

January 2013



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة للأمم
المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and
Agriculture
Organization
of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная
организация
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones Unidas
para la
Alimentación y la
Agricultura

COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Item 4.2 of the Provisional Agenda

Fourteenth Regular Session

Rome, 15-19 April 2013

REVIEW OF THE FUNDING STRATEGY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR ANIMAL GENETIC RESOURCES

Table of Contents

	Paragraph
I. Introduction.....	1 – 4
II. Progress in the implementation of the Funding Strategy.....	5 – 25
III. Draft monitoring and evaluation system	26 – 29
IV. Guidance sought.....	30
 Annex 1. Draft procedures for monitoring and independent evaluation	
 Annex 2: Draft amendments to the Funding Strategy for the Implementation of the <i>Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources</i>	

Tables

1	Voluntary contributions to the FAO Trust Account (GCP/GLO/287/MUL)
2	Geographical distribution of eligible concept notes
3	Budget estimate for monitoring and evaluation of the first project cycle funded under the Trust Account of the Funding Strategy (USD)

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (the Commission), at its Twelfth Regular Session, adopted the *Funding Strategy for the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources*¹ (Funding Strategy) and requested FAO to implement it.²
2. At its Thirteenth Regular Session, the Commission requested FAO to launch the first call for proposals for the use of funds received through the FAO Trust Account, and provided detailed guidance on the process.³ It also requested FAO to prepare draft monitoring procedures for consideration at its Fourteenth Regular Session as a basis for using experience gained in the first round of projects in preparing for subsequent calls for proposals.⁴
3. According to the Funding Strategy,⁵ reporting to the Commission is required at each of its regular sessions. At its current and Sixteenth Regular Sessions, the Commission will review progress reports on the operation and effectiveness of the Funding Strategy.
4. This document provides information on resources under the FAO Trust Account for the Funding Strategy, and gives a brief overview of FAO's Regular Programme and extrabudgetary financial resources dedicated to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources (Global Plan of Action)*. It reports on the status of implementation of the first project cycle under the FAO Trust Account for the Funding Strategy, and considers monitoring and evaluation procedures. More detailed information on resources dedicated to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*, as well as partnerships and alliances pursued by FAO with other international mechanisms and organizations to facilitate the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*, is given in the document *Detailed FAO progress report on the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources*.⁶

II. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FUNDING STRATEGY

A. Use of resources under the FAO Trust Account for the Funding Strategy

Contributions to the FAO Trust Account

5. In line with the *Global Plan of Action*, FAO established, in 2009, the FAO Trust Account for the Funding Strategy.⁷ Contributions received as of 31 December 2012 are shown in *Table 1*. In addition, Switzerland provided financial resources for an Associate Professional Officer to support the Animal Genetic Resources Branch in the implementation of the Funding Strategy.

Table 1. Voluntary contributions to the FAO Trust Account (GCP/GLO/287/MUL)⁸

Donor	Year	Contribution
Switzerland	2009	50 000 (USD)
Switzerland	2010	250 000 (USD)
Norway	2010	100 000 (USD)
Germany	2011	480 000 (Euro)
Switzerland	2012	106 000 (USD)

¹ CGRFA-12/09/Report, Appendix C.

² CGRFA-12/09/Report, paragraph 43.

³ CGRFA-13/11/Report 12, paragraphs 85–88.

⁴ CGRFA-13/11/Report 12, paragraph 88.

⁵ Annex I, Section D, I. Periodicity of reporting.

⁶ CGRFA/WG-AnGR-7/12/Inf.2.

⁷ Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources, paragraph 68.

⁸ Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) and <http://www.fao.org/tc/tcom>

Call for submission of concept notes

6. On 15 September 2011, a call for concept notes for projects to be funded under the Funding Strategy was published. Within the deadline for submission (15 November 2011), the Secretariat received 52 eligible concept notes: 43 single-country and 9 multiple-country concept notes (see *Table 2*).

7. The Commission, at its Thirteenth Regular Session, had agreed on a maximum budget per project of USD 50 000 for single-country projects and USD 100 000 for multiple-country projects. The duration of projects was limited to a maximum of two years. The Commission also agreed that under the first call for proposals countries could submit not more than one proposal.

Table 2. Geographical distribution of eligible concept notes

Region	Number of concept notes	Number of Commission Member countries involved
Africa	27	28
Latin America and the Caribbean	8	11
Asia	7	6
Europe	5	8
Near East	4	4
Southwest Pacific	1	2
Total	52	59

Screening of concept notes

8. The Secretariat collated all the concept notes, verified adherence to eligibility criteria as given in Section B of *Annex I* to the Funding Strategy and prepared relevant background documentation to facilitate the screening of concept notes.

9. As requested by the Commission,⁹ Regional Focal Points for Animal Genetic Resources (RFPs) and some subRFPs, as well as regional networks, provided support in facilitating the screening of concept notes by the Bureau of the Working Group. Some RFPs held wide consultations among their member countries and provided detailed evaluations.

10. Taking into account the appraisals of the RFPs and regional networks, the Bureau of the Working Group ranked the concept notes according to five selection criteria, identified as being the most relevant and distinctive criteria for the selection of concept notes. Each member of the Bureau of the Working Group evaluated each of the 52 concept notes using a point system under which each concept note was awarded between 1 and 10 points for each criterion, with 10 points being the highest achievable score.

11. The Bureau of the Working Group selected the 26 concept notes with the highest total scores and submitted them to the Bureau of the Commission, which approved all of them.

Submission of project proposals

12. The Secretariat of the Working Group invited relevant proponents to submit a project proposal by 15 August 2012 and also informed proponents about concept notes that had not been selected. A summary of the selection process is available online.¹⁰

⁹ CGRFA-13/11/Report, paragraph 87.

¹⁰ http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/genetics/Funding_strategy.html

Appraisal and approval of project proposals for funding

13. In accordance with the Funding Strategy, the Bureau of the Working Group designated a panel of experts for the screening of the project proposals.¹¹ Following the experience of the International Treaty, each project proposal was reviewed by three experts. Subsequently, each member of the Bureau of the Working Group evaluated each of the project proposals, taking into account the appraisal report provided by the Panel of Experts. In their evaluation, the Bureau Members focused on the quality of the proposals and on the conversion of expert opinions in this regard, as well as on the most equitable use of available funds among countries. Following these criteria, the Working Group Bureau selected 13 project proposals, as shown in *Table 3*, for approval by the Commission Bureau. All proposed projects were approved for funding. Letters of agreement (LoA) with successful proponents have been initiated.

Table 3. Projects approved for funding Ranking	Country	Title	Fund	Cumulative funds
1	Balkan countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	BushaLive	100000	100000
2	Mozambique	Conservation of native cattle breeds of Mozambique, for their present and future use	50000	150000
3	Cook Islands, Fiji and Niue	South West Pacific Regional Animal Genetic Resources Project	100000	250000
4	Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Peru	Capacity strengthening for implementing breeding strategies for llamas in Bolivia and Peru	100000	350000
5	Togo	Caractérisation phénotypique et moléculaire des populations locales de poules au Togo	49795	399795
6	Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda	Promotion of indigenous chicken for improved livelihood and income generation	100000	499795
7	Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Senegal	Assessment of the impact of transhumance on the sustainable management of animal genetic resources	100000	599795
8	Algeria, Morocco	Préservation de la race ovine Béni Guil par les échanges de semences entre pays	100000	699795
9	Uruguay	Caracterización productiva y conservación en ovinos criollos de Uruguay	49985	749780
10	Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica	Enhancement of farmers' communities through goat utilization and genetic improvement	100000	849780
11	India	Documenting and supporting community-based conservation of four local breeds	50000	899780
12	Nigeria	Conserving the Muturu breed of cattle in South Rain Forest Zone of Nigeria	50000	949780

¹¹ Each member of the Working Group Bureau nominated two experts from his/her region.

13	Chile	<i>In situ</i> conservation strategies for cattle and goats	49000	998780
----	-------	---	-------	--------

Lessons learned

14. The number of concept notes received within a relatively short period of time, from all regions and from a wide range of institutions, groups and entities is indicative of some of the unmet financial needs required for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*.

15. The initial experience in the operation of the Trust Account demonstrates the importance of having efficient and simple procedures. In order to improve subsequent calls for proposals, the Commission may wish to clarify the role of RFPs in the pre-screening of concept notes as well as the number of single-country and multiple-country concept notes a country may submit under the same project cycle.

16. According to the Operational Procedures, concept notes and project proposals have to be submitted through Commission members (or their National Focal Points) to the FAO Secretariat. However, a question may be raised as to why project proposals should need to be submitted through Commission members even though the respective Commission members have previously approved the concept notes for the same project proposals. In line with the Working Group's recommendation,¹² the Commission may wish to consider changing the Funding Strategy so as to allow for the direct submission of project proposals by their proponents to the FAO Secretariat, as proposed in Draft Amendment 2 given in *Annex 2* to this document.

17. The Commission may also wish to consider simplifying the current approval procedures by delegating the selection of concept notes and the appraisal, as well as the approval of project proposals, to the Bureau of the Working Group, as proposed by the Working Group at its last session.¹³ Draft Amendments 1, 3 and 4 contained in *Annex 2* to this document reflect this proposal.

Administrative arrangements

18. The Commission, at its Twelfth Regular Session, noted that the level of administration associated with the FAO Trust Account should be commensurate with the size of its available budget.¹⁴ In the absence of a dedicated fund, FAO currently supports, through its Regular Programme, the operation of the Funding Strategy.

19. During the implementation of the first call for proposals, it has become evident that there is a need to standardize the process of receiving applications and systematizing the information through the use of appropriate information, communication and management tools. Such tools are important in enabling inquiries to be addressed promptly, for monitoring and reporting on the development of the project cycle and to reduce the workload of the Secretariat.

20. In line with FAO administrative procedures, LoAs are being used as contractual instruments, with the approved project document as annexes.

B. Information on FAO's Regular Programme and extrabudgetary resources dedicated to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*

FAO Regular Programme resources

¹² CGRFA-WG-AnGR-7/12/Report, paragraph 20 viii.

¹³ CGRFA-WG-AnGR-7/12/Report, paragraph 20 vi.

¹⁴ CGRFA-12/09/Report, paragraph 43.

21. In FAO's Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2010-13 and its Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2010-11¹⁵ and 2012-2013,¹⁶ animal genetic resources-related activities are listed under three organizational results.¹⁷ In addition, the majority of decentralized offices have planned activities and outputs related to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*, based on the requirements of the respective region.

22. FAO has been involved in the development of national and regional Technical Cooperation Projects contributing to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*. An overview of resources by organizational output, strategic priority area and location can be found in the document *Detailed FAO progress report on the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources*.¹⁸

23. An increasing number of countries requesting technical assistance, the continued need to keep up to date with fast-emerging new technologies in animal genetics and breeding, and the need to support capacity development and the implementation of the Funding Strategy are putting heavy pressure on FAO's human resources.

Voluntary contributions to FAO

24. Trust funds in support of the *Global Plan of Action* have been made available under the Strategic Partnership for Rural Development between Sweden and FAO, under the FAO-Norway Partnership Cooperation Agreement, under the FAO-Turkish Partnership Programme and by Germany. The funds under these agreements help FAO to provide catalytic funds for special activities at all levels. In addition, FAO is associated with two GEF and European Commission-funded projects that support the generation and dissemination of knowledge. FAO has also prepared a multidonor trust fund programme to facilitate the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*. This fund has so far received one contribution, from Switzerland in support of the Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS).

Other resources

25. The Funding Strategy also includes resources that are not under FAO control. FAO continues to provide information to countries on such funding sources and grants through the DAD-Net discussion network and through its web site.¹⁹ The information provided in the document *Synthesis progress report on the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources – 2012*,²⁰ provides an overview of various policies, programmes and activities undertaken at different levels to promote the wise management of animal genetic resources.

II. DRAFT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

26. The Commission, at its Thirteenth Regular Session, requested FAO to administer, implement, monitor and evaluate projects funded under the FAO Trust Account for the Funding Strategy, in line with the rules and procedures laid out in the Funding Strategy and FAO procedures. It also requested FAO to prepare draft monitoring procedures, as envisaged in the Funding Strategy.²¹

27. Draft procedures for monitoring and evaluation are given in *Annex I* to this document. It should be noted that the Funding Strategy, in Section C.II.8, sets out reporting and monitoring requirements for individual projects, whereas Section D of the Funding Strategy describes reporting

¹⁵ C 2009/15.

¹⁶ C 2011/3.

¹⁷ See list of Organizational Results in CGRFA/WG-AnGR-7/12/Inf.2.

¹⁸ CGRFA/WG-AnGR-7/12/Inf.2.

¹⁹ http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/genetics/Funding_strategy.html

²⁰ CGRFA-14/13/Inf.15.

²¹ Funding Strategy, Annex I, Section C, II 8c.

requirements for the portfolio of projects. The application of standard FAO procedures, as applicable to LoAs, and financial rules will ensure routine reporting and monitoring in line with those requirements.

28. The Funding Strategy requires independent evaluations of the use of the resources under the FAO Trust Account.²² Such evaluations are necessary to assess, analyse and further improve the impact of the use of the resources for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*.²³ Evaluations can be undertaken at the level of individual projects, or at the programme or portfolio level. After the completion of the projects under the first call for proposals, the Commission may wish to request an independent evaluation, as foreseen in the Funding Strategy.²⁴ In order to be commensurate with the budget of the first project cycle, it is proposed that the evaluation of the projects be carried out at portfolio level. The costs of such an evaluation would amount to a sum of approximately USD 35 000, which would be charged to the FAO Trust Account.²⁵ A simple and relatively low-cost project portfolio evaluation is described in *Annex I.C*.

29. Reporting to the Commission on the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action* and the Funding Strategy is supplemented by FAO's regular reporting on programme implementation and the use of assessed and voluntary contributions.²⁶ As regards projects, online access to project information provided through the Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) is already available to recipient governments and donors. The information provided includes project details, financial data and relevant project documents for projects operated in a recipient country or funded by a specific donor.

²² Funding Strategy, Section C, II, 9; Section D, II.

²³ Funding Strategy for the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources, Annex I, Section D, Chapter 2, paragraphs 4–6: Information and reporting requirements.

²⁴ Section C, II, 9.

²⁵ http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/oed/docs/Evaluation_Docs/Guidelines/OED_procedures_project_eval_November_2011_EN.pdf

²⁶ C 2013/8 PIR 2010-11, paragraph 71, 110 and annexes.

III. GUIDANCE SOUGHT

30. The Commission may wish to
- i. Thank governments that have contributed to the FAO Trust Account, and urge governments and other potential donors to provide or increase funding to the FAO Trust Account and to other funds that support the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*;
 - ii. Thank the Bureaus of the Working Group and the Commission, the Regional Focal Points and the Panel of Experts for their significant work and valuable contributions in the first project cycle of the Funding Strategy;
 - iii. Request FAO to continue providing Regular Programme funds and technical advice to support country implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*;
 - iv. Request FAO to continue to pursue partnerships and alliances with other international mechanisms and organizations to enhance mobilization of financial resources for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*;
 - v. Adopt the draft procedures for monitoring and independent evaluation as contained in Annex 1;
 - vi. Mandate the Secretariat of the Working Group to launch, between the Commission's sessions, a second call for proposals once USD 1 million is available in the Trust Account, and apply the procedures and priorities applied during the first project cycle;
 - vii. Consider changing the Funding Strategy with the objective of delegating the selection of concept notes, the appraisal of project proposals and the approval of projects for funding to the Bureau of the Working Group, as proposed in Draft Amendments 1, 3 and 4 given in *Annex 2* to this document;
 - viii. Consider changing the Funding Strategy with the objective of allowing for the direct submission of project proposals to the FAO Secretariat, as proposed in Draft Amendment 2 given in *Annex 2* to this document;
 - ix. Decide, with regard to future calls for proposals, that countries may submit a single-country concept note and join, in addition, one multiple-country concept note; and
 - x. Acknowledge the role of Regional Focal Points in quality assurance during development and pre-screening of concept notes and define this role more clearly.

Annex 1

Draft procedures for monitoring and independent evaluation

A. Objectives

These monitoring and evaluation procedures aim to promote

- a. Accountability and transparency for the achievement of priorities established by the Commission for use of resources under Trust Account through the assessment of outputs, outcomes and impact, effectiveness, processes, and performance.
- b. Learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned, as a basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, programmes, and project management.

B. Reporting and monitoring

In line with the reporting and monitoring requirements for individual projects funded under the Trust Account (Section B.8 of Annex 1 to the Funding Strategy), result-based management is part of the Funding Strategy and will be achieved through:

- a. use of standard reporting and monitoring procedures;
- b. recipients' reports prepared in accordance with an agreed reporting schedule and progress milestones identified in the project document and approval process;
- c. FAO standard monitoring procedures, as applied by FAO to Letters of Agreement (LoA);
- d. Responsibility for project monitoring: The executing entity will develop agreed monitoring products and deposits them with the Secretariat as set out in the project approval process.

C. Evaluation

- a. A terminal independent evaluation of the project portfolio is conducted at the end of the project cycle.
- b. The minimum requirements for such evaluation are:
 - compliance with norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group.
 - assessing at a minimum:
 - the achievement of outputs and outcomes, and provide ratings for targeted objectives and outcomes;
 - the sustainability of outcomes after project completion, with a scale of rating;
- c. The minimum contents of the terminal evaluation report are:
 - basic data on the evaluation:
 - when the evaluation took place,
 - who was involved,
 - the key questions, and
 - the methodology;
 - basic data on the project, including expenditures from the Trust Account and other sources;
 - lessons for broader applicability; and,
 - the terms of reference of the evaluation (in an annex).
- d. The independent evaluation shall be based mostly on review of project documents and reports, and interviews, questionnaires, focus group discussions via electronic communication.

- e. It shall include visits to the locations of a limited sample of projects.
- f. The evaluation report shall be submitted to the Secretariat within a reasonable time after termination of the projects.
- g. The evaluation report shall contain findings and recommendations and will be made public through the website.
- h. Responsibility: the evaluation team is composed by independent experts not involved with the projects and the Trust Account. An approach paper and Terms of Reference for evaluation are prepared by the Secretariat and the FAO Evaluation Office. The evaluation report is reviewed, if needed, by the evaluation office of the executing entity. The evaluation team is solely responsible for the independent evaluation report.

Annex 2

Draft amendments to the Funding Strategy for the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Animal Genetic Resources

Draft Amendment 1		
	Existing text	Amended text
Annex I, Section C.II.3(d) <i>Screening and response to concept notes</i>	d) Responsibility for the above action: Members of the Commission Bureau, on the basis of preparatory work done by the Secretariat and the recommendations of the Bureau of the Working Group. The Bureaus might work collaboratively through email exchanges and conference calls. The Secretariat will invite preparation of project proposals based upon concept notes approved by the Bureau of the Commission.	d) Responsibility for the above action: Members of the Commission Bureau of the Working Group , on the basis of preparatory work done by the Secretariat and the recommendations of the Bureau of the Working Group . The Bureaus might will work collaboratively through email exchanges and conference calls. The Secretariat will invite preparation of project proposals based upon concept notes approved by the Bureau of the Commission Working Group .
Draft Amendment 2		
	Existing text	Amended text
Annex I, Section C.II.4(f) <i>Submission of project proposals from approved concept notes</i>	f) Responsibility for the above tasks: Commission Members or legal or natural persons, in consultation with Commission Members. Formal submissions should be provided by a Commission Member or Commission Members, herewith referred to as the proponent, through National Focal Points, to the Secretariat.	f) Responsibility for the above tasks: a Commission Member or Commission Members , or legal or natural persons, in consultation with Commission Members . Formal submissions of project proposals should be provided directly by the proponent to the Secretariat . provided by a Commission Member or Commission Members, herewith referred to as the proponent, through National Focal Points, to the Secretariat.
Draft Amendment 3		
	Existing text	Amended text
Annex I, Section C.II.5(d) <i>Appraisal of proposals will involve</i>	d) Responsibility for the above tasks: the Bureau of the Commission, on the basis of recommendations submitted by the Bureau of the Working Group and an appraisal report submitted by a panel of experts designated by the Bureau of the Working Group. The panel of experts will work without remuneration.	d) Responsibility for the above tasks: the Bureau of the Commission Working Group , on the basis of recommendations submitted by the Bureau of the Working Group and an appraisal report submitted by a panel of experts designated by the Bureau of the Working Group. The panel of experts will work without

	Resources to enable work by the panel will be provided under the core administrative budget of the Trust Account including convening of necessary panel sessions.	remuneration. Resources to enable work by the panel will be provided under the core administrative budget of the Trust Account including convening of necessary panel sessions.
Draft Amendment 4		
	Existing text	Amended text
Annex I, Section C.II.6(d) Approval of projects for funding within the project cycle	d) Responsibility for the above tasks: the Commission or a delegated authority, such as the Bureau of the Commission and, in addition, one representative per each region.	d) Responsibility for the above tasks: the Commission or it's Bureau or the Bureau of the Working Group, and, in addition, with one representative per each region.