



ORGANISATION NORD AMERICAINE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANIZACION NORTEAMERICANA DE PROTECCION A LAS PLANTAS
CANADA UNITED STATES MEXICO

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

Executive Summary and Recommendations

The Evaluation of the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) was carried out from September, 2007 to March 2008 by REL Solutions Inc., an independent consulting firm.

The evaluation addressed four broad areas:

- Mission and Strategic Goals;
- Performance and effectiveness;
- Governance and organizational structure; and
- Funding.

Regarding NAPPO's Mission and Strategic Goals, the evaluation found that:

- There is very strong public and private support - regionally and internationally.
- Plant protection should continue to be the main driver; trade facilitation is critical and compatible.
- NAPPO is widely recognized for its leadership within the region and globally.
- Additional outreach efforts with industry and environment representatives will ensure continued relevance of regional and international standards.

Regarding the Performance and Effectiveness of NAPPO, the evaluation found that:

- NAPPO has developed 27 regional phytosanitary standards; all but one has been introduced/modified over the past 10 years; and indeed, two-thirds over the past 5 years.
- Numerous regional standards have been the basis for International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) standards -- Pest Risk Analysis, Pest Free Areas, Wood Packaging, Areas of Low Pest Prevalence, Consignments in Transit, Pest Free Areas for Fruit Flies, and Plants for Planting which is currently under development).
- These 'success stories' underscore the benefit, measured in terms of economic losses avoided, of timely introduction of regional and international pest prevention actions.
- Background research has shown that savings in pest control and eradication programs can run as high as thousands of millions of dollars. NAPPO needs to showcase these success stories through an annual report to senior government and industry officials.

Regarding NAPPO Governance and Organizational Structure, the evaluation found that:

- The organizational structure of NAPPO is judged to work quite well. The roles and responsibilities of key NAPPO agents are written into the Constitution and Bylaws and provided through the NAPPO website.

- Accountabilities would be strengthened at several levels by using ‘accountability contracts’ to ensure the timely delivery of results.
- NAPPO’s Strategic Plan should be updated taking into account this evaluation and monitored/updated on an annual basis.
- The location of the Secretariat (Ottawa, Canada) is not an issue.

Regarding the issue of NAPPO funding, the evaluation found that:

- NAPPO has a very small budget for an international organization, especially considering its major contribution to regional and international pest prevention efforts
- Due to the strengthened Canadian dollar and the addition of a Technical Director position, the regular country contributions no longer cover NAPPO expenses and the reserve fund will soon be depleted.
- Increasing the annual country contribution in an equitable fashion provides the most stable and sustainable strategy, without the threat of compromising the role of NAPPO.

CONCLUSION

The North American Plant Protection Organization has established itself as a key player in plant protection, both regionally and internationally, since its creation in 1967. It is a unique forum for public/private sectors and NGOs to collaborate in the protection of the plant resources (agricultural and forestry) of North America.

International movement of goods and people continues to increase at a rapid pace and protection of plant resources is best achieved using a continental approach. Plant pests do not respect international boundaries.

A renewed strategic plan and a solidified funding base will allow NAPPO to build on past achievements and develop strategies and actions to prepare for the ever-increasing plant protection challenges of the 21st century.

Recommendations RE (1) ‘NAPPO Mission and Strategic Goals’

REC (1.1) Regarding the goal on ‘industry involvement’, NAPPO leadership needs to work with the Industry Advisory Group (IAG) to seek ways to ‘reach out’ to industry as part of a campaign to gain broader awareness of NAPPO’s role and the benefits to industry of their involvement. Development of an awareness/communication campaign could ultimately be targeted at a wider audience (See **REC (1.8)** below).

REC (1.2) To put more onus and accountability on industry in general and the representatives on the IAG in particular, the roles and responsibilities of IAG members need to be articulated and posted on the NAPPO website. In particular, an articulation of the expectations re their gathering of industry input and sharing NAPPO information broadly across industry sectors as the ‘voices’ of industry in their respective country.

REC (1.3) Regarding the goal on ‘inclusion on environmental perspectives’, NAPPO executive need to consider where and how to more systematically and proactively integrate spokespersons who can speak intelligently on environmental issues/concerns into the work of NAPPO Panels. This will likely require broadening the network currently being used to identify ‘environmental’ representatives.

REC (1.4) Related to REC (1.3), each member of the Executive Committee should initiate discussion with other government agencies/departments that represent environmental issues in their respective country. The purpose would be to reinforce the utility of cooperation and participation on NAPPO Panels, where relevant; additionally, to try to ensure that budgetary and other administrative constraints would not stand in the way of the participation of environmental experts attending NAPPO Panels or other meetings.

REC (1.5) Regarding the role on 'world trade', the Executive Committee should consider building into the NAPPO work plan and budgeting for an ongoing 'international capacity building' role for NAPPO; i.e. provision of training, workshops and dissemination of other information in cases that support the introduction of a new NAPPO and IPPC standard in areas where risks to the NAPPO region would be considered high due to the level of international trade into the NAPPO region.

REC (1.6) Regarding the goal on 'NAPPO reputation', NAPPO executive should clarify and rearticulate the intent of this goal and ensure that it is communicated to all stakeholders.

REC (1.7) Regarding NAPPO 'awareness', NAPPO executive should give consideration to building a fifth goal around the target of increasing the profile and understanding of NAPPO, particularly among senior officials within the public sector of each country. The importance of this is to make NAPPO a higher priority and, by extension, to obtain a more secure, sustainable and (hopefully) higher budget to support NAPPO activities. One implication of a higher profile though is that it likely raises expectations among senior officials about what NAPPO will deliver. Realistic expectations need to be set (given the limited overall budget of NAPPO) and greater accountability needs to be built into the full NAPPO governance and reporting structure. (See REC () below).

REC (1.8) Regarding NAPPO awareness and outreach, NAPPO executive should consider developing an 'Information Kit' that could be easily modified to serve different audiences. Standard material could include the higher-level links to NAFTA and SPP, as well as highlights of NAPPO pest risk and trade facilitation 'success stories'. A package for industry would also include for example, some identification of industry's role in NAPPO and NAPPO's expectations.

REC (1.9) Corresponding to REC (1.7) and (1.8), if a goal on increasing NAPPO awareness was established, NAPPO should develop an appropriate communication strategy with an integrated public relations plan to achieve Regional recognition, build and manage the positive image of and to promote NAPPO. As part of this, all materials, including presentation decks should, as a standard be available in both English and Spanish.

Recommendations RE (2) 'Performance and Effectiveness of NAPPO'

REC (2.1) The Executive Committee needs to clarify the expectations for NAPPO in terms of how to define 'success' and 'good performance'. This relates back to the ambiguity about NAPPO's mandate and whether or not NAPPO should be spending more resources and efforts to ensure 'implementation' of standards in a timely fashion.

REC (2.2) Additional actions need to be taken to encourage the timely introduction of new standards, once approved by all three countries. The Working Group, with the assistance of the Secretariat, should be tasked with the specific role of preparing a short ‘monitoring’ report, say every 6 months, on the status of implementation of each of the outstanding standards. This should then be a standing item on the agenda of each Executive Committee meeting.

REC (2.3) If it is determined that training is a major stumbling block to implementation of a standard, NAPPO Executive Committee could/should consider a plan where an expert mission from NAPPO is sent to the field to provide needed training/workshops and help implement a work plan. This could be led by the NAPPO Technical Director or contracted out to another expert. In either case, this should be administered on a ‘fee for service’ basis.

Recommendations RE (3) ‘Governance and Organizational Structure’

REC (3.1) The roles and responsibilities of the NAPPO Working Group need to be better articulated. As part of this exercise, consideration should be given to specifying particular ways that the Working Group can and should be supporting the work of the Secretariat; for example, in ensuring the successful participation in NAPPO of industry in their country and in the inclusion of ‘environmental’ representation (as appropriate) in the work of Panels.

REC (3.2) Working Group members in each country need to be given adequate time within their NPPO position to carry out this crucial role within NAPPO. The latter should represent a significant portion of their NPPO job description and their NAPPO Working Group performance should be a key highlight in their annual employee appraisal.

REC (3.3) The roles and responsibilities of the NAPPO Secretariat need to be better articulated. Within the Secretariat, the role of the Executive Director and the Technical Director need to be agreed upon. There is an undercurrent of tension between at least one NPPO about possible emerging roles for the Secretariat (in international fora), and this should be addressed.

REC (3.4) NAPPO executive should sharpen the description of roles and responsibilities for the position of Technical Director, as posted on the NAPPO website. As discussed throughout this report, a Technical Director offers many opportunities for NAPPO, and consideration needs to be given to identify the priority areas for this position. Recognizing that it may evolve, particularly with the possible introduction of new work, the position description should be revisited in each of the next two years to ensure that there is clarity around this role.

REC (3.5) NAPPO executive should include on the website description of roles and responsibilities an elaboration of the expectations for both Panel Chairs and the Industry Advisory Group. The rationale behind this was given in the discussion of REC (2.8) and REC (1.2) respectively.

REC (3.6) NAPPO executive should implement a systematic strategic planning process that would address its mandate, priorities and the key issues raised in the Evaluation study. In so doing, the Executive Committee needs to take a more pro-active role to

provide direction for NAPPO as well as serve to position it appropriately against the broad set of Regional and global pest protection and trade challenges that are evolving.

This should be communicated to key NAPPO stakeholders and serve to drive the annual business planning process. This broader-based strategic planning should be forward-looking (with say a 3 to 5 year time horizon) and draw intelligence and input from a broader set of stakeholders than the normal NAPPO channels (i.e. NAPPO Panels and Committee members).

REC (3.7) On an annual basis, NAPPO executive should build a ‘strategic management and direction setting’ component into the annual business planning exercise. This would require a greater commitment of time on the part of all key NAPPO players (Secretariat, Working Group and, in particular, Executive Committee). This should be conducted separate from and in advance of the operational business planning that takes place during and around the Annual Meeting in October.

REC (3.8) NAPPO executive should put in place mechanisms for greater accountability for all the key NAPPO players, to help ensure that performance meets expectations at all levels, from the Executive Committee down to the work of particular Panels. On the broadest level, this would involve developing an accountability and performance framework, to serve as the basis for measuring and reporting to key stakeholders on ‘results achieved’ for NAPPO over a particular period of time. At the level of Panels, REC (2.9) suggests an approach.

REC (3.9) NAPPO should consider introducing a new form of ‘Annual Report’; i.e. one that would be at a higher level than current documents and that would succinctly bring together information on NAPPO performance, ‘results achieved’ and serve to showcase the importance of NAPPO with a senior-level audience. This links to REC (1.7) and REC (1.9).

REC (3.10) The Executive Committee should take the decision to retain the NAPPO Secretariat in its current location.

REC (3.11) The NAPPO Secretariat e-mail address should be given a more generic address, rather than the current version that links to one of the 3 specific countries.

Recommendations RE (4) ‘NAPPO Funding’

REC (4.1) The Executive Committee needs to be seeking the most stable and sustainable source for future funding of the NAPPO Secretariat. This should come from country contributions from each of the three countries. Long-term planning needs to rely on the assurance of sustainable and stable funds.

REC (4.2) The current formula, whereby each country contributes an equal amount to the funding of the NAPPO Secretariat should be maintained, though the contribution from each country will have to be increased.

REC (4.3) To determine the appropriate level of funding needed for the Secretariat, looking ahead, the NAPPO executive needs to base this on a determination of what ‘business’ it sees for the Secretariat, in support of the overall goals of NAPPO.

REC (4.4) The NAPPO executive should seek to finance the NAPPO Secretariat in order to allow it to engage in services deemed important and within its mandate. Based on current estimates, this would amount to a total budget for the Secretariat of \$650K. In terms of funding needs, there would be a total shortfall of \$330K, or \$110K in additional funds from each of the three countries. Each of the three Heads of NPPOs should seek these funds from their respective government sources, to commence in the next fiscal year, using the results of the independent Evaluation Study and its follow-up to provide the rationale.

REC (4.5) The funding formula for annual country contributions should include a factor for inflation, over time.

REC (4.6) To demonstrate good governance, management control and efficiency in operation, the NAPPO executive should task the Secretariat and Working Group to conduct a review of NAPPO Panels with the intention of identifying those lower priority areas where costs might be saved through sunseting or termination of a Panel.