

Impact Focus Areas

Executive Summary

- The IPA indicative listing of seven IFAs has been retained for preparation of the MTP 2010-2013, with changes in titles for five of them, reflecting some change in focus.
- The preliminary identification of all Organizational Results included for support in each of the IFAs is shown in Annex 1.
- A presentation format for the IFAs in the MTP 2010-2013 is proposed, which would provide the scope and indicate how the ORs relate to each IFA. One sample IFA formulation is presented in Annex 2 using the proposed format.
- The challenges and next steps on which Working Group comments are sought are: the more systematic and structured involvement of field offices, in particular to communicate the key features of the IFAs and get their input; further refinement of the IFA content during preparation of the MTP; and the development of tailored communication and advocacy material to be used for resource mobilization at all levels.

Introduction

1. In adopting the IPA, the 35th Conference approved the concept of Impact Focus Areas (IFAs) as follows:

Impact Focus Areas contribute to Strategic Objectives and their agreed Organizational Results, providing a focus within or across them. They will:

- a) help mobilise resources for priority groups of results which could benefit from additional funding, acting as “flagships”, providing a communication and advocacy tool to better attract voluntary extra-budgetary resources and partnerships to supplement assessed contributions;*
- b) progressively enable pooled, and less rigidly tied, funding of voluntary extra-budgetary contributions;*
- c) primarily address issues of priority to developing countries with emphasis on capacity building and getting policy frameworks right; and*
- d) facilitate Governing Body oversight of the use of extra-budgetary resources in line with agreed priorities.*

2. The IFAs represent one of the elements of the resource mobilization strategy, and are not meant as an additional layer in the results hierarchy.

3. The IPA provided an agreed indicative listing of seven IFAs as basis for further formulation:

- i. Action towards global food security in the context of the current food crisis and climate change*
- ii. Prevention and reduction of the negative effects of transboundary animal and plant pest and food safety incidences*
- iii. Strengthening the information base for sustainable forest management*
- iv. Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*
- v. Coping with scarcity of land and water resources*
- vi. Information and statistics*
- vii. Standard setting and regulation:*

4. The present paper reports on progress to date with respect to the elaboration of the IFAs. It describes what has been achieved and challenges, and seeks guidance from the Working Group to inform the finalization of the IFAs in the Medium Term Plan 2010-2013.

Process, main achievements and challenges

5. The timeline for the preparation of the Strategic Framework foresaw the formulation of the IFAs running in parallel with the Organization Results (OR). In fact, a step-wise approach has been followed: the Strategy Teams have first formulated ORs for each Strategic Objective (SO) during January-March; since late March, attention was given to the formulation of IFAs.

6. A senior manager has been designated to lead each IFA. Several of the IFA managers have participated in the Strategy Teams and are familiar with the OR formulation process, including risks and targets.

7. Each IFA manager held a first round of consultations “within” the SOs to which the IFA mainly relates, and then sought the views of other relevant SO strategy team leaders. This will be followed by consultation with decentralised offices.

8. Elements of the IFA formulation are: title, Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results supported, overarching description of the IFA, relevant partnerships, and the relationship to the ORs, including the main focus of action within each OR, at what level (e.g. headquarters, regional, national) and whether some of the risks identified in the OR formulation would be mitigated by funding received through the IFA.

9. Bearing in mind the agreed definition, each IFA effectively groups ORs that relate to the same theme or cross-cutting issue, from one or more SOs, that is considered a priority for ‘flagship’ treatment and advocacy to mobilize extra-budgetary funding. Therefore, the IFAs directly relate to the results framework through the constituent ORs. In this way, they are not an additional layer in the results hierarchy.

10. Resources attracted through the IFAs will contribute directly to achievement of the ORs. As the Organization engages in implementation and monitoring of the results framework, and as resources are leveraged through the IFAs, the effect on indicators targets, resources levels planned, and risks mitigated, will be duly analysed.

11. The first challenge is to ensure proper understanding across the Organization of this important resource mobilization tool, directly supporting ORs, and that the formulation effort remains focussed but as light as possible at the planning stage. The second challenge is to devise an adequate process to more systematically reach out to decentralized offices and ensure that less earmarked resources can be meaningfully channelled towards Results at the country, sub-regional and regional levels. Finally, an advocacy and communication strategy is needed to support IFAs as an important dimension in overall resource mobilization efforts of FAO.

Preliminary overview of the IFAs at current planning stage

12. The seven indicative IFAs have been retained, with some proposed changes in the titles that reflect adjustments in focus in the case of five IFAs (in italics) and as shown below. The

first six IFAs listed have completed their initial draft formulation stage at the time of writing, while the seventh is still to hold a first round of consultations.

- i. ***Support to the implementation of the Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA)***
The Comprehensive Framework for Action of the UN High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis provides governments, regional and international organizations with a menu of policies and actions from which to draw responses that are appropriate to the specific needs, capacities and conditions of regions and countries. The purpose of the IFA-CFA is to increase the scale and focus of FAO's corporate support to achievement of the CFA outcomes "*Smallholder farmer food production growth sustained*", and "*Global information and monitoring systems strengthened*".
- ii. ***Transboundary Threats to Production, Health and Environment (EMPRES)***;
Build national, sub-regional, regional and global systems for early warning, rapid response, supportive research, and rehabilitation emphasizing "building back better" after invasions by transboundary animal diseases and plant pests, and food safety incidents. Stronger national systems, especially in developing countries, will recognize and respond to transboundary threats earlier and reduce the risk of those threats spreading within countries, to neighboring countries and then to trading partners. They will protect national production, ensure food safety and quality along the supply chain, and reduce environmental and health risks.
- iii. ***Strengthening the information base for sustainable forest management (SFM)***
There is broad consensus that timely and reliable information is needed by countries to achieve the Strategic Objective "sustainable management of forests and trees."
FAO has a strong comparative advantage in providing guidelines, technical assistance, and technology for countries to monitor, assess, report on and validate their forest resources, forest policies and institutions. Investments in improved forest management will create jobs, improve livelihoods, and reduce poverty. In the context of climate change, strengthened forest management capabilities, starting with monitoring and assessment, but extending to effective action on the ground, will be critical for countries to meet their obligations to international treaties or instruments.
- iv. ***Capacity Building in support of Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF)***
The IFA relates to the promotion of responsible fisheries and aquaculture sector management at the global, regional and national levels with priority given to capacity building in support of implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, Compliance Agreement and International Plans of Action.
- v. ***Water and Land Scarcity: reconciling competition in linked water and land systems (WALS)***
The scarcity of water and land resources are among the main challenges to doubling the world's food production between now and 2050 and securing food supply at local, national and global levels, while preserving the natural resources base. The Agriculture sector will need to increase water and land productivity while negotiating water allocations with other users as a matter of priority. This IFA will contribute to the achievement of the SOs where water is a prime productive and environmental agent, providing a focus on natural resource scarcity within and across them. It will serve as a platform to mobilize resources in order to scale up operational responses in water and

agricultural management to address the points of competition and reduce the threats to global agricultural production posed by water and land scarcity.

vi. ***Capacity Building to strengthen information and Statistics for decision making in support of agricultural development and the fight against hunger (CBIS)***

FAO plays a key role in the collection, analysis, interpretation and dissemination of information and statistics on nutrition, food, agriculture and forest and fishery resources. FAO's comparative advantage is based on its long experience in the field of food and agriculture statistics and its unique relationship with Governments on the exchange of such data. Quality issues are at the heart of improving the statistics compiled by FAO and this constraint was clearly recognized in the recent independent evaluation on statistics in FAO (2008). The purpose of the IFA is to increase the scale and focus of FAO support to achieve improved basic quality of the data provided by Member Countries, in particular in those countries where the data is most needed to assess food insecurity and vulnerability.

vii. **Standard setting and regulation**

Strengthened national and global capacities for the development and implementation of regulations and standards with particular attention to the capacities and participation of developing countries (plant protection, food safety, genetic resources).

13. Thirty-four ORs (61%) have been so far identified for inclusion under one or more IFAs (see Annex 1). There is an average of about 7 ORs per IFA (with a high of 14 and a low of 3). ORs may relate to more than one IFA, as the focus may be on a different angle in terms of core functions, activities required, or geographical coverage.

14. It is expected that the IFAs will provide a concrete interface with Members, donors and other partners, especially for those ORs where the Organization feels it needs to step up its resource mobilization efforts, both in terms of voluntary contributions and partnerships to mitigate significant risks of not achieving results due to inadequate funding.

15. FAO will also need to ensure a convergence with existing mechanisms such as the FAO Multidonor Partnership Programme. The advantage of the IFAs is that, with time, they will provide a highly visible vehicle for resource mobilization. The IFAs would also convey to members and extrabudgetary contributors the urgency of acting on specific areas of need at the country level. At this initial stage, the IFAs seem to be particularly interesting to promote those areas of work (or themes) that cut across several Strategic Objectives.

16. Annex 2 provides an example of formulation of the IFA-EMPRES.

Next Steps

17. The next steps foresee:

- more systematic and structured involvement of field offices, in particular to communicate the key features of the IFAs and get their input;
- further refinement of the IFA content during preparation of the MTP and PWB; and
- the development of tailored communication and advocacy material to be used for resource mobilization at all levels.

Annex 1 – Organizational Results covered by Impact Focus Areas

Strategic Objective	Org Res	Impact Focus Areas					
		CFA	CCRF	CBIS	SFM	WALS	EMPRES
A (Crops)	A1	x				x	
	A2						x
	A3						x
	A4						
B (Livestock)	B1	x					
	B2						x
	B3						
	B4	x					
C (Fisheries and aquaculture)	C1		x	x			
	C2		x				
	C3		x				
	C4		x				x
	C5		x				
	C6		x				
D (Food quality and safety)	D1						
	D2						
	D3						x
	D4						
E (Forestry and trees)	E1				x		
	E2				x		
	E3				x		
	E4				x		x
	E5				x		
	E6				x		
F (Natural resources)	F1					x	
	F2					x	
	F3					x	
	F4						
	F5						
	F6						
G (Enabling environment)	G1	x					
	G2	x					
	G3	x					
	G4						
H (Food security)	H1						
	H2						
	H3	x					
	H4	x		x			
	H5			x			
I (Emergencies)	I1						x
	I2						x
	I3	x					x
K (Gender)	K1						
	K2						
	K3	x					
	K4						
L (Investment)	L1	x					
	L2	x					
	L3	x					

Legend:

CFA:

Support to the implementation of the Comprehensive Framework for Action

CCRF:

Capacity building in support of implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries

CBIS:

Capacity building to strengthen information and statistics for decision making in support of agricultural development and the fight against hunger

SFM:

Strengthening the information base for sustainable forest management

WALS:

Water and Land Scarcity: Reconciling competition in linked water and land systems

EMPRES:

Transboundary Threats to Production, Health and Environment

Annex 2: Sample Formulation of Impact Focus Area – EMPRES: Transboundary Threats to Production, Health and Environment

The template below indicates the main elements to be included in the formulation of Impact Focus Areas¹

Indicative Title (as published in IPA): Prevention and reduction of the negative effects of transboundary animal health, plant pest and food safety incidences	
Revised Title: Transboundary Threats to Production, Health, and Environment	
Acronym: EMPRES: [Animal Health, Plant pests, Food safety]	Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results supported: A2, A3, B2, C4, D3, E4, I1, I2, I3
Overarching description of IFA:	
<p>Building national, sub-regional, regional and global systems for emergency response, early warning, rapid response, supportive research, and rehabilitation emphasizing “building back better” after invasions by transboundary animal diseases and plant pests, and food safety incidences. Stronger national systems, especially in developing countries, that recognize and respond to transboundary threats earlier will reduce the risk of those threats spreading within countries, to neighboring countries and then to trading partners. Every campaign should become an opportunity to learn how to improve the identification of vulnerabilities in the food chain, and the national response mechanisms, and information sharing, often through FAO and regional organizations, to protect national production, ensure food safety and quality along the production chain,, minimizing environmental and health risks.</p>	
<p>Partnerships with external partners that will be undertaken: i) Animal health: OIE, WHO, Regional Organizations dealing with animal health (ASEAN, SAARC, AU IBAR, PAHO, EC...), Research Organizations (ILRI, CIRAD...), donors (EC, WB, ADB, national agencies such as USAID and corresponding agencies in FRANCE, Japan), private sector (SSAFE group, feed industry...), professional associations... ii) Plant pests UN CERF- National and Sub-Regional donor; WFP; Regional Locust Control Commissions (five, covering Western-Northwestern Africa, the Red Sea area, South and Central Asia, Southern and Central Africa [Red Locust], Eastern Africa [DLCO-EA]); National Locust Control Organizations; National Plant Protection Organizations; ICIPE; BGRI (ICARDA, CIMMYT, Cornell, India, China); private biopesticides producer companies; NGOs, iii) Food Safety: WHO , OIE, public and private organizations dealing with food safety (e.g. ILSI, ICD; SSAFE,); research organizations (e.g. IFPRI; CGIAR); donors (e.g. EC, Norway; The Netherlands,); Consumers organizations (e.g. Consumers International; Safe Food International, Center for Science in the Public Interest) and academia (e.g. Salford University, UK; University of Wageningen, The Netherlands)</p>	

¹ Impact Focus Areas will contribute to the achievement of Strategic Objectives and their Organizational Results. They will: a) help mobilise resources for priority groups of results which could benefit from additional funding, acting as “flagships”, providing a focus for communication and advocacy to better attract voluntary extra-budgetary resources and build partnerships to supplement assessed contributions; b) progressively enable pooled, and less rigidly tied, funding of voluntary extra-budgetary contributions; c) address primarily issues of priority to developing countries with emphasis on capacity building and getting policy frameworks right; and d) facilitate Governing Body oversight of the use of extra-budgetary resources in line with agreed priorities (IPA paragraph 11).

Relationship to Organizational Results	
A2 - Risks from outbreaks of plant pests and diseases are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	National capacity building for better threat recognition and rapid response; National contingency planning to prepare more rapid and effective response.
A3 - Risks from pesticides are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	National pesticide management systems to prevent obsolete stocks and ensure better matching of field requirements with supplies; national and local application of integrated pest management, biopesticides, and other approaches to reduce field pesticide demand.
B2 - Reduced animal disease and associated human health risks	National capacity building for better surveillance, detection, reporting and response to animal health events and crises. Direct support to these components of prevention and control strategies. Design of strategies, methods and tools to prevent and control diseases in animals and to prevent human threats.
C4 - Members and other stakeholders have benefited from increased production of fish and fish products from sustainable aquaculture	Promotion of the ecosystem approach to aquaculture including biosecurity frameworks.
D3 . National/regional authorities are effectively designing and implementing programmes of food safety and quality management and control according to international norms	Support the review, assessment and strengthening of policy, legislative frameworks and systems for food safety/quality managements and control to enable countries to establish national risk-based food safety programmes and national emergency response plans. Provide timely information, scientific advice, food safety intelligence, early warning and guidance and assistance at national level to enhance preparedness and response to food safety emergencies through EMPRES-food safety, INFOSAN and CMC. Support countries in their effort to develop and implement national strategies for building public awareness and education on food safety and quality focused on emerging threats.
E4 - Sustainable management of forests and trees is more broadly adopted, leading to reductions in deforestation and forest degradation and increased contributions of forests and trees to improve livelihoods and to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation.	National programmes and regional networks for forest health and protection against transboundary insects and disease

<p>I1 - Countries vulnerability to crisis, threats and emergencies is reduced through better preparedness and integration of risk prevention and mitigation into policies, programmes and interventions</p>	<p>EMPRES-led capacity building programme at national and regional levels on risk assessment, preparedness, contingency planning management and communication, including the establishment of regional networks [e.g. Regional Animal Health Centres] to share information and deliver training</p>
<p>I2 - Countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture related interventions.</p>	<p>Crisis Management Centre strategic approaches at regional and global levels for food chain emergencies</p>
<p>I3 - Countries and partners have improved transition and linkages between emergency, rehabilitation and development.</p>	<p>Mainstreaming of good medium term development practices into emergency transition programs at national and local levels following transboundary pest and disease events threatening animal health, plant pests incidence, and threats to food safety</p>