approach to train facilitators in various SPS related needs assessments/tools can be improved and further refined. The report should also assess to what extent the project outputs have remained relevant and sustainable after the end of the project and, where appropriate, make recommendations to enhance their relevance and sustainability in the future.	Identify lessons learned, analyse and make recommendations to enhance the impact, efficacy, efficiency and sustainability of future projects	<p>Specific recommendations</p> <p>General recommendations:</p> <p>Future projects – implementation and adoption</p> <p>Use of facilitators – training, tools, needs assessments</p> <p>Relevance and sustainability in the future – review and maintenance</p> <p>Requirements – training and assessment approach and resources</p> <p>Validation dependencies</p> <p>Networks and community of practitioners</p> <p>Ongoing costs and resources – to maintain, update, manage, overheads</p> <p>Confidentiality and IP</p> <p>Mandating the requirement (ongoing demand)</p>	<p>Consider the IPPC strategic framework:</p> <p><i>ICD 2: The phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool has been widely used by contracting parties to understand their strengths and weaknesses and develop plans to address capacity deficiencies.</i></p> <p><i>ICD 3: The IPPC Secretariat is resourced to help contracting parties access assistance to address phytosanitary capacity needs.</i></p>	<p>Gap – developed countries, donors (ref World Bank, STDF) using PCE as a basis for providing funding</p> <p>On line forum – opportunity to continue connections, takes time and effort (\$\$)</p> <p>Maintaining material, integrating feedback to adapt and remain current</p>

Task	Evaluation themes	Approach	Consultation	Output
		Log frame – project proposal cf. final report – risks, lessons		

## Key stakeholders

	Facilitator Trainers	Responded/ interviewed	Interview			
			Email	Video	Tele	In person
1	Ana PERALTA	N				
2	Orlando SOSA	N				
3	Sarah BRUNEL	Y	X	X		
	<b>Trainee Facilitators</b>					
4	Olga LAVRENTJEVA, Estonia	N				
5	Ms Shaza OMAR, Egypt	Y	X			
6	Francisco GUTIERREZ, Belize	N				
7	Ms Ruth WOODE, Ghana	N				
8	Konan KOUAME, Côte d'Ivoire [IPPC Bureau and CPM Vicechair]	N				
9	Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH, CAHESA (RPPO)	N				
	<b>Validated Facilitators</b>					
10	Mr Mekki CHOUBANI, NEPP, Morocco	Y	X			
11	Ms Alphonsine LOUHOUARI, Congo	N				
12	Mr Chiluba MWAPE, US AID	Y	X			
13	Mr Fitzroy WHITE, Jamaica	Y	X			
	<b>PCE Lawyers</b>					
14	Mr Sylvestre YAMTHIEU, Cameroon	Y		X		
15	Mr. Pablo José WILLSON AVARIA, Chile	Y	X			
16	Mamuka MATIASHVILI, Georgia	N				
17	Ms Harinirina Saholy RAMBININTSAOTRA ép RABELISOA RAKOTONDRABE, Madagascar	N				
18	Miles YOUNG, Sydney/Fiji	N				



	<b>PCE Country Coordinators</b>					
19	Sohaoly Ramiliarijaona Saholy Ramiliarijaona; NPPO head, Madagascar	Y	X			
20	Michael JAMES, head of NPPO, Barbados	N				
21	Mamadouba Camara, National PCE contact point, Guinea	N				
22	Ricardo SOMARIBBA, PCE in Nicaragua	N				
	<b>CDC Members</b>					
23	Sally JENNINGS, New Zealand	Y			X	
24	Olga LAVRENTJEVA, Estonia	N				
25	Magdalena GONZALES ARROYO [Trainer], Costa Rica	N				
	<b>National Plant Protection Organisation</b>					
26	Javier TRUJILLO, Mexico (CPM Chair)	Y	X			
27	Peter THOMSON, New Zealand (CPM Bureau)	Y	X			
28	John GRIEFER, USA (CPM Bureau)	Y	X			
29	Kyu-Ock YIM, Republic of Korea	Y	X			
30	Ralf LOPIAN, Finland	N				
31	Diego QUIROGA, Argentina	N				
	<b>Regional Plant Protection Organisation</b>					
32	Visoni TIMOTE, PPPO	Y	X			
	<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>					
33	Brent LARSON	Y		X		
-	Sarah BRUNEL	Y	X	X		
	<b>Donor organisations</b>					
34	Morag WEBB, COLEACP	Y		X		
35	Babacar SAMB, Guinea, COLEACP	Y		X		
36	Chagama KEDERA, Kenya, COLEACP	Y		X		
37	Marie-Helene KESTEMONT, COLEACP	Y		X		

38	Benedicte WERNER, COLEACP	Y		X		
39	Shane SELA, World Bank, USA	Y		X		
	<b>Others</b>					
40	MarkSCHIPP, President, OIE, Australia	Y				X
41	John STRATTON, formerly OIE PVS expert/trainer, Australia	Y				X
42	Roger DAY, CABI	Y	X			
43	Washington OTEINO, CABI	Y	X			
44	Kenza LE MENTEC, WTO	Y		X		
45	Marlynne HOPPER, STDF	Y		X		
46	Roshan KAHN, STDF	Y		X		

## **List of Evaluation Questions**

The STDF Evaluation Guidelines provide an indicative list of questions which formed the basis of this evaluation and the final report. All of the following questions were taken into account and guided the interviews and analysis. They were complemented by project-specific and stakeholder-specific questions arising from the Desk Analysis.

### **A. STDF Evaluation Guidelines**

#### **Relevance**

- Was the Project the right answer to the SPS-related needs of the beneficiary?
- What was the value added of this project, compared to other support programmes?
- Were local contexts, ownership, processes and stakeholders adequately taken into account in the design and implementation of the project?

#### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent were the project objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved (based on the indicators for expected outputs and outcomes identified in the project's logframe)?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives, outcomes and outputs?
- To what extent were horizontal issues (particularly related to gender and environment) adequately addressed in the project?

#### **Efficiency**

- Were the activities and outputs delivered according to the project document (i.e. on time and within the budget)?
- What changes and risks, if any, occurred during project implementation, and how was the project able to adapt to these changes and manage risks?
- Was the project a cost-effective contribution to addressing the needs of the beneficiary?

#### **Impact**

- To what extent did the project contribute to higher level objectives of the STDF programme such as a measurable impact on market access, improved domestic, and where applicable regional, SPS situations, and/or poverty reduction?
- What real difference (expected and/or unexpected) has the project made or is likely to have on the final beneficiaries?
- What was the role of the project, if any, in raising awareness on SPS challenges and/or mobilising additional resources for SPS capacity?

#### **Sustainability**

- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the end of STDF funding?
- Do the recipients of the project have the necessary capacity to sustain the results?
- What follow-up activities, if any, are planned and/or required to sustain these results over time?
- What are the major factors which influenced sustainability of the project?

- Was sustainability (including follow-up activities, scaling up and dissemination of results) adequately considered at the project design phase and throughout the project?

#### Lessons learned

- What lessons can be learned from the project regarding the process of project design and implementation?
- What lessons can be learned from the project, which may be of importance to the broader donor community and which should be disseminated more widely?
- What actions have been taken by the beneficiary, STDF partnership or others to disseminate, learn and follow-up on the outcomes of the project? How could STDF increase the sharing of good practice on SPS capacity building coming out of this project?

#### **B. Project- and stakeholder-specific questions arising from the Desk Analysis\***

\* Supplementary questions were also asked to address specific STDF evaluation criteria

##### ***For everyone***

1. How useful and/or valuable are a pool of trained facilitators to direct SPS capacity development activities? Why?
2. If you were considering a SWOT analysis of the concept, what would you identify as the greatest strength, weakness, opportunity and threat to achieving success?
3. In your experience with this project, what are the most important factors for successfully training, validating, using and maintaining a pool of facilitators? I.e. Approaches to capture benefits and minimise risks
4. Anything else you think I should know?

##### ***Facilitator Trainers***

5. Would you change or add any new training elements to the facilitator training and validation?
6. Are there aspects of the training approach you would change? Eg. Different methods for different modules?
7. What do you see as the main benefits of using external consultants to help develop course materials and methods?
8. Who would you recommend to undertake the trainer training? Is there a set of requirements for selecting and approving trainer candidates? Will they be required to be validated PCE facilitators or could/should others also be able to be trained?
9. How much of the materials used in PG-401 were drawn from outputs of the STDF project to develop capacity building tools (<https://www.standardsfacility.org/PG-350>)? To what extent were these materials critical to the success of PG-401?
10. How essential is it that facilitator trainees are from an NPPO or RPPO? What baseline experience is necessary prior to undertaking the training to ensure facilitators are competent in all areas of their PCE role?
11. Are there any sectors 'missing' from the pool of facilitators? Eg. Developed country trainees, donor organisations. Should every NPPO and RPPO develop at least one PCE facilitator to guide their own country/region capacity development consistent with the Convention and its standards?

12. A number of trainees were not assessed as suitable facilitators. How would you increase the number of 'graduating' facilitators in future training?
13. In your view, how many validated trainers and facilitators are really needed as a global resource?

#### ***Trainee Facilitators***

14. What are the most useful and least useful aspects of the facilitator training?
15. What skills and materials do you now use the most?
16. How are you maintaining your training to be PCE-ready?
17. Does your organisation still support you to become a validated PCE facilitator?
18. How has your organisation allowed you to use your PCE and facilitation skills to improve phytosanitary capacity within your country?
19. Have you used the facilitator web-forum on the IPP to maintain your connections with trained and validated facilitators?
20. Do you expect to use this in the future? When, how or why not? What support do you expect to access through the web-forum and the facilitator network?

#### ***Validated Facilitators***

21. Having completed one or more PCEs, how effective was the facilitator training in providing the skills you needed to facilitate the PCE? Did you have what you needed to do the job?
22. Are there areas of the training that need to be added, revised, strengthened? Is the case study still relevant?
23. How useful and relevant is the IPPC guide 'Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy' for countries undergoing a PCE? Is there anything missing in the guidance? Does it provide enough direction to enable the development of a practical and realistic action plan?
24. Are the other IPPC guides and manuals useful references for the country undergoing the PCE?
25. Was the facilitator role clearly understood by the PCE country, or were you expected to go beyond your role and training?
26. How useful/important was ongoing engagement and mentoring from your trainers (within or outside the IPPC Secretariat) to the success of your facilitation task?
27. Did your organisation fully support your participation in the PCE? What benefit does your organisation from your participation? Will they continue to support you?
28. Were you paid? By whom?
29. Did you receive feedback on your facilitation and were there lessons from this that you provided to the IPPC Secretariat?
30. Have you been able to apply the PCE tool since the project ended?
31. Going forward, how do you expect to take out time to apply the PCE tool? (have you been contacted by IPPC in regards for potential virtual PCE application due to Covid-19 related travel restrictions)

#### ***PCE Lawyers***

32. What were the three key things you gained from the PCE training/awareness process?

33. How has this changed or impacted your approach to phytosanitary legislation development and implementation?
34. Has your organisation benefited from your participation in the training? How?

***PCE Country Coordinators***

35. Why was the facilitator selected by your country to assist with the PCE?
36. What did they contribute most to the PCE process? Eg. Independence, facilitation skills, SPS/NPPO/IPPC experience, PCE knowledge, other
37. How do you see that PCE outcomes and country development needs could be fed back into any IPPC capacity development strategy and the PCE Strategy?

***CDC Members***

38. Where did the CDC add value to this project and best contribute to its outcomes?
39. The IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 proposes that the PCE is widely used by contracting parties. What role could the trained facilitators play in encouraging greater use of the PCE tool? How is the IC proposing to promote the use of PCE to define and address capacity needs in contracting parties?
40. How were CDC members involved in the project (substance and process including at project design, implementation, finalization/follow-up etc.)?

***IPPC Secretariat***

41. The Secretariat plays a critical role in ensuring training and resources support the consistent implementation of the Convention and ISPMs. Is this role recognised by CPM and contracting parties? Is it funded sufficiently as a core function of the Secretariat? If the Secretariat did not play this role, who would?
42. Are there any gaps in the Standards and Implementation Framework that have been highlighted through recent PCEs and resultant national strategies and action plans that require further guides or reference resources? Is there a process for progressing the development of these resources? Eg. Call for Topics
43. How has the IPPC been building on the results of this project? What have they learned about projects of this nature? What would they change, do differently (to capture the learning elements)? Etc.

***Donor organisations***

44. How did the donor learn of the PCE tool?
45. What does the donor expect that the PCE will achieve?
46. Will the PCE outcomes be integrated into any larger program or stand alone?
47. Will a national capacity development strategy be developed as a Project output? What role/involvement (if any) will donor staff have in the PCE?
48. Does the project funding include funding for IPPC Secretariat staff and/or a facilitator?
49. Is a co-contribution from the IPPC and/or the country required - how much (%)?
50. Is the entire PCE being run or is there a focus on only some of the 13 modules?
51. Is the donor likely to fund more PCEs as part of larger projects in other countries?
52. Is this dependent on the outcomes of a current PCE?

53. Could/would aspects of PCE be used as part of monitoring and evaluation of p/s improvements under the larger program?
54. Will the process of running a virtual PCE be analysed and adapted as alternative to f2f in future - given travel is likely to be restricted for some time to come? Could be a PCE 'lite' or progress review PCE rather than the whole thing
55. Would the donor support PCEs using IPPC-validated facilitators rather than IPPC Secretariat staff in future?

**C. General inquiries of NPPOs and RPPOs**

**Questions**

1. Were you aware of this project?
2. Do you recall receiving any information on it (2014-17)?
3. Has there been any discussion on PCE and this project been discussed at your Regional Plant Protection Organisation?
4. Have you read the 'Preparing a national capacity development strategy' training tool that was developed through this project? Ref. link: <http://www.fao.org/3/17766EN/i7766en.pdf>
5. Do you ever refer to the guidance and training materials on the IPP – either for your NPPO or in development of capacity development programs you may be involved in?
6. Do you see the PCE as an important tool for the IPPC community?



International Plant Protection Convention  
Implementation of PCEs under the IPPC Secretariat oversight from 2000 to date

## IMPLEMENTATION OF PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY EVALUATIONS UNDER THE IPPC SECRETARIAT OVERSIGHT FROM 2015 TO DATE

[1] Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations were conducted under the IPPC Secretariat oversight in the following countries:

Country	PCE project duration	PCE Facilitator(s)	Project symbol	Outputs/comments
<b>Africa</b>				
Comoros	2015-2016	Hamim Hamissi/ Sarah Brunel/ Orlando Sosa	COI/14/001//01/99	Phytosanitary Law revised National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy (NPCDS) produced
South Sudan	2015-2016	Hamim Hamissi/ Sarah Brunel	TCP/SSD/3502	Draft phytosanitary law produced NPCDS drafted but not finalized Project could not be completed due to lack of funds
Kenya	2016-2017	Chiluba Mwape/ Orlando Sosa	MTF /GLO/527/STF	NPCDS drafted
Madagascar	2016-2017	Alphonsine Louhouari/ Sarah Brunel	MTF /GLO/527/STF	Revised phytosanitary law drafted NPCDS drafted
Guinea	2016-2017	Mekki Chouibani/ Sarah Brunel	MTF /GLO/527/STF	NPCDS drafted, obtained 1 million USD through STDF
Somalia	2017-2018	Chiluba Mwape/ Orlando Sosa	TCP/SOM/3601	NPCDS drafted
Sierra Leone	2019-2020 (in progress)	Ruth Woode/Mekki Chouibani	Financed by COLEACP	In progress



Cameroon	2020	FAO Laywer	FAO project	Pesticide project, only focussing on the possible revision of the phytosanitary law
<b>Asia</b>				
Sri Lanka	2019-2020 (in progress)	Ringolds Armitis/ Sarah Brunel	GCP/INT/291/CPR	In progress
Cambodia	2021	TBD	GCP/INT/291/CPR	
Nepal	2020	Fitzroy White/Sarah Brunel		IPPC Secretariat funded by the World Bank - virtual
<b>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</b>				
Moldova	2015-2016	Ketevan Lomsadze/ Orlando Sosa	TCP/MOL/3502	NPCDS drafted
Georgia	2016-2017	Ketevan Lomsadze/ Orlando Sosa	TCP/GEO/3601/C1	NPCDS drafted
Uzbekistan	2018	Olga Lavrentjeva/ Ketevan Lomsadze	FAO project	PCE was not completed, no outputs.
Belarus	2021	TBD	FAO Project	
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>				
Barbados	2017-2018	Fitzroy White/ Sarah Brunel	TCP/RLA/0066	Phytosanitary law revised NPCDS drafted and project proposed to donors on this basis
Nicaragua	2019	Francisco Gutierrez/ Sarah Brunel	TCP/NIC/3701/C1	Phytosanitary law revised NPCDS drafted
Bahamas	2020-2021	Juliet Goldsmith/ Fitzroy White	FAO Sub-regional office	Being undertaken virtually
Dominica	2020-2021	Francisco Gutierrez	FAO Sub-regional office	Being undertaken virtually

Saint Lucia	2020-2021	Fitzroy White	FAO Sub-regional office	Being undertaken virtually
Trinidad and Tobago	2020-2021	Juliet Goldsmith/ Fitzroy White	FAO Sub-regional office	Being undertaken virtually
<b>Near East and North Africa</b>				
Palestine	2014-2018	Orlando Sosa/ Sarah Brunel (follow up)	OSRO/GAZ/402/NET	Phytosanitary law drafted NPCDS drafted and updated
Tunisia	2018	Mekki Chouibani/ Sarah Brunel	TCP/SNE/3601/C1	NPCDS drafted
<b>Pacific region</b>				
Fiji	2020	FAO Lawyer	FAO project	Revising phytosanitary law

---

**International Plant Protection Convention**

**Facilitator Training – curriculum and training materials**

The following training curriculum included e-learning with innovative adult learning. It applied techniques provided by external training consultants.

<p>Pre-workshop e-learning</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access for each participant to e-learning on the Results Based Management Thinking Tools.</li> <li>2. A project using the Logical Framework Analysis to be developed by participants using a case study on import.</li> <li>3. A virtual platform elaborated for participant to post their personal information, to run e-learning exercises, to consult documents and to post their case study. The information and tests hosted on the platform focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- knowledge of the Convention</li> <li>- knowledge of the ISPMs</li> <li>- knowledge on NPPOs and phytosanitary systems.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p>2 weeks Intensive Training-Workshop</p>	<p><u>Week 1:</u> general knowledge on phytosanitary issues and the PCE modules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Day 1: Introduction, the Convention, Country Profile and Environmental Forces</li> <li>- Day 2: Phytosanitary Legislation, Implications regarding the IPPC, Contents and relationships between of law and regulations</li> <li>- Day 3: Organization and management of an NPPO (related ISPMs and manuals), Pest Surveillance, Pest Diagnostic Capacity</li> <li>- Day 4: Pest Risk Analysis and Pest Reporting, Pest Eradication and Pest free areas and Areas of low pest prevalence, Import, export and Transit, Ethic and transparency of the PCE</li> <li>- Day 5: Stakeholders analysis introduction, field trip</li> <li>- Day 6: Work on the case study on import through a role play, Guideline on presentation skills.</li> <li>- Day 7: Day off to integrate the teachings.</li> </ul> <p>Each day ended with a test and a wrap up.</p> <p>Lawyers attended Days 1 to 4 with the participants.</p> <p><u>Week 2:</u> Logical Framework Approach and the PCE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Day 8: Introduction to general strategic planning, Stakeholders analysis, From vision to mission, Problem analysis</li> <li>- Day 9: SWOT, Logical Framework Approach</li> <li>- Day 10: Work plan and budget, Ethics and transparency, Group work</li> <li>- Day 11: Groups presentations, Discussion on how to present the outcome of the PCE to authorities</li> </ul>

	- Day 12: General wrap up, Take away message, Next steps, Trainees and training assessment.
Post-workshop	Re-submission of the individual project.

These topics were taught through sessions, structured in the following way:

- A rapid presentation on the topic (20-30 minutes maximum) with an outline, and main information related to the topic (i.e. ISPMs, existing manuals or IRSS studies, and content of the related PCE module).
- Group interactive exercises with the use of flipcharts, post its. Group exercises built on the experience and knowledge of all the participants and directed them to discover new information and findings.
- A wrap up to summarize what was learnt.
- A test to validate the acquisition of knowledge at the end of each session, posted on the PCE platform.

All sections built on each other to constitute all together a whole system (i.e. surveillance, pest risk analysis, import, export, etc. constitute all together the whole phytosanitary system). The case study that participants worked on prior to attending the training workshop is used during the workshop for role play and group exercises.

The pre-workshop e-learning consisted in 3 elements:

- E-learning on the Results Based Management Thinking Tools, which provides an introduction to the Logical Framework Approach.
- A case study specifically developed for the training, which asked participants to make proposals on phytosanitary import regulation for an imaginary country, using the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). A comprehensive guide on the LFA was also provided to participants as pre-workshop reading material.
- Multiple choice questions: 45 on the WTO, SPS Agreement and IPPC principles; 14 on phytosanitary legal aspects; 93 on Definitions, Pest listing, reporting, surveillance; 44 on Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) and activities relating to PRA; 45 questions on Pest freedom.

A dedicated web platform was developed for the project to enable sharing of all exercises and tests, and to keep track of participants CVs and performance. It proved very useful for communicating all tests and documents to the trainees, and to have all information available in a single place.

Each participant connected to the platform with a personal code after the confidentiality undertaking was returned. This enabled each participant to access reading material, e-learning questions with an automatic score and the case study. The case study could be uploaded once completed. Participants took a short test on the platform at the end of each session.

Information on the participants was available to the trainers via the platform. This included participant CVs and results to questions, tests and to the case study.

## Training material produced

Training material has been developed in line with the curriculum. As the PCE tool is confidential and as the presentation were interactive and were based on the PCE modules, only selected presentations were made available on-line at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/training-material-on-the-phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation-pce/>. In addition, an IPPC Guide *Preparing a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy* has been published in English, French and Spanish at <https://www.ippc.int/en/media-kit/>.

Content of document	Type of document	Volume	Languages	Available on-line
Agenda of the training	doc	4 pages	EN, FR, ES	
1.1 Knowing each other Setting ground rules together	pptx	9 slides	EN, FR, ES	
1.2 All what you should know about this training	pptx	16 slides	EN, FR, ES	
1.31.3 Understanding what is the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	pptx	11 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
1.4 Understanding the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)	pptx	24 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
1.5 International Standardson Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)	pptx	23 slides	EN, FR, ES	
1.6 Country Profile and Environmental Forces Assessment	pptx	5 slides	EN, FR, ES	
2.1 Working on Phytosanitary legislation	pptx	12 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
2.2 International Legal Framework	pptx	21 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
2.2 bis annex G/SPS/GEN/1490 English	pdf	5 pages	EN, FR, ES	
2.3 International legal framework: Obligations and responsibilities under the IPPC	pptx	40 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
2.4 Assess your personality profile	pptx	7 slides	EN, FR, ES	
2.5 Before Drafting Legislation	pptx	12 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
2.6 Elements of plant protection legislation	pptx	16 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
3.1 From vision to mission	pptx	19 slides	EN, FR, ES	
3.2 NPPO Establishment and Management	pptx	36 slides	EN, FR, ES	
3.3 Pest Surveillance	pptx	15 slides	EN, FR, ES	
3.4 Pest Reporting	pptx	15 slides	EN, FR, ES	
3.5 Delivering Phytosanitary Diagnostic Services	pptx	23 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.1 Pest Risk Analysis	pptx	16 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.2 Eradication, Pest Free Areas and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence – Modules 9 and 12	pptx	13 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.3 Phytosanitary import regulatory system	pptx	9 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.4 Export certification, re-export and transit	pptx	12 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.5 Ethic and transparency	pptx	8 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.1 Pest Risk Analysis	pptx	16 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.2 Eradication, Pest Free Areas and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence – Modules 9 and 12	pptx	13 slides	EN, FR, ES	
4.3 Phytosanitary import regulatory system	pptx	9 slides	EN, FR, ES	

4.4 Export certification, re-export and transit	pptx	12 slides	EN, FR, ES	
5.1 Introduction to the stakeholder analysis	pptx	8 slides	EN, FR, ES	
5.1 bis NPPO Stakeholders	pptx	23 slides	EN, FR, ES	
5.2 Simulation exercise on the PCE	pptx	6 slides	EN, FR, ES	
6.1 The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) PROCESS	pptx	7 slides	EN, FR, ES	
6.2 Presentation skills	pptx	18 slides	EN, FR, ES	
6.3 Homework	pptx	1 slide	EN, FR, ES	
8.1 Bis Activity Understanding PCE tool	pptx	2 slides	EN, FR, ES	
8.2 PCE and Strategic planning	pptx	9 slides	EN, FR, ES	X
8.3 Problem analysis	pptx	10 slides	EN, FR, ES	
8.4 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)	pptx	15 slides	EN, FR, ES	
9.1 Logical Framework Approach	pptx	29 slides	EN, FR, ES	
9.2 PCE Country Implementation Planning Discussion	pptx	4 slides	EN, FR, ES	
10.1 PCE Country Implementation	pptx	7 slides	EN, FR, ES	
10.3 Presenting the PCE Results A Wrap up Session	pptx	7 slides	EN, FR, ES	
PCE results presentation	pptx	1 slide	EN, FR, ES	
Book of exercises	doc	24 pages	EN, FR, ES	
Book of exercises for lawyers	doc	15 pages	EN, FR, ES	
Case study for PCE application	doc	15 pages	EN, FR, ES	
Instructions for trainees to draft the case study for PCE application	doc	1 page	EN, FR, ES	
CIDT Participant handbook - Strategic Planning and Program Design, using the Logical Framework Approach (LFA)	doc	101 pages	EN	
IPPC guide Preparing a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy	doc		EN, FR, ES	X
Confidentiality undertaking	doc	2 pages	EN, FR, ES	
e-learning QCM on WTO, IPPC and SPS	On-line	20 questions	EN	
e-learning QCM on legislation	On-line	8 questions	EN	
e-learning QCM on PRA	On-line	44 questions	EN	
e-learning QCM on definitions – pest listing and reporting	On-line	5 questions	EN	
e-learning QCM on import and export	On-line	43 questions	EN	
e-learning QCM on phytosanitary improvement	On-line	37 questions	EN	
Test QCM on WTO, IPPC and SPS	On-line	20 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Test QCM on legislation	On-line	8 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Test QCM on NPPO establishment	On-line	7 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Test QCM on surveillance	On-line	4 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Test QCM on phytosanitary measures	On-line	6 questions	EN, FR, ES	

Test QCM on phytosanitary improvement	On-line	10 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Test QCM on import and export	On-line	9 questions	EN, FR, ES	
Individual Test: LFA - Managing Risks (1 hour)	pptx	1 slide	EN, FR, ES	
Guidelines on the assessment of PCE facilitators (for trainers)	doc	12 pages	EN	
Grid to assess participants (training) (for trainers)	doc	1 page	EN	
Grid to assess participants (when conducting a PCE) (for trainers)	doc	1 page	EN	
Training certificate	pptx	1 page	EN, FR, ES	

## **Assessment of PCE facilitators STDF project 401**

Following a training the trainers and an assessment training with CSI consultants, a methodology to assess each participant has been determined and is detailed below.

### **1. Description of tasks, technical and personal skills, education, experience and cultural fit expected for PCE facilitators**

#### ***1.1 What PCE facilitators should do***

The PCE is structured in 3 missions having the following aims:

1. To conduct a gap analysis of the phytosanitary capacity of a country
2. To facilitate the development of a National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy
3. To facilitate national consensus on the National Phytosanitary Action Plan

These translate in the following actions:

- Prepare/organize meetings, workshops, site visits
- Review documents related to phytosanitary system and conduct analysis
- Liaise with project counterparts and follow procedures (intelligence)
- Identify key stakeholders
- Facilitate/run PCE meetings
- Keep collected information confidential
- Interview stakeholders individually on strengths and weaknesses of the phytosanitary system (to understand the phytosanitary situation of the country)
- Set tasks, regularly follow up with national stakeholders
- Debrief/report to relevant stakeholders
- 

Future steps for a trained PCE facilitators are the following:

- Draft project proposals
- Provide feedback on PCE for updating
- Identify and train potential PCE facilitators
- Identify and collect at national levels: experiences, case studies, phyto resources, gaps, risks, emerging issues (pos. and neg.)

#### ***1.2 Success indicators for a PCE***

The following elements are indicators that a PCE has been conducted successfully:

- Get positive feedback
- Stakeholders involved
- Output: strategy produced, law produced or modified
- The representative of NPPO has/feels ownership
- Strategy turns into action (projects)
- Meet key decision makers (actions)



- See impacts, e.g. Law or procedures implemented (published)

### *1.3 Skills, education, experience and cultural fit*

#### Technical skills for a PCE facilitators

- Phytosanitary systems knowledge specialist
- Strategic planning
- Group facilitation
- PCE tools knowledge (expert)
- At least one FAO language
- Office set application

#### Personal skills for a PCE facilitators (Must are in bold)

- **Good communication skills (oral and written)**
- **Organized/time management**
- **Analyzing/critical thinking/ problem solving**
- Responsive/under pressure/stress resistant
- Presentation skills/facilitation skills
- **Diplomacy/culturally sensitive**
- Discreet/responsible
- **Autonomous/Neutral**
- Genuine/inspire trust
- Willing to travel

#### Education for a PCE facilitators

- MS degree agriculture

#### Experience for a PCE facilitators

- At least 5 years' experience in NPPO or RPPO or phytosanitary programme
- International exposure
- Project management experience
- Capacity development experience

#### Cultural Fit for a PCE facilitators (Must are in bold)

- Diplomacy/neutral
- 2 languages
- Willing to travel also to developing countries
- **Integrity/ethics**
- Multicultural openness
- Medcially/physically fit for travel (no discrimination)
- **Serving humanity**

### *1.4 Profile of PCE facilitators*

Each PCE facilitator will be invited to determine his/her profile in an ice-breaker, at the beginning of the training. Some indications on how this could be done:

- we are together for the next two weeks and probably more, later
- it would be nice to know each other better, to understand and help each other better, to cooperate more, to have fun also

- one easy way is to look at one element of our personality: our working style, like: some of us are precise, quality oriented and quiet, some of us are talkative and ready to meet everybody, some of us are impatient and action oriented, some of us are curious and prefer reflexion and research, etc...

Let's see what today's mix looks like!

A good way to do this is to look at 4 different scales and you create your personal graph that will lead you to your "probable" profile.

We will then put all profiles on one slide and comment on the team image.

Then you start the profile workshop

- share one slide at a time (E/I, E/I, A/C, O/F)
- ask them to position themselves the way they are usually, naturally, not the way they should be today
- ask them to avoid "zero" on the scale
- make an example with your own graph (be a role model in sharing what seems confidential)
- mention that this is not an exact science, mistakes are ok, but seldom
- find a way to remember each one final profile (Action) and 4 letters (EEAO...)

According to the profiles elaborated by CSI consultant (see Appendix 1), the preferred profile for a PCE facilitator are:

EEAO: Action

EIAO: Project

### ***1.4 Attitude***

PCE facilitators should have a positive attitude.



Cynical
Obstructive
Not cooperative
Withdrawn
Not productive
Blame others/undermines
Procrastinate
Negative
Pessimist
Criticize the organization

Positive
Enthousiastic
Productive
Cooperative
Serious
Success oriented
Engaged
Pro-active
Solution oriented
Integrity
Serving others
Motivates others

## **2. Organization of assessments prior and during and after the training**

The indispensable technical and personal skills, and cultural fit will be assessed prior the workshop as well as during the workshop. Further assessment will be undertaken for the trainees that will be involved in phase 2.

**2.1 Assessment prior and during the training (Phase 1)**

A table with the essential skills and the various sources for assessing them is provided below. A grid for each participant, identified by a number will be provided to trainers to be filled in during the training. Each trainer will assess up to 5 participants during the whole Training workshop: prior to the workshop through exercises, during the workshops through the group works, interactions, role play, individual presentation, attendance, profile and profile weaknesses, the interview, field trip and social events.

A score will be given to each participants for tests (for QCMs and case study). For other skills to be assessed, a scale of Low, Medium or High will be used.

Details on the interviews are provided in point 3.

The candidates to be selected will be the ones with medium/high technical skills and medium/high personal skills, as detailed in the following grid of first level analysis:

Technical skills	NO	YES	YES
High			
Medium	NO	YES/NO	YES
Low	NO	NO	NO
	Low	Medium	High
			Personal skills

**2.2 Assessment during the conduction of the PCE (Phase 2)**

Following the previously described assessment during the workshop, the best candidates will be selected to conduct a PCE in a country.

Prior, during and after the mission, all the skills will be reassessed. Additional skills to be assessed during the Phase 2 of conducting a PCE in a country are the following:

- Project management
- Autonomous/neutral for later
- Diplomacy
- Discrete/responsible
- Genuine/inspire trust

At the end of the PCE, the success factors will also be sued.

Number  
Trainer:

	CV	Tests pre-learning	Case study	Tests during learning	Questions on PCE	Group work	Role play	Observation of interaction	Individual presentation	Interview	Attendance	Field trip	Social/Private
General Phytosanitary knowledge	x	x	x	x				x				x	
IPPC/ISPMs	x	x	x	x									
Practical implementation knowledge	x		x		x		x	x					
Strategic planning			x					x					
PCE modules knowledge	x				x					x			
Facilitation and presentation skills	x					x	x	x	x				
Communication oral						x	x	x	x	x			
Communication written			x										
Organized and time management			x					x	x	x	x	x	x
Analyzing/critical thinking/problem solving			x			x	x			x		x	x
Diplomacy/cultural sensitivity						x	x		x	x		x	x
Integrity/ethic								x		x	x	x	x
Serving humanity								x		x		x	x
<b>Other remarks</b>													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discrete/responsible</li> <li>- Autonomous/neutral</li> <li>- Genuine/inspire trust</li> </ul>													

### 3. Questions to be asked during interviews

#### 3.1 Translating values into questions

The values of integrity and serving humanity are difficult to assess. They are sliced to characteristics:

- Integrity: honest, demonstrating ethical behaviour, demonstrating the values of the organization, being good, treat people the way you want to be treated, no lies, discreet and maintain confidentiality, do not cheat, do not use information for personal benefit, being franc, morals and values, acting in accordance with the code of conduct of the organization, respect of the rules, be considerate of others.
- serving humanity: selfless (putting others needs above your own), dedicated to a cause, understanding, patient (having restraint, knowing when to act), respect of culture and tradition, responsive, responsible, pro-active to solve problems, change oriented, development oriented, principle behaviour, ethical behaviour, not to abuse authority or situation, being considerate of situation of others who are less privileged, showing values, having integrity, conviction people, not joking on race and value, empathy, tolerant, genuine. Ex. Belong to associations.

These 2 values would translate in the following questions:

#### Diplomacy/cultural sensitivity

Give me a real example when you had to manage a situation involving a cultural or political obstacle that you successfully solved.

I would like to hear details, what was the issue, who did it involved, when, where and how you handled it.

#### Integrity and ethics

Tell me what the term “Integrity” means for you? Can you relate to me a specific experience of yours that illustrate it?

Can you provide an example when you have been in a situation in which you had to be considerate of others and their needs?

Can you provide an example when you were helping others?

#### Serving humanity

While working in a country, one of the most important key goals is to serve humanity. Could you please define what is your understanding “to serve humanity”?

#### 3.2 Other questions

Other questions had been thought of for other skills, which will be assessed through other sources:

#### Being organized

To work as a PCE facilitator, you will need to be organized in order to face different challenges in a country you work in. Can you please provide your best example of a project. Could you

give the best example when you managed your tasks/projects in an organized way? What was the task, people and situation you managed?

In your work, can you please provide me with an exact example that you have organized effectively and that you are proud of? Please provide me with details such as names, dates.

In your work, can you please provide me with an exact example of when you have managed your time effectively to achieve the objectives of a project that you are proud of. Please provide me with details such as names and dates.

#### Oral Communication skills

In your work, can you please provide an example of a situation when you have communicated an important message to a group of stakeholders? By the way, can you please give me dates, names and details. Take your time.

How was listening useful in this communication?

#### Analytical/critical thinking/problem solving

In your work, can you please provide an example when you have put in practice your critical thinking. With critical thinking, we intend the process of evaluating information critically to guide to your action. Please elaborate by providing dates, names and details. Take your time.

#### Autonomous/neutral

Can you give me your best example of an event or activity in which you acted autonomously How did you manage it? Please give me details, who was involved, names and dates and any other details you wish to give me. Please take your time.

### ***3.3 Interview content***

A 45 minutes interview will be organized for each participant and ran by 2 trainers. These interviews will be ran during the second week of training and will be filmed.

At the beginning of the interview, it should be mentioned that there will be 4 questions for the 45 min of interview, and that participants can go back to a question if necessary.

The 4 questions to be asked will be:

#### **1. Describe in concise terms the PCE process.**

*Answer:*

- 1. Application to the IPPC for access to the system*
- 2. Designation of a PCE coordinator and Facilitator (if needed)*
- 3. Selection of the modules to be applied*
- 4. Selection of stakeholders to participate in the process*
- 5. Conduct of a situation/gap analysis using the PCE module questionnaire*
- 6. Identification of priority weaknesses (no more than 5)*
- 7. Conduct of a problem analysis*
- 8. Conduct of the SWOT analysis*
- 9. Conduct of the logical framework and work plan*
- 10. PCE report editing*
- 11. Presentation of the National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy*

2. In your work, can you please provide me with an exact example of when you have managed your time effectively to achieve the objectives of a project that you are proud of. Please provide me with details such as names and dates.
3. Give us your best example of a problem you encountered in your job and how you solved it successfully. Please specify the problem, the process you followed, names, dates, details, and why you considered it successful.
4. Tell me what the term “Integrity” means for you? Can you relate to me a specific experience of yours that illustrates it?

## Appendix 1: Assessment of profiles

# Relationship

<i>Extraversion</i>	<i>Introversion</i>
You need to talk to think	You think better if you do not talk at the same time
You enjoy meeting with others	You may not need to meet so often with others
You like a variety of tasks	You work better if you concentrate on one thing at a time
It is ok to interrupt you at work	You dislike to be interrupted
You may talk easily in public	You need to prepare before talking in public
You contribute at meetings	You are rather quiet in meetings
You tend to be impulsive	You tend to consider before taking actions

*CSI Consultants*

# Working with ideas

<i>Experimental</i>	<i>Innovate</i>
It is here & now	You are more future oriented
You like defined problems	You enjoy ambiguity or complex problems
You like proven tested ideas	You work better if you can generate lots of new ideas
You are very practical	You are seen by others as "head in the clouds"
You like to work with real matters	You search for possibilities
You like standard systems, procedures that work	You search for a new way
Facts & details are important	You jump too quickly beyond facts
You solve problems with a given problem solving technique	You have creative ways of solving problems

*CSI Consultants*



## Decision making

### *Analysing*

You have objective decision criteria

Your decisions bring payoff

You may be perceived as cold and detached

Your decisions are linked to the situation

You decide using evidences

Your fairness may depend on company culture

You like clear analysis

Tasks are important

### *Conviction*

You have more subjective personal decision criteria

You measure your decisions against your beliefs

You are over committed some time

The situation may not change your decision, personal consideration may

You search for right & wrong

Your fairness relates to your values & beliefs

You like harmony & common values

Principles are important

*CSI Consultants*

## Your environment

### *Orderly*

You like actions & solving issues

You like working with order

You develop a plan & follow it through

You rush to quick decisions & may lack information

You hate to be late & you dislike when others are late

You respect deadlines

You dislike too many changes

Concluding is important

### *Flexible*

You like information, you may procrastinate for more  
You are often disorganized

Your plans change often

Your decisions may be delayed because you want more info

You may be late & it is ok for the others to be late

You may fail to meet dead lines

You are open minded & you may change plans easily

Diagnosing is important

*CSI Consultants*



IMAGINATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irregular work pattern</li> <li>• Hate deadlines</li> <li>• Conceptual and global</li> <li>• Future Oriented</li> <li>• Prefer complexity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At ease in R&amp;D</li> <li>• Solve problems (their own way)</li> <li>• Find provocative solutions</li> <li>• Disorganized</li> <li>• Active mind</li> </ul>
PROMOTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Real promoter</li> <li>• Opportunist</li> <li>• Use others' ideas</li> <li>• Do many things</li> <li>• Easily bored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of energy</li> <li>• Create networks of people</li> <li>• Find resources</li> <li>• Speakers and communications</li> <li>• Visionary</li> </ul>
PROJECT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective and analyzing</li> <li>• Turn ideas into solutions</li> <li>• Search project works</li> <li>• Like experimental work</li> <li>• Move from one project into another</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather active and communicative</li> <li>• Avoid routine work</li> <li>• Sometime surprizing</li> <li>• Developers and testers</li> <li>• "Cold" analyst</li> </ul>
ACTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organize everything</li> <li>• Methodical</li> <li>• No delays</li> <li>• Fast face, strong will</li> <li>• Very active</li> <li>• Start projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect timing and plans</li> <li>• Ignore others' feelings</li> <li>• Impatient and realistic</li> <li>• Not a negotiator</li> <li>• Can work on very large projects</li> </ul>
PRODUCTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like "real" work</li> <li>• Measure everything</li> <li>• Like to finish projects</li> <li>• Tend to test ideas</li> <li>• Follow a plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not afraid by quantities</li> <li>• Like production environment</li> <li>• Decide and act</li> <li>• Avoid too many changes</li> <li>• Time conscious, efficient</li> </ul>
EXPERTISE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather serious-minded</li> <li>• Like control work</li> <li>• Reliable and precise</li> <li>• Usually reserved</li> <li>• Like to check</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irritated when not perfect</li> <li>• Respect rules</li> <li>• Do one thing at a time</li> <li>• Work carefully</li> <li>• Tend to be meticulous</li> </ul>
DUTY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong sense of duty</li> <li>• Usually loyal</li> <li>• Build amiable atmosphere</li> <li>• Strong personal values</li> <li>• Sense of justice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catalyst in a group</li> <li>• Careful negotiator</li> <li>• Take risks to help others</li> <li>• Create company culture</li> </ul>
INFORMATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledgeable</li> <li>• Search for new information</li> <li>• Very flexible</li> <li>• Attentive to others' feelings</li> <li>• Fight for their own ideas and values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discover unexpected information</li> <li>• Not decisive</li> <li>• Not time conscious</li> <li>• Like to work their own way</li> <li>• Help others when motivated</li> </ul>

**Results of participant feedback in facilitator training workshops**

An on-line survey received feedback from 32 participants across the five facilitator workshops. Eleven questions sought feedback on the training, trainers and course materials in a 1-5 ranking scale. A further five questions sought qualitative feedback from participants to improve the training in future. These were:

Q12: What were the most useful aspects of the workshop?

Q13: What were the least useful aspects of the workshop?

Q14: What should we do differently next time?

Q15: Additional comments and suggestions:

Q16: Please specify any further training and/or coaching you feel would be useful in the future:

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
Q1: The training workshop reached its objective of training potential PCE facilitators				5	25
Q2: The content of the training workshop served objectives well				3	29
Q3: The training workshop methodology in whole enhanced your learning			1	7	24
Q4: The training workshop material provided (i.e. print out of presentations, exercises, the manual, etc.) enhanced your learning			1	8	23
Q5: The PCE training platform (where the case study and tests were posted) was user friendly and a useful tool for your learning			1	12	23
Q6: The CIDT pre e-Learning module was of help to get prepared on the Logical Framework Approach				8	23

Q7: The pre workshop tests were useful to get prepared for the training		1	2	10	18
Q8: The case study of Antigonja helped you implement what you learnt				6	26
Q9: The trainers explained the training workshop material in a way that you could understand			1	3	24
Q10: The trainers were available to answer your questions				6	26
Q11: Overall, the PCE facilitators training workshop was useful to you				3	29
N=32 [8+7+8+5+4]					