

## **Discussion of draft Results Frameworks (Strategic Objectives and Functional Objectives)**

### **Executive Summary**

After discussion at its last meeting of the main issues involved in the refinement of results frameworks for the identified 11 Strategic Objectives and 2 Functional Objectives, and its consideration of two examples of Strategic Objectives, the full set of frameworks is provided in the agreed format for the Working Group to review and comment (in the Annexes 2-14). To facilitate this review, the present document starts with a recapitulation of how the comments made by the Working Group on 23 March 2009 have been taken into account, and highlights issues encountered in elaborating the Functional Objectives.

It is expected that the Working Group should devote most of its session to a sequential discussion of the above Objectives, with the benefit of the presence of the responsible ADG's and strategy team leaders, so that the advice obtained could feed back into revised formulations for incorporation in the draft Medium Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget.

### **Introduction**

1. At its meeting of 23 March, Working Group 1 considered the process for formulating the draft results frameworks and issues encountered, and provided comments and suggestions for improvements in the presentation.
2. Since then, the strategy teams have continued to refine the draft results frameworks, taking into consideration the Working Group's comments. The present paper presents the draft results frameworks for all 11 Strategic Objectives and the two Functional Objectives as of 6 April. This will form the programmatic backbone of the Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11 proposals being prepared during April-June and is still subject to further refinement as regards outcomes and indicators.
3. The following paragraphs briefly describe how the comments provided by the Working Group on 23 March are being taken into account (seven bullets in italics extracted from the Chair's Aide Mémoire, paragraph 6), issues in elaborating the Functional Objectives, and the next steps in the formulation process.

### **Reflection of the Working Group comments**

- *Definitions of the terms used should be provided for a common understanding of key concepts.*
4. A glossary of key terms is provided in Annex 1. The glossary includes a concise definition for each term in the FAO results hierarchy, as well as observations on its application.
    - *A process should be developed for setting priorities within and among the Strategic Objectives, building on the guidance provided in the IPA and involving the Technical Committees and the Programme Committee.*
    - *For each Strategic Objective, the identification of issues, challenges and risks should include opportunities to address them.*
  5. In formulating the results frameworks, prioritization and focus of action was a major concern of the strategy teams in determining how FAO can respond to the various development problems *via* the proposed Organizational Results (OR) under each Strategic Objective (SO).

6. For each SO, a log-frame based analysis was used to validate how the proposed ORs address key problems and to determine any gaps or overlaps. The determination of where FAO is best placed to intervene was guided by the key criteria outlined in the IPA: i) organizational performance, ii) existing technical capacity, including for cross-disciplinarity, iii) integration of strengths in advocacy, normative work and technical cooperation, iv) availability of alternative sources of supply and avoidance of duplication and v) ability to leverage partnerships to achieve desired results.

7. The Strategic Objective text on issues and challenges, assumptions and risks is still to be updated to identify more explicitly the opportunities available to the Organization in addressing problems, as well as FAO's comparative advantage, which should essentially be reflected in the Organizational Results. Further analysis could be undertaken to facilitate setting relative priority among SOs.

8. At the OR level, the strategy teams formulated indicators of outcome, including targets and means of verification; identified key assumptions and risks associated with each indicator; and validated the necessary primary tools to be used during implementation. The validation of the primary tools, which are the approaches to providing FAO's goods and services, took account of FAO's strengths in terms of application of core functions and the IPA criteria noted above.

9. This analytical process has entailed making choices among various possible courses of action within the SOs, and this effort is being reinforced by guidance from the Technical Committees. At the time of writing, COFI and COFO have considered SOs C and E respectively, and their reactions may be summarized as follows.

10. During COFI, there were few statements expressing relative preferences (e.g. one intervention underlined the importance attached to ORs C1, C2 and C3). Other statements referred to important thematic areas addressed by the ORs, which were taken into account when developing the indicators. On the whole, there was general support for SO C as formulated, and for its comprehensive coverage of pertinent issues and areas identified as priorities by COFI. As requested by COFI, specific reference to small-scale fisheries has been included in the ORs.

11. COFO endorsed the draft FAO Strategy for Forests and Forestry, as well as the Organizational Results and Primary Tools included under SO E. COFO did not recommend any major changes, but did request some modifications in language: under OR E3, a reference to governance was expanded to refer to "governance at all levels"; under OR E5, a reference to investments in forests was expanded to include investing in innovation; under OR E6, a reference to the importance of conserving forest biodiversity was expanded to include the conservation of forest genetic resources.

12. The Impact Focus Areas, which are "flagship" groups of OR's requiring extra-budgetary resources to fully address key challenges, could offer a means to convey priority areas of work across the results frameworks. A separate paper on the development of IFAs has been prepared for the Working Group.

- *Outcomes, indicators and responsibilities for achieving these outcomes should be explicitly outlined;*
- *there should be a focus on indicators that are measurable;*
- *in the final formulations language used should be more concise and consistent*

13. As defined, the Organizational Results are to be stated as outcomes that FAO commits to achieve in a four-year timeframe, with indicators of achievement. In most cases, the indicators are measurable and thus quantified targets can be contemplated. The indicators presented in the present paper represent a work-in-progress and require further review and refinement to meet RBM quality

standards, in particular to meet the S.M.A.R.T. criteria<sup>1</sup>. The process for refining indicators will also involve greater selectivity in deciding on which of the indicators to maintain and which to abandon – considering critical factors such as the availability and cost of estimating baseline values and resource needs for on-going measurement.

14. The indicators have been through an initial round of corporate review, and corresponding reformulation and reduction within the ambit of the Strategy Teams. This has resulted in the current overall average of between three and four indicators per Organizational Result – whereas management would aim to finalize the results matrices with no more than three indicators per Result – in line with the practice of our WHO comparator.

Objective	Title	Org Results	Indicators
A	Sustainable intensification of crop production.	4	15
B	Increased sustainable livestock production.	4	13
C	Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources.	6	19
D	Improved quality and safety of foods at all stages of the food chain.	4	15
E	Sustainable management of forests and trees.	6	18
F	Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture.	6	16
G	Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods.	4	11
H	Improved food security and better nutrition.	5	16
I	Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies.	3	9
K	Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas.	4	9
L	Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development.	3	9
X	Effective collaboration with member states and stakeholders	4	21
Y	Efficient and effective administration	3	13
<b>Total</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>184</b>

- *In the presentation of the results framework, some elements that are important for internal management (e.g. means of verification, risk analysis) do not necessarily need to be considered by Members, whose attention might be better directed to strategic aspects;*

<sup>1</sup> S.M.A.R.T. = SPECIFIC, MEAURABLE, ACHIEVABLE, RREALISTIC, TIME-BOUND;

15. The results frameworks in Annexes 2-14 provide the elements that form the basis for selecting the corporate outcomes (i.e. ORs), indicators and targets, as well as the primary tools – the key approaches and means of action – that FAO will use to achieve each Organizational Result.

### **Issues in elaborating the functional objectives**

16. It is recalled that the Functional Objectives are meant to cover essential activities conducive to an enabling environment for FAO to effectively and efficiently achieve the substantive Organizational Results under the Strategic Objectives. Functional Objective X also applies a results framework to support core functions and critical transverse dimensions. Recognizing the difference in nature between Functional and Strategic Objectives, a separate, dedicated process was facilitated by an external expert in results-based management, to elaborate the formulations of Organizational Results and indicators under Functional Objectives X and Y.

17. The formulation of the Functional Objectives presents some unique challenges and is a work in progress. In order to promote coherence and recognize inter-dependencies among the areas of work covered by the Functional Objectives, it was necessary to consolidate significantly the Organizational Results as originally presented in the IPA. Given that most of the work covered under the Functional Objectives is delivered as internal support to managers of the Strategic Objectives, the FO formulation will require validation by the Strategic Objective Teams – a process that is only just starting.

18. In the case of Functional Objective X, a major challenge was to ensure coherence and cohesion in the results-based formulation of a diverse set of areas including governance and oversight, reflection of Member priorities in FAO programmes, resource mobilization, and ensuring corporate approaches to FAO Core Functions. An issue is whether the Core Functions covering advocacy and communication; information, knowledge and statistics; technical, policy and legal advice; support to capacity building; and support to development of international instrument can be adequately represented and measured through primary tools and indicators under one Organizational Result (X2 on FAO services). Compounding these difficulties is the fact that FO X leadership does not have a clear institutional home, as do the other Strategic Objectives and Functional Objective Y. Moving forward, there is also the need to ensure adequate focus within this objective – and validation of that focus with the Strategy Teams – on improving the Organization's approach to applying FAO Core Functions across the Strategic Objectives.

### **Next steps in formulation process**

19. The Strategy Teams will:
- continue to improve indicators and overall language for consistency and conciseness;
  - prioritize within and among Organizational Results;
  - analyze the application of core functions.

**Annex 1: Selected Glossary of Key Terms in the FAO Results Hierarchy**

<b>Results-Based Management (“RBM”)</b>	A management strategy by which an organization ensures that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (outputs, outcomes and impacts). RBM rests on clearly defined accountability for results, and requires monitoring and self-assessment of progress towards results, and reporting on performance.
<b>Strategic Objectives (“SOs”)</b>	Benefits or changes expected to be achieved in a ten year time frame in Member country institutions, the international community or development partners.  These benefits represent several steps in the cause-and-effect chain beyond the immediate result of the uptake of FAO’s products and services by its primary users, building on the related Organizational Results.
<b>Functional Objectives (“FOs”)</b>	Objectives of the FAO Strategic Framework which cover essential work related to the provision of an enabling environment for the Organization to effectively and efficiently achieve the substantive Organizational Results under the Strategic Objectives.  These objectives provide for the application of a results framework to support functions and critical areas of transverse work, such as corporate approaches to core functions, where the IEE has noted the need for significant improvements.
<b>Organizational Results (“ORs”) / Outcomes</b>	In standard terminology, outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Identified as “ <i>Organizational Results</i> ” in FAO’s terminology.  FAO “Organizational Results” represent the outcomes that FAO commits itself to achieve for Member Countries and the international community in a time-frame of four years in order to contribute to the achievement of Strategic Objectives. ORs represent the first-order level of results in the causal chain beyond what FAO produces, i.e. requiring up-take and use by primary user groups, and are stated in terms of what it is expected to be the result of the use of FAO products and/or services by these primary users. In order to be able to measure and report on the achievement of organizational results, indicators, means of verification, baselines and targets are formulated related to a given timeframe. ORs will normally involve contributions of multiple organizational units, both headquarters and decentralized.
<b>Core Functions</b>	The critical means of action that FAO will apply in order to achieve Organizational Results.  The core functions derive from the Organization’s mandate and comparative strengths, and will be applied across all of the Objectives and at all levels of the Organization: global, regional and national. Examples of core functions of FAO include provision of policy advice, generation and dissemination of information and undertaking advocacy and communication. Core functions can be conceptualized as the potential organizational “tool kit” at the disposal of a programme managers when deciding whether and how FAO can contribute to addressing a particular development problem.

<b>Impact Focus Areas (“IFAs”)</b>	<p>Thematic areas comprised of groupings of Organizational Results requiring resources to meet existing or emerging challenges, i.e. taking account of funding gaps identified through implementation monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>IFAs are often, but not exclusively cross-cutting, contributing to strategic objectives and providing a focus within them. IFAs act as “flagships”, providing a communication and advocacy tool to better attract extra-budgetary funding and partnerships to complement Regular Programme resources. They provide focus for extra-budgetary resource mobilization efforts over the Medium Term Plan period (four years), complementing National Medium Term Priority Frameworks. They are also intended to facilitate less rigidly tied and pooled funding of extra-budgetary resources, as well as facilitate Governing Body oversight of the use of those resources in line with agreed priorities.</p>
<b>Primary tools</b>	<p>The overall approaches to be utilized by FAO in crafting its intervention under a particular Organizational Result.</p> <p>The primary tools synthetically describe the key Outputs and Activities required in order to achieve an OR. They reflect careful analysis by programme managers of how FAO can best utilize the core functions to leverage the Organization’s comparative advantage. The approaches expressed in the Primary Tools will normally be funded through a mix of regular programme and extra-budgetary resources. As in the case of the OR, Primary Tools represent the contributions of multiple organizational units.</p>
<b>Outputs</b>	<p>The products and services which result from a development intervention and which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.</p>
<b>Risk analysis</b>	<p>An analysis or an assessment of factors (“assumptions”) that affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention’s objectives. The process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks.</p> <p>FAO identifies assumptions and risks both at the level of the overall Strategic/Functional Objective, as well as at the level of the individual Organizational Results.</p>

## Annex 2: Strategic Objective A - Sustainable intensification of crop production

### Issues and Challenges

To meet the projected global demand for food, feed and fibre, crop production will need to double by the year 2050, while conserving the natural resource-base that is the foundation of agricultural production. Trends in population growth, environmental conditions, incomes, rapid urbanization and consumption patterns will drive this demand. Unless supply can meet demand, malnutrition and damaging price volatility will become even more prevalent. Providing an adequate supply will require more efficient production systems through good farming practices that incorporate the value of natural resources in production, sustained by an enabling policy framework. But the pattern and scale of supply are constrained by several factors, including shifts in production (e.g. into biofuels), availability and costs of key inputs (labour, land, water, energy, mechanization, fertilizers, seed), farm management capacity, crop failures due to adverse climate events and outbreaks of pests and diseases, as well as inappropriate policies.

A major challenge to food security is the efficient production of needed quantities and quality of crops (including horticulture crops, range/pasturelands and underutilised/newly emerging and high value crops) to meet the changing demands of consumers and adhere to food safety and environment standards. Such production also offers opportunities to small as well as resource-poor farmers, maintains the natural resource base and copes with the anticipated impacts of climate change on crop production.

Sustainable intensification of crop production comprises good crop, nutrient, pest, and soil management, fosters improved farming practices, and takes into account landscapes and ecosystems within which agriculture occurs. It aims to increase economic benefits for farmers and optimise ecosystem resilience by capitalising on and strengthening ecological processes, valuing the full range of ecosystem services that agricultural producers can generate and largely reducing or eliminating negative environmental impacts.

Hence, crop production intensification using the ecosystem approach needs to address four key dimensions:

- a) Increasing **agricultural productivity** through improved use of resources to achieve higher yields while promoting the sustainability of the farming systems and progressing from subsistence farming to income-generating agriculture.
- b) Enhancing sustainable **crop protection** through Integrated Pest Management (IPM), which combines different crop production and protection strategies and practices to grow healthy crops and minimise the use of pesticides, and through the national implementation of globally agreed instruments such as the International Plant Protection Convention and the Rotterdam Convention to minimise pest problems, misuse of pesticides, and environmental pollution.
- c) Managing **biodiversity and ecosystem services**, i.e. in addition to sound agronomic practices (crop, soil, nutrient and water efficient management), identify, use and establish mechanisms for valuing the roles of agricultural biodiversity and ecosystem services [such as pollination, nutrient cycling, carbon sequestration and water infiltration supported by conservation agriculture (CA) and integrated nutrient management (INM)]; and
- d) Encouraging sustainable **livelihoods** so that the benefits of increased productivity and diversification can be fully realised by producers within the value chain, including through access to quality seeds of adapted varieties, good post-harvest, food safety and marketing practices. This can also be encouraged by addressing the enabling environment, such as access to markets (including storage, agro-processing and food safety) and credit. Taking advantage of urban and peri-urban agriculture as a means to strengthen access to food in rapid urban expansion areas is an example of the contribution of sustainable crop intensification to livelihoods.

These four key dimensions are integral parts of a framework for sustainable crop production intensification. This framework also includes global and regional instruments, treaties, conventions and codes that improve international cooperation in enhancing and sustainably using natural resources,

and reducing risks from and improving management of transboundary threats to production, environment, and human health in a world more closely linked by trade.

The sustainable intensification of crop production is also dependent on up-to-date and reliable information and statistics to underpin the development process and to ensure it is supported by relevant and appropriate policies. In particular, data on crop area, production and yield are very weak in many developing countries. A major focus on capacity building is required to ensure an adequate information base in all countries.

### Assumptions and Risks

- Member countries are supportive of developing policies in favour of sustainable intensification of crop production.
- Sustainable intensification of crop production will expand the choices and diversity of production systems that farmers can utilise to improve income and health.
- Member countries are in a position to implement internationally negotiated standards and agreements.
- Effective strategic linkages are established among all the relevant stakeholders to ensure sustainable crop production intensification.
- Research and other institutions continue to develop improved technologies and sustainable crop production systems, so that agricultural practices meet yield demands.
- Political and economic events in some vulnerable countries may seriously slow down the transfer and uptake of innovations.
- The costs of inputs (such as seed, fertilizer, fuel) will hinder profitability of agricultural activities, or the cost/availability of water becomes a major constraint to crop intensification.
- Member countries have adequate capacity to collect, verify, analyse, disseminate and exchange information and data, utilising international standards, to effectively facilitate decision-making.

### Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective A

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G – Inter-disciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
A1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
A2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
A3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
A4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

### Organizational Result A1 - Policies and strategies on sustainable crop production intensification and diversification at national and regional levels

OR Indicator	Target (4 years)
<b>A1.1</b> New or enhanced national or regional policies, strategies or programmes on sustainable crop production intensification or diversification, including responses to climate change.	10 countries with policies or strategies on sustainable crop production intensification 33 national Food Security programmes 8 regional Food Security programmes 8 countries with policies, strategies or programmes on crop diversification
<b>A1.2</b> Intergovernmental fora, including Committee on Agriculture (COAG), International Rice Commission (IRC) and Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD),	COAG, CSD, IRC, and other intergovernmental fora

provide guidance for the sustainable intensification of crop production.	
<b>A1.3</b> Number of countries with policies, programmes, strategies or projects to test, document and adopt practices that manage agricultural biodiversity and ecosystem services and preserve biodiversity, including through payments of environmental services in agricultural production landscapes	5 countries
<p><b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical advice to policy makers that promote the integration of sustainable crop production in a wider food security and nutrition perspective.</li> <li>2. Guidance for countries on the implementation of sustainable crop production intensification policies, programmes and projects.</li> <li>3. Framework for sustainable crop production intensification through the ecosystem approach that includes guiding principles, checklists and case studies.</li> <li>4. Guidance documents and technical assistance on assessing the economic, social and environmental sustainability of crop production intensification.</li> <li>5. Capacity building, training, information dissemination and awareness creation, through guidelines, manuals and methodologies.</li> <li>6. Strategies for crop diversification and production, including introduction of new and adapted technologies (e.g. for horticultural crops, urban and peri-urban agriculture, forage, etc).</li> <li>7. Improved use of existing information and intergovernmental platforms, fora, networking and knowledge management tools.</li> <li>8. Baseline measurements and monitoring of rangelands and grassland to enhance food security and promote climate resilient development.</li> <li>9. Farming systems analysis, guidelines and project support on linking farmers to markets.</li> <li>10. Nuclear strategies in food and agriculture.</li> <li>11. Technical advice related to payments of environmental services in selected agricultural landscapes.</li> <li>12. Investment facilitation for extra budgetary resources for projects, programmes and policy development.</li> <li>13. Production and utilization of timely and reliable information and statistics related to crop production.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result A2 - Risks from outbreaks of transboundary plant pests and diseases are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels</b></p>	
<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>A2.1</b> Adoption and improved national implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures.	15 standards developed and 12 adopted Improved implementation in 8 developing countries
<b>A2.2</b> Percentage of affected countries receiving forecasts and other information on Desert Locust and other transboundary plant pests	100 percent
<b>A2.3</b> National and regional contingency plans developed for specific pest and disease threats other than Desert Locust,	12 countries in 3 regions

including weeds and woody plants	
<b>A2.4</b> Number of countries and subregions applying preventive locust control systems or area-wide integrated application of Sterile Insect Techniques	6 countries in each of 4 subregions

**Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result**

1. Technical advice to policy makers that promote the integration of plant protection into sustainable crop production in a wider food security perspective.
2. Guidance for countries on the implementation of sustainable plant protection policies, programmes and projects.
3. Framework for sustainable plant protection programmes through the implementation of the IPPC and the use of international standards.
4. Capacity building, training, information dissemination and awareness creation, through guidelines, manuals and methodologies.
5. Providing, and making better use of, a neutral forum and information exchange, including as a key element of the global phytosanitary system of governance for trade.
6. Baseline measurements of national capacity building needs and the development of an international framework to facilitate the implementation of ISPMs.
7. Collaboration on contingency planning and early warning for transboundary pests and diseases especially through EMPRES & IPPC frameworks.
8. Nuclear strategies to develop tools that allow for the management of plant pests and diseases.
9. Investment facilitation for resources for projects, programmes and policy development.
10. Information management and early warning systems, networks with outreach to the affected communities and standardised information reporting and data transmission technologies for early detection and real-time tracking of transboundary plant pests and diseases.
11. Livelihood vulnerability measures through vulnerability data from various sources such as FAO GIEWS, WFP VAM, USAID FEWS and FIVIMS for affected countries.
12. Emergency response guidelines, contingency plans and structured preparedness tools as decision support for prevention; rosters to source potential consultants with expertise in relevant areas such as emergency management and coordination, list of suppliers and air operators; pre-prepared agreements, ToRs and contracts etc.
13. Regional and sub-regional mechanisms to ensure effective collaboration and risk communication, inter-agency collaboration and coordination among countries and regions on prevention and control of transboundary pests and diseases.
14. Guidelines on good practices made available to countries, decision makers and stakeholders.
15. Partnerships between national and international research entities, meteorological institutions and private sector in the development of new technologies, provision of services and capacity building.
16. Operational instruments, tools and resources in administrative support areas of finance, procurement and logistics, and human resource management to deliver emergency operations efficiently.
17. Production and utilization of timely and reliable information and statistics related to crop production and pests and diseases.

**Organizational Result A3 - Risks from pesticides are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels**

<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>A3.1</b> Number of countries adopting measures to improve the life cycle management of pesticides aimed at reducing risks to human health and the environment.	30 countries

<b>A3.2</b> Countries improving regulatory control of the distribution and use of pesticides in accordance with international codes and conventions.	20 countries
<b>A3.3</b> Countries establishing or strengthening Integrated Pest Management programmes to reduce reliance on pesticides	20 countries
<b>A3.4</b> Pesticides evaluated for the safety of pesticide residues in food, and Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) estimated	100 pesticides evaluated 1,000 new MRLs estimated
<b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delivery of agreed Secretariat functions to support implementation of the Rotterdam Convention (RC) and the FAO/WHO Joint Meetings on Pesticide Residues in Food (JMPR), Pesticide Specifications (JMPS) and Pesticide Management (JMPM).</li> <li>2. Technical guidelines for the implementation of the Code of Conduct and for dealing with pest and pesticide management under emergency situations.</li> <li>3. Special initiative developed and operational to reduce the use of highly hazardous pesticides in countries.</li> <li>4. IPM Programmes established or strengthened to reduce reliance on pesticides.</li> <li>5. Practical guidance available on monitoring pesticides in the environment and their effect on human health to guide policy and action.</li> <li>6. Capacity building, training, information dissemination and awareness creation through guidelines, manuals and methodologies.</li> <li>7. Establishment of an improved pesticide management system and triangulation of pesticides in emergencies.</li> <li>8. Programmes and projects to assist countries in the quantification, risk reduction, elimination and prevention of obsolete pesticide stocks and acute contamination from pesticides.</li> <li>9. Strategies, technical advice and policy guidance to countries on integrated approaches to pest and pesticide management in line with the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, the Rotterdam Convention and other international instruments.</li> <li>10. Programmes and projects to build capacity at regional, national and farming community level promoting an integrated approach to pest and pesticide management.</li> <li>11. Regional collaboration and harmonization of approaches, including south-south collaboration in the implementation of international instruments and standards, as well as better use of existing information, intergovernmental platforms, fora, and knowledge management tools.</li> <li>12. Production and utilization of timely and reliable information and statistics on pesticides.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result A4 - Effective policies and enabled capacities for a better management of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) including seed systems at the national and regional levels</b>	
<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>A4.1</b> Number of countries joining the <i>International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</i> (IT-PGRFA), and developing/revising national regulations for its implementation	130 countries have joined the IT-PGRFA 25 countries in the process of developing/revising national regulations/policies
<b>A4.2</b> Number of countries/subregions developing national PGRFA strategies/policies that reinforce the linkages among	5 countries develop or improve their strategies for an integrated approach

conservation, plant breeding and seed systems, in the implementation of the <i>Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilisation of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</i> (GPA-PGRFA)	in the implementation of the GPA-PGRFA 3 sub-regions officially endorse harmonised seed-related regulatory framework
<b>A4.3</b> Number of countries with improved technical and research capabilities in conservation, plant breeding, biotechnology-biosafety and nuclear techniques, and in seed systems and information management for sustainable crop production	10 countries in conservation, plant breeding, biotechnology-biosafety and nuclear techniques 20 countries for seeds and PGRFA information management 10 countries in seeds and planting materials production, storage and related aspects
<b>A4.4</b> Number of countries with at least 10 smallholder communities with defined plans, programmes and facilities for managing on-farm plant genetic diversity, seed production and use and related risks using FAO- recommended policies, tools and guidelines	At least 10 small holders communities with defined plans, programmes and facilities for seed production, treatment and storage, and for managing on-farm plant genetic diversity 10 countries apply Disaster Risk Management (DRM) tools
<p><b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Guidance and support to the achievement of the Work Programme of the IT PGRFA as adopted by the Governing Body.</li> <li>2. Policy advice and technical assistance to the current and updated GPA-PGRFA through the Working Group on PGRFA of the Commission of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA); facilitate implementation and monitoring of the GPA-PGRFA including as it relates to relevant international instruments.</li> <li>3. Technical support to the development and implementation of integrated programmes on conservation and sustainable use, including seed systems, at regional and national levels.</li> <li>4. Generation, management and dissemination of knowledge, data, tools, technologies for national and regional capacity building in conservation, plant breeding, seed systems development and related interdisciplinary areas.</li> <li>5. Technical assistance and guidance to communities, small holders and farmers to sustainably manage crop diversity and seed systems.</li> <li>6. Strengthen partnerships and alliances with relevant organisations to ensure informed decision making and implementation of best practices for PGRFA management for sustainable crop production.</li> </ol>	

### Annex 3: Strategic Objective B - Increased sustainable livestock production

#### Issues and Challenges

Over the past three decades, there has been rapid expansion of production and consumption of animal products. The livestock sector currently provides 43% of global agricultural output in value terms. The anticipated continued expansion of the demand for animal products will require substantial improvements in resource use efficiencies and accelerated development and adoption of appropriate technologies.

The global livestock sector is characterised by a growing dichotomy between (i) livestock kept by large numbers of smallholders and pastoralists for livelihoods and rural food security, and (ii) intensive commercial livestock production, providing employment to producers and others in associated processing, distribution, marketing and support services. While traditional livestock systems contribute to the livelihoods of 70% of the world's rural poor, increasing numbers of large-scale operations with sophisticated technology, based on internationally sourced feed and animal genetics, cater for the rapidly growing markets for meat, milk and eggs.

The "middle-ground", i.e. midsize market-oriented family farms, while still growing in importance in many places, are gradually squeezed out of expanding formal markets and appear particularly vulnerable to economic and animal disease shocks. In fact, animal disease emergence and spread, including pathogens that spill over from animals to humans (zoonoses), appear to be very closely linked to structural aspects (e.g. co-existence of diverse livestock production and marketing systems under different regulatory and hygienic conditions), to changes in production environments and to increased interactions among livestock and wildlife.

A further consequence of the spread of large-scale production and of the pressures on traditional small-scale livestock keeping is the loss of genetic diversity in livestock populations – a critical condition for the resilience and sustainability of the sector. Latest figures show that 20 percent of documented breeds are at risk of extinction.

Livestock occupy one-fourth of the terrestrial surface of the earth as grazing land, and expansion of pasture is a major factor in deforestation in developing countries and countries with economies in transition; pasture encroachment also leads to wildlife-livestock interactions often with detrimental effects on shared resources and with increased risks of new pathogens.

The livestock sector, which claims one-third of global crop land for feed grain production, contributes to, but is also affected by grain price trends. As competition for land grows, prices – not only of animal feeds, but also of water, energy and labour – are increasing, and extensive pasture-based livestock production is being affected by climate change and socio-economic pressures.

The vigorous growth of the livestock sector, its increasing importance for food security and human nutrition and health and its recent structural changes require comprehensive governance by the international community. Considering the very substantial positive and negative impacts of the sector on social, environmental and public health targets, the preparation and negotiation of a “Code of Conduct for a Responsible Livestock Sector” is suggested under this Strategic Objective.

There are viable opportunities to alleviate many of the risks associated with the expanding livestock sector and to develop its full potential. Increased productivity will make more efficient use of scarce inputs and natural resources; advances in animal breeding, nutrition and husbandry, and in the prevention and control of animal diseases will increase productivity and improve animal welfare while reducing the risk of the emergence of zoonotic diseases. This will require adoption of new technologies as well as institutional development, including improved intersectoral collaboration (One World - One Health concept) supported by an enabling policy and regulatory environment.

Increased sustainable livestock production is also dependent on up-to-date and reliable information and statistics to underpin the development process and to ensure it is supported by relevant and appropriate policies.

### Assumptions and Risks

- Assumption that the demand for substantially more, good quality and safe animal products (which are increasingly processed) will continue to be vigorous. The contribution of the livestock sector to global food security will thus increase, and innovative public-private partnerships will encourage investments in livestock-related research and extension for development and in national and regional capacity and institution building in production, handling and processing and marketing of animal products.
- Assumption that for the foreseeable future, livestock will remain important, and particularly in pastoral areas is often the sole livelihood support for large numbers of people.
- Assumption that national governments, (sub)regional organizations and the international community will establish the technical, institutional, policy and legal measures necessary for the livestock sector to effectively, safely and equitably deliver on its objectives and that FAO is accorded the mandate of designing and negotiating such measures.
- Assumption that member countries will have adequate capacity to collect, verify, analyse, disseminate and exchange information and data, utilising international standards, to effectively facilitate decision-making.
- Risk that, in the absence of comprehensive effective oversight, improved inter-sectoral collaboration and careful governance, vigorous livestock sector growth will cause harm to society (e.g. marginalization and impoverishment of smallholder livestock farmers), to public health (e.g. (re)-emerging zoonotic diseases) and to natural resources, environment and climate (e.g. livestock diversity erosion, pollution through effluents, greenhouse gas emissions, encroachment on natural habitats and delicate ecosystems).
- Risk that an increasingly volatile grain and energy sector will disrupt external input-dependent livestock farming economies and, through the growing price linkages between grain (biofuels) and energy commodities, reduce livestock sector profitability in the absence of suitable response options.
- Risk that climate change will threaten grassland-based livestock production systems and thus the livelihoods of the most vulnerable households.
- Risk that investments in research for development will fall short of generating the technologies required to respond to the challenges of a rapidly changing sector.

### Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective B

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G – Inter-disciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
B1	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
B2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
B3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
B4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

### Organizational Result B1 – The livestock sector effectively and efficiently contributes to food security, poverty alleviation and economic development

OR Indicator	Target (4 year)
<b>B1.1</b> Number of countries which have adopted the necessary elements of a regulatory framework to underpin the livestock sector	6
<b>B1.2</b> Percentage of the countries requesting FAO assistance to enhance the efficiency / productivity and added value of their livestock production and that act	75%

upon the advice given	
<b>B1.3</b> Countries assisted in responding to disasters and emergencies that affect livestock-related livelihoods and whose requests are in conformity with the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)	100%
<b>B1.4</b> Number of national and regional programmes on food security (NPFS, RPFS) whose livestock components are supported by investment plans and focus on increased productivity, improved income and nutritional benefits	33 NPFS, 8 RPFS
<p><b>Primary Tools</b> for achievement of the Organizational Result</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Livestock sector statistics, information and knowledge that informs and influences decision makers in both the public and private sectors.</li> <li>2. Livestock sector analysis, policy and strategic advice, and decision support tools that enable the sector to contribute to economic development, poverty alleviation and improved human nutrition and health, including through enhanced access by livestock producers to expanding and increasingly sophisticated local, regional and international markets.</li> <li>3. Legislative advice that supports the livestock sector in ensuring its equitable and effective development.</li> <li>4. Guidance (guidelines, manuals, methodologies, technical reviews, issues and option papers) covering animal nutrition, feeds, animal breeding, husbandry, processing/value adding, animal welfare, animal identification, regulation of the livestock sector, good management practices for responsible intensification and increased efficiency of livestock production (spanning crop-livestock / pasture / aquaculture / agroforestry systems).</li> <li>5. Livestock components within the NPFS/RPFS (national and regional programmes on food security) with focus on increased productivity, improved incomes and nutritional benefits.</li> <li>6. Relief and rehabilitation response to natural disasters and man-made emergencies which have an impact on the livestock sector.</li> <li>7. Investment facilitation for livestock sector development, as guided by sub-sector policies and strategies, including through enhanced public-private partnerships for strengthening livestock services and through formal partnerships among important stakeholders.</li> <li>8. Capacity building (technical, statistics, policy, legal and institutional) to enhance the livestock sector's contribution to economic development, poverty alleviation and better quality diets.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result B2 - Reduced animal disease and associated human health risks</b>	
<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>B2.1</b> Number of the most significant animal and zoonotic diseases covered by the FAO/OIE/WHO Global Early Warning System (GLEWS) platform on animal / zoonotic diseases (domestic terrestrial and aquatic animals, wildlife)	10
<b>B2.2</b> Number of countries implementing a regulatory framework for animal health system governance that emphasises disease prevention and control capabilities, thereby considering public-private partnerships and	50

inter-sectoral collaboration requirements (One World-One Health orientated)	
<b>B2.3</b> Number of Transboundary Animal Diseases (TADs), food-borne and vector-borne animal diseases, Transboundary Aquatic Animal Diseases (TAADs) and Emerging Infectious Diseases (EID) against which EMPRES and the Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Disease Operations (ECTAD) have taken action	All important animal diseases, TAADs, EIDs as per response to country requests
<b>B2.4</b> Number of countries implementing investment programmes for animal health system which incorporate the One World – One Health approach	50
<p><b>Primary Tools</b> for achievement of the Organizational Result</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis of national animal health systems, including product inspection and hygiene, for guiding design, negotiation and implementation of comprehensive animal health and veterinary public health (zoonotic / food-borne diseases at the production stage) policy, legislation and investment opportunities.</li> <li>2. Timely information, surveillance, disease intelligence, forecasting, early warning tracing and detection of animal and zoonotic disease threats through the FAO/OIE/WHO Global Early Warning System (GLEWS) on animal / zoonotic diseases (domestic terrestrial and aquatic animals, wildlife).</li> <li>3. Methods and tools (guidelines, manuals and strategies), instruments, policies, and decision support for prevention, control and elimination of main animal, zoonotic, food-borne and vector-borne diseases and risk communication at national, regional and international levels, and response to animal health crises (e.g. CMC-FC/ECTAD); mainstream One World – One Health concept (domestic animal, wildlife, human and ecosystem health).</li> <li>4. Regional and sub-regional mechanisms for collaboration among countries and sectors on contingency planning, prevention and control of transboundary animal and zoonotic diseases, based on the EMPRES platform.</li> <li>5. Public-private partnerships, legal instruments and investment strategies for strengthening animal health systems, including private practitioners/service providers and community animal health workers where indicated.</li> <li>6. Support of national and regional capacity building at technical, institutional, policy and regulatory levels on early warning, detection, prevention, preparedness, risk communication, inter-agency collaboration, coordination and control of animal and zoonotic and food-borne diseases at the production stage; partnership arrangements.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result B3 - Better management of natural resources, including animal genetic resources, in livestock production</b></p>	
<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4year)</b>
<b>B3.1</b> Number of assessments of risks and opportunities in the livestock sector's use of, and interactions with natural resources and climate published	3 regional, 1 global reports
<b>B3.2</b> Number of countries implementing livestock-environment interface management	20
<b>B3.3</b> International agreements in which FAO's role/mandate on animal genetic resources and	CBD-UNFCCC post-Kyoto

livestock-environment issues is recognised/ mainstreamed	
<b>B3.4</b> Number of countries implementing national strategies and action plans for the improved management and conservation of animal genetic resources	30
<b>Primary Tools</b> for achievement of the Organizational Result	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information and knowledge management on livestock-environment interactions, on impacts of climate change on livestock, wildlife, habitat use and environment-mediated disease spread, on technology, institutional, regulatory and policy options for reducing the environmental impact of the livestock sector (including excessive grazing pressure, waste and greenhouse gas emissions; water pollution, forest conversion, land, ecosystem and biodiversity degradation); national and regional capacity building at technical, institutional and policy levels on the livestock-environment interface, vulnerability, mitigation and adaptation strategies.</li> <li>2. Policies and strategies for enabling sector adjustment to changing environmental conditions; programmes for livestock sector adaptation to and mitigation of the impacts of environmental and climate change, including assessment of aquaculture habitat degradation affecting fish<sup>2</sup> production.</li> <li>3. Investment in livestock-mediated natural resources stewardship with particular attention to industrial systems and extensive, grassland-based systems, including payment for environmental services and focusing on public-private partnerships.</li> <li>4. Technical and scientific information for underpinning incorporation of livestock sector considerations in international environmental fora (conventions, treaties and agreements).</li> <li>5. Guidance (guidelines, manuals, methodologies and good management practices, capacity building for extension and advisory services) for improving natural resource use efficiency in livestock production, including use of integrated land/water management (crop-livestock / pasture / aquaculture / agroforestry).</li> <li>6. Support to countries in the implementation of the Global Plan of Action on Animal Genetic Resources<sup>3</sup> (GPA – AnGR) through information and knowledge management, development of tools and guidelines on characterization, monitoring and inventory, sustainable use and conservation, maintenance of a Clearing House Mechanism (DAD-IS), advocacy and capacity-building; leading the development and implementation of a funding mechanism; and assistance to countries in institutional, policy and legal development.</li> <li>7. Advice on AnGR-related issues to the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) including through the Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITWG-AnGR).</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result B4 - Code of Conduct for a Responsible Livestock Sector</b>	
<b>OR Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>B4.1</b> Decision of FAO membership on COAG-led preparation and adoption of a Code of Conduct for a Responsible Livestock Sector	Expert consultations (2011; 2013); annual “World Livestock 20xx” reports
<b>Primary Tools</b> for achievement of the Organizational Result	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design and negotiation of livestock sector-relevant framework agreement (Code of Conduct</li> </ol>	

<sup>2</sup> INSOFAR AS INTEGRATED LIVESTOCK-FISH PRODUCTION IS CONCERNED

<sup>3</sup> TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL SPECIES ONLY (EXCLUDING AQUATIC ANIMALS)

for a Responsible Livestock Sector), overseen by COAG, in synergy and harmony with relevant international agreements and instruments; and advised by expert consultation(s). [The focus of attention of this Code of Conduct will be: a) on technical options ranging from improved animal nutrition, feeds, animal breeding, husbandry, processing/value adding, animal welfare, animal identification, animal health management, good agricultural and management practices for the sustainable intensification and increased efficiency of livestock production, and b) on the improved regulation and policy / institutional support of the livestock sector as guided by integrated agricultural/rural development and food security programmes at national and regional levels and with focus on enhancing livestock's role in social/economic development, public health and environmental sustainability].

2. Two expert consultations to prepare background materials and decision support for the Code negotiation process.
3. Annual flagship publication ("World Livestock 20xx", first edition in 2010) for the information/guidance of negotiation and implementation of Code of Conduct for a Responsible Livestock Sector.

**Annex 4: Strategic Objective C - Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources.*****Issues and Challenges***

The fisheries and aquaculture sector will continue to play an important role in human nutrition, the fight against hunger and poverty and more generally in economic development. The demand for fish and fish products will continue to grow. Correspondingly, there will be an increased need for effective management and conservation of fisheries and aquaculture resources and for ensuring the conservation of aquatic biodiversity and the health and productivity of ecosystems supporting fishery resources and fish production, as called for by the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF). In order to meet the nutritional, social and economic objectives of the sector, it will be essential to ensure the sustainable use of the wild stocks by capture fisheries, the sustainable development of aquaculture, and minimized negative impacts of fishing on the environment.

The state of world capture fisheries is far from optimal as illustrated by the State of World of Fisheries and Aquaculture (SOFIA) released in March 2009. Moreover, the problems of fleet overcapacity and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing challenge the international community as it seeks lasting solutions. Inland resources and ecosystems are particularly prone to adverse impacts from a variety of human activities.

There is limited potential for growth of global catches of wild fish stocks and it is expected that aquaculture will contribute to fill the gap in the increasing demand for fish and fish products. Aquaculture currently provides about half of the fish used for human consumption. Sustainable development of the sector faces two challenges: the urgent need for appropriate technologies and avenues to increase aquaculture production in many developing countries; and the broad demand for improving resource use efficiency and management and protection of the environment.

An important issue is the co-existence, in relation to both capture fisheries and aquaculture, of a large-scale, industrial subsector and a small-scale subsector. The latter employs more than 90 percent of all people who work in fisheries and aquaculture, communities for which artisanal fishing or small-scale aquaculture represents a major contribution to food security and livelihoods. Integrated policies and improved management tools are necessary to address the specific needs of both subsectors.

There will continue to be a considerable need for the promotion of good governance, practices and regulatory action in relation to fisheries and aquaculture at a global, regional and national levels, particularly public policies and practices and instruments that integrate into the regulatory framework the principles and standards contained in the CCRF and related instruments. Relevant institutions must be strengthened to achieve good fisheries governance.

A multipronged approach is required to enable FAO Members and regional fishery bodies (RFBs) to take the action necessary to facilitate enhanced responsibility and meeting international obligations, especially when implementing international instruments that seek to improve fisheries governance. In addition, they will need well trained staff and adequate financial resources. Assistance and capacity building in these fields are essential.

There are major challenges facing the improvement of information and data on the status and trends of fisheries and aquaculture for use as a sound basis for policy-making, management and sectoral planning. In particular, artisanal fishing and small-scale aquaculture are often under-represented, or sometimes even totally neglected in official statistics. Inland fisheries as a whole are also a serious problem in this regard. The Committee on Fisheries (COFI) has adopted two

Strategies for capture fisheries and for aquaculture to address these challenges. Active implementation of the Strategies is now needed at global, regional and national, levels. This will require a major focus on capacity building and partnership activities with emphasis on the integration of information and data utilizing common standards.

Other challenges are emerging: the impact of climate change, including the increasing frequency of natural disasters; rising fish prices, fuel dependency and consumption and production inputs costs; the emergence of animal diseases in aquaculture; the increasing influence of retail sector and use of market instruments and certification to promote sustainability and responsible trade; the general deterioration of aquatic ecosystems, both in the marine environment and in inland waters. The need for increased attention to be paid to environmental threats and concerns; and the need for adequate response to emergencies.

### ***Assumptions and Risks***

- Countries have the will and capacity to improve governance and management in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors through strengthened regulatory and institutional frameworks at the national, regional and global levels. However, there is a strong risk that overfishing, overcapacity and IUU fishing will persist and even worsen if the necessary regulatory and institutional measures are not maintained or not adopted and implemented. Some types of subsidies given to the fishing sector are aggravating the situation. This would continue to compromise the ability of countries to realize net economic benefits from their capture fisheries and negatively affect the already limited potential growth of world catches from wild fish stocks. Widespread difficulties to attract and retain qualified staff in fisheries and aquaculture administrations, particularly in developing countries also present a serious risk.
- The aquaculture sector may encounter numerous constraints to its growth in the coming decades: e.g., the environmental impact of aquaculture development; conflicts between resource users; prevalence of diseases; and the potential for increased dependence on wild fish for use as seed and feed. There may even be a further decline in the growth rate, as evidenced over the last two years.
- Trade in fish and fish products generates benefits (income and employment) from the point of capture/production to the final consumer. Trade in fish and fish products must, however, be underpinned by sound management regimes to ensure its sustained contribution to economic development.
- Adequate capacity to collect, verify, analyse, disseminate and exchange information and data, utilizing international standards is available to effectively facilitate decision-making by countries individually or collectively through regional and global mechanisms. There is a risk that a lack of adequate capacity and non-adherence to standards could lead to inadequate information and jeopardise effective decision-making.
- The risks inherent to the sector can be aggravated by external threats such as: the impact of climate change; impacts from other sectors, such as pollution, leading to the deterioration of marine and inland aquatic environments and their ecosystems; deficiencies in the management of coastal and riparian areas, and land and water resources; coastal area activities such as tourism, industrial development, spill-offs and population migrations; alternative and conflicting uses of coastal areas and/or inland and marine water resources; and rapid increases in the price of inputs such as fuel and animal feed. All States must give high priority to implementation of the CCRF resulting in more effective management of marine and capture fisheries within the framework of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAF).
- There is adequate capacity in national fisheries and aquaculture departments and RFBs for effective management, including representing interests of fisheries sector in national and regional planning.

*Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective C*

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
C01	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C02			x	x	x			
C03	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C04	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C05		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
C06		x	x	x	x	x		x

**Organizational Result C1 - Members and other stakeholders have improved formulation of policies and standards that facilitate the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and other international instruments, as well as response to emerging issues**

Indicator	Target (4 years)
<b>C.1.1</b> Countries and RFBs have developed an appropriate policy and regulatory framework for the implementation of the CCRF and related instruments, including the formulation, adoption and/or implementation of policies, plans of action, laws and regulations and bilateral and regional agreements with specific attention to small-scale fisheries, overcapacity and IUU fishing.	10% increase in countries
<b>C.1.2</b> International fisheries instruments have been developed under the guidance of COFI or other fora including international guidelines and legally binding instruments.	Adoption of three to five new instruments
<b>C.1.3</b> Countries and RFBs have improved monitoring and analytical capacities through improved statistical collection and reporting systems as a basis for policy making, sectoral planning and management.	10% improvement
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regular reporting on the status of implementation of the CCRF and related instruments</li> <li>2. Advice on establishing and integrating policy and legal frameworks, balancing development objectives with conservation needs and giving special attention to small scale fisheries and aquaculture</li> <li>3. Providing platforms, such as COFI, for international debate, and strengthening their contribution to and participation in other international fora [Such as the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), World Trade Organization (WTO), Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Commission on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), International Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Labour Organization (ILO)]</li> <li>4. Developing new instruments, such as agreements, plans of action, technical and international guidelines</li> <li>5. Advocacy and communication, in particular about the economic, social and environmental benefits and the sector's enhanced contribution to the UN MDGs of implementing the CCRF</li> </ol>	

<p>and related international instruments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Capacity building in statistics and the development of legal and policy frameworks, international negotiation, and economic and social aspects of fisheries</li> <li>7. Production and utilization of timely and reliable information and statistics and citation and other analyses of their use as a basis for policy development</li> <li>8. Strengthened collaboration with relevant intergovernmental, governmental and non-governmental partners including organizations of fishworkers, fishfarmers and fishing/aquaculture industry</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result C2 - Governance of fisheries and aquaculture has improved through the establishment or strengthening of national and regional institutions, including RFBs</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>C.2.1</b> Improved governance leads to greater benefits from capture fisheries and aquaculture	4% increase
<b>C.2.2</b> Countries have conducted assessments of their institution(s) and institutional arrangements and based on lessons learned have adopted new policies and instruments for better governance, including strengthening their institutions and institutional arrangements or creating new ones where needed.	10 countries
<b>C.2.3</b> RFBs have conducted assessments of their performance and have taken steps to improve it	10 RFBs
<b>C.2.4</b> Countries and relevant stakeholders have taken steps towards the establishment of new RFBs/Aquaculture networks (AqN) where gaps have been identified in the governance of shared resources	Establishment of 2 RFBs
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advice and assistance (through legal, policy and information support) to strengthen existing institutions</li> <li>2. Capacity building on governance and management of institutions</li> <li>3. Regular analysis and reporting on experiences with institutional assessments and reform</li> <li>4. Legal, policy and technical advise to establish new RFBs</li> <li>5. Field support to and case studies on institutional reform</li> <li>6. Working with other UN agencies and relevant IGOs and NGOs to ensure maximum efficiency in promoting institutional reform for improved governance</li> <li>7. Support to RFBs, AqN and relevant international institutions in addressing cross-cutting issues such as small-scale fisheries and small-scale aquaculture</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result C3 - More effective management of marine and inland capture fisheries by FAO Members and other stakeholders has contributed to the improved state of fisheries resources, ecosystems and their sustainable use</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>C.3.1</b> Stocks or populations (marine and inland) have been assessed using the best scientific evidence available, also taking into account traditional and local knowledge as	5% more stocks assessed by 2012

appropriate	
<b>C.3.2</b> National and international stocks or populations (marine and inland) show improved status and/or have been successfully maintained where already at productive levels.	A decrease to 25% or less in the global mean level of Overexploited, Depleted and Recovering stocks
<b>C.3.3</b> Countries and RFBs have adopted and implemented measures for more effective management of their marine and inland capture fisheries and their marine and inland water ecosystems, in accordance with the CCRF and consistent with an EAF and taking into account the specific needs and contributions of small-scale fisheries.	10% increase in the number of countries/RFBs that have completed and formally adopted fisheries management plans or equivalent frameworks that are consistent with the Code of Conduct and EAF.
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development and dissemination, in cooperation with other appropriate partners, of technical guidelines, toolboxes and other information material on fisheries management in the framework of EAF and relevant aspects of the Code of Conduct. Particular emphasis will be placed on material for management of small-scale fisheries</li> <li>2. Regular reporting on and assessment of the state of fish stocks and ecosystems</li> <li>3. Technical advice and capacity building in all areas of fisheries assessment and management in the framework of EAF, taking special account of the needs of small-scale fisheries and livelihood requirements, at national, regional and global levels</li> <li>4. Partnerships with other UN agencies and relevant IGOs and NGOs. Facilitating and promoting international cooperation in fisheries management through e.g. workshops, consultations, creation of networks and other means, including with other sectors where necessary</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result C4 - Members and other stakeholders have benefited from increased production of fish and fish products from sustainable aquaculture</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>C.4.1</b> Increased contributions of aquaculture sector to rural development and livelihoods	10% increase
<b>C.4.2</b> Improved aquaculture output as well as performance (e.g. decrease in the global use of fishmeal, reduce dependence on antibiotics, reduction of habitat deterioration)	10% increase
<b>C.4.3</b> Increased consumption of farmed fish products coming from sustainable aquaculture practices	10% increase
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Promotion of the ecosystem approach to aquaculture (EAA) including biosecurity frameworks, risk assessments, integrated aquaculture, ICZM etc.</li> <li>2. Capacity building through training programmes, regional workshops to facilitate adoption and implementation of FAO guidelines, focusing on rural sectors, small farmers and women</li> <li>3. Support and promotion of small farmers clusters and associations emphasizing the involvement of women and minorities</li> <li>4. Promotion of global, regional and thematic reviews and assessments of the aquaculture sector</li> <li>5. Promotion and support to aquaculture partnerships and aquaculture networks in applied research and development, technology transfer, and capacity building</li> <li>6. Development of information tools and systems to disseminate, collect, manage and utilize</li> </ol>	

relevant data 7. Improved communication and coordination between regional offices and FI in HQ as well as between FAO and other regional organisations 8. Effective work of the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture	
<b>Organizational Result C5 - Operation of fisheries, including the use of vessels and fishing gear, is made safer, more technically and socio-economically efficient, environmentally friendly and compliant with rules at all levels</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>C.5.1</b> Increased number of countries whose fisheries are harvested using environmental friendly, safe, technically and economically efficient fishing vessels, fishing gear and fishing practices	5% improvement over baselines
<b>C.5.2</b> Number of countries and RFBs with increased operational capacity to strengthen and expand MCS nationally and internationally	5% improvement over baselines
<b>C.5.3</b> Increased number of countries whose fishing communities are better prepared and have improved resilience to threats, natural disasters and climate change	5% improvement in 5 highly vulnerable countries with coastal fisheries
<b>Primary Tools</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development and application of knowledge products and best practices on safer, more technically and socio-economically efficient fishing operations including inventory of technologies and best practices related to C5-1, C5-2, C5-3</li> <li>2. Development and application of knowledge products and best practices to minimize adverse impacts of fishing on the environment including global updates of bycatch and discards, low energy capture technologies and development of environmentally friendly fishing technologies</li> <li>3. Provision of technical advice and support on all matters related to responsible fishing operations including facilitation of workshops, technical consultations, commissioning of studies and reviews</li> <li>4. Provision of technical advice and support in the development of appropriate small-scale fishing technologies</li> <li>5. Provision of technical advice and support on harbour management, waste reduction, microfinance programmes, processes for enhanced stakeholder participation in disaster response and preparedness, and adaptation to climate change</li> <li>6. Support to Member states and RFBs in capacity building and promoting activities that strengthen and expand their capacity for integrated monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) systems of fishing operations.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result C6 - Members and other stakeholders have achieved more responsible post-harvest utilization and trade of fisheries and aquaculture products, including more predictable and harmonised market access requirements</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>C.6.1</b> Increased adoption of good practices for fish utilization,	20% improvement

marketing and trade, both at the government and industry levels	
<b>C.6.2</b> Improved participation in and increased benefits from national, regional and international fish trade, particularly for developing countries	+10% improvement
<b>C.6.3</b> Improved harmonization, predictability and transparency in international fish trade and market access requirements, including seafood safety requirements, and reduction in trade disputes	20% improvement
<p><b><i>Primary Tools</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provision of support and advice to national, regional and international organizations, including private sector, to improve practices for post harvest utilization and marketing of fish</li> <li>2. Regular assessment and reporting, in particular through COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade, on developments, trends and issues of fish utilization, trade and market access requirements</li> <li>3. Provision of technical advice and capacity building in all areas of fish utilization, marketing and trade at national, regional and global levels through e.g. responses to ad hoc requests for technical support, TCP projects, continued technical support to and back-stopping of the Fish Infoservices, short and long-term comprehensive projects funded by extra-budgetary funds</li> <li>4. Development of strategic partnership with relevant UN agencies, IGOs and NGOs to promote the development and implementation of instruments and practices, including market instruments, for responsible and sustainable fish utilization, marketing and trade</li> <li>5. Support to national and regional extension, research and professional institutions and regional networks to promote responsible fish utilization, marketing and trade</li> </ol>	

## **Annex 5: Strategic Objective D - Improved safety and quality of food at all stages of the food chain**

### **Issues and Challenges**

Inadequate controls of food safety and quality along the food chain continue to plague both developed and developing countries. Reports of food safety management failures demonstrate the difficulties faced by countries in achieving effective and integrated controls throughout the pre-production to consumption continuum, even in developed countries with mature food safety and quality systems supported by considerable technical and scientific capacities. The consequences of these failures include food-borne illness and concomitant negative economic effects on farmers, food businesses and consumers. The challenges are magnified in many developing countries which are mainly characterised by fragmented food control systems, inadequate or inconsistent legal frameworks, weak institutions, lack of adequate consumer protection policies, poor infrastructure and shortages of trained human resources; where poverty reduction and socio-economic development are highly dependent on countries' capacities to comply with market requirements for safety and quality; and where food-borne diseases remain a major cause of death and illness, particularly among children.

In many developing countries, food safety/quality strategies and action plans also fail due to inadequate and inconsistent budgetary and other support. Improving food safety and quality management at national level at all stages of the food chain requires strategic inter-sectoral planning and investment. There is a need to raise awareness among high-level policy makers of the need for food safety policies and strategies to be developed and considered in the context of broader national food security, agricultural development and public health goals.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission develops science-based food safety standards that most individual countries, in particular developing countries, do not have the capacity or resources to develop on their own. The Commission also develops internationally-agreed food quality standards. Both developing and developed countries look to the Codex Alimentarius standards for international guidance to protect consumers' health, while ensuring fair practices in food trade. Given the implications of WTO's SPS and TBT Agreements on international food trade, there are increasing expectations attached to the Codex standard setting process and to scientific advice to support that process. Developing countries must build capacity to participate effectively in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its related bodies, so as to ensure the validity and relevance of Codex standards in the international context.

The mere existence of standards is insufficient to provide assurance of public health protection or compliance with specific market requirements. This requires capacity to apply the standards through a national system of food safety/quality management and control, where both public and private sector actors are assigned clearly defined roles and responsibilities and possess the knowledge, skills and facilities necessary to perform their functions effectively and efficiently.

Climate-related effects, altered population demographics, life-style changes, evolving food production systems, shifting market dynamics and increasing application of private standards are all expected to challenge governments to identify emerging hazards, to recognise changing food safety and quality priorities and to adapt programmes of food safety/quality management accordingly.

## Assumptions and Risks

### International level

- Risk that international financial crisis may lead to reduced funding for development from donor countries
- Risk that protectionist policies at regional/sub-regional and/or at national levels undermine multilateral agreements on food safety and quality regulation
- Risk that private food safety standards may undermine harmonization of official standards in line with those of Codex Alimentarius
- Risk that an increasing number of private standards on specific quality (for which no Codex standard exists) creates trade barriers between countries
- Risk that increasing numbers of international agencies involved in food standards setting and food safety capacity-building resulting in poor coordination and decreased overall effectiveness of assistance
- Risk that climate change related effects create new and unmanaged food safety risks
- Risk that monoculture/industrial agriculture coupled with climate change will lead to the loss of bio-diversity and dietary diversity and the consequence of micro-nutrient malnutrition

### National level

- Risk that political instability and problems of food security may undermine the ability of governments to consistently support food safety and quality programmes
- Risk that informal cross border food trade of unsafe/ inferior quality products with neighbouring countries could create unexpected challenges to national food safety/quality management
- Risk that long-term planning for food safety and quality management is undermined by the need to respond to food chain emergencies
- Risk that separate systems and levels of control for domestic markets and export could give rise to greater and uncontrolled food safety risks for the most vulnerable
- Risk that fragmented delivery of technical assistance at national level reduces efficiency of assistance.
- Risk of poor coordination among institutional stakeholders (ministries/ agencies at national and decentralized levels) leading to poor enforcement

### Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective D

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G – Inter-disciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
D1		x	x		x	x	x	x
D2	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
D3	x	x			x	x	x	x
D4	x	x			x	x	x	x

### Organizational Result D1 - New and revised internationally agreed standards and recommendations for food safety and quality that serve as the reference for international harmonization

OR Indicator	Target (4 year)
D1.1 Extent of Codex member country participation in the Codex process	80 national contact points
D1.2 Use of Codex standards by member governments	20 -50 percent of countries in 6 regions

<b>D1.3</b> Utilization of FAO/WHO scientific advice (food safety, quality and nutrient requirements) in the development of internationally agreed standards and recommendations	Continued high use of recommendations from Expert bodies by Codex committees (semi-quantitative assessment)
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contribution of the Codex Secretariat to support the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission.</li> <li>2. Provision of legal advice to the Codex Alimentarius Commission and to related expert bodies.</li> <li>3. Advocacy to raise awareness of national decision-makers of the importance of Codex and for the use of Codex texts at national and regional levels and facilitation of regional collaboration on food standardisation.</li> <li>4. Support for the development of institutional and individual capacities that enhance effective country-level participation in Codex and use of Codex standards.</li> <li>5. Advocacy for and management (jointly with WHO) of the FAO/WHO Codex Trust Fund to support participation of developing countries to regular Codex Sessions.</li> <li>6. Provision of scientific advice on food safety and quality, including food composition and nutrient requirements, through the implementation of JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA, JECN and ad hoc expert meetings and the operation of INFOODS.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result D2 - Institutional, policy and legal frameworks for food safety/quality management that support an integrated food chain approach</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>D2.1</b> Countries enabled to establish national food safety/quality policies on the basis of sound assessments and through participative processes	15 countries
<b>D2.2</b> Countries enabled to assess their food safety/quality legislative frameworks, to identify legislative drafting priorities and to develop/adopt required legislation.	15 countries
<b>D2.3</b> Countries enabled to establish or improve inter-agency coordinative mechanisms for management and control of food safety/quality along the food chain	15 countries
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decision-support tools for policy makers on food safety and quality, including consideration of impact of food biodiversity on nutrition.</li> <li>2. Support for the review, assessment and strengthening of institutional and legislative frameworks for food safety/quality management and control, including consideration of integrated bio-security systems.</li> <li>3. Support the development of institutional and individual capacities for the generation, compilation, analysis and use of scientific data on food safety and quality, nutrition and biodiversity to support policy decisions.</li> <li>4. Provision of scientific advice for early identification of emerging food safety issues and assessment of their implications for food safety management and capacity development.</li> <li>5. Food production and trade statistics and analysis of market trends, assessment of cost of compliance and economic and social impacts of non-compliance.</li> <li>6. Facilitate good practices in food safety/quality investment and on enhancing public-</li> </ol>	

private partnerships.	
<b>Organizational Result D3 - National/ regional authorities are effectively designing and implementing programmes of food safety and quality management and control according to international norms</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>D3.1</b> Number of countries enabled to develop risk-based food safety programmes	8 countries with improved systems for using data to develop risk-based food safety programmes
<b>D3.2</b> Countries enabled to provide efficient and uniform food inspection and certification services meeting international recommendations	12 countries with more efficient inspection services
<b>D3.3</b> Countries enabled to expand the range of the food analyses, ensuring their reliability and efficient delivery	10 countries with improved food analysis capacities
<b>D3.4</b> Countries enabled to establish national food safety emergency response plans with an action plan for developing the capacities necessary for its effective implementation and to integrate food safety into other national emergency plans	12 countries
<b>D3.5</b> Countries enabled to develop and implement national strategies for building public awareness and education on food safety and quality including health and nutritional benefits of local/traditional foods	12 countries with national strategies developed and action plans agreed

**Primary Tools**

1. Facilitate development of an enabling environment for broad stakeholder participation in food safety/ quality programme design and in standard setting at national level.
2. Support the application of the food safety risk analysis framework to food safety decision-making at national level (risk assessment, risk management and risk communication). including the development of national food standards.
3. Facilitating access to information on international food safety standards, risk (-benefit) assessment and scientific advice, food composition and other related issues (e.g. the Web-based portal IPFSAPH, JECFA and MRA publication series, Journal of Food Composition etc.).
4. Facilitate development of an enabling environment for regional /sub-regional collaboration on a range of food safety and quality issues.
5. Support for building capacities and improving efficiency of food laboratory, food inspection and certification services.
6. Guidance and technical assistance on nutrient reference values, food labelling, nutrient requirements and health claims.
7. Support the development of institutional and individual capacities on specific food control issues such as contaminant monitoring programmes, sampling programmes, traceability/ product tracing and facilitate a supportive policy environment for implementation of effective programmes.
8. Provision of timely information, food safety intelligence, forecasting, early warning and guidance and assistance on national-level preparedness and to food safety emergencies through EMPRES-Food Safety, INFOSAN and CMC-FC.
9. Support to the design and implementation of NPFS/RPFS to assure attention to the impact of food safety and quality on food security and poverty alleviation.
10. Partnerships with academic and research institutions as reference centres and to enhance and expand training and capacity building.

**Organizational Result D4 - Countries establish effective programmes to promote improved adherence of food producers/businesses to international recommendations on good practices in food safety and quality at all stages of the food chain, and conformity with market requirements**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>D4.1</b> Countries enabled to introduce holistic and integrated strategies for promoting compliance with good agricultural, manufacturing and hygiene practices based on sound assessments of key sub-sectors	12 countries with strategies and action plans developed; 6 countries with strategies formally adopted and action plans under implementation
<b>D4.2</b> Countries enabled to comprehensively incorporate food safety/hygiene considerations into programmes of good practice in primary production	Training implemented in 15 countries Reduced levels of contamination in primary products in 10 countries
<b>D4.3</b> Countries enabled to provide effective programmes in support of food businesses, on food safety/quality management and on context-appropriate technologies	20 countries
<b>D4.4</b> Countries enabled to implement voluntary standards and schemes, including those for specific quality	8 countries with programmes to strengthen the capacity of farmers and businesses to comply with voluntary standards and schemes

**Primary Tools**

1. Support development of national strategies for achieving food quality and safety goals.
2. Support institutional and individual capacities to develop and implement programmes for improving food safety and quality management for small and lesser developed businesses including the street food sector.
3. Provision of guidelines on good practices at primary production in the animal, plant and fisheries sectors.
4. Assist national actors to assess feasibility of voluntary standards and schemes and support institutional and individual capacities to implement such standards and schemes for specific quality products.
5. Support for the development of national capacities to promote product and process innovation.
6. Assist national actors to develop programmes of consumer awareness/education in food safety, biodiversity and its impact on nutrition and other food quality issues.
7. Decision-support tools to inform investment planning in food safety/quality infrastructure.
8. Market studies and identification of emerging market trends including analyses of the impact of private and voluntary standards on market access.

**Annex 6: Strategic Objective E - Sustainable management of forests and trees.*****Issues and Challenges***

The forest sector continues to be affected by the rapid pace of global changes. Globalization, through rapid expansion of trade, increased transnational investments, and world-wide introduction of improved information and communication technology, is presenting new opportunities and challenges. Forestry has become more people centered, and society's demands on forests have undergone significant changes with increasing emphasis on environmental, social and cultural values. Interactions between the forest sector and other sectors are increasingly understood to be the source of both problems and opportunities. In addition, the critical roles that forests and trees outside forests play in mitigation of and adaptation to climate change, as well as a source of bio-energy, are increasingly recognized, requiring careful consideration in national and international decision-making.

Commitment to enhancing the contribution of sustainable forest management to overall sustainable development is increasing. More than ever, the significant contributions of forests and trees to sustainable livelihoods and eradication of hunger and poverty is appreciated. There is greater recognition of the linkages of forestry with agriculture, energy and water. However, progress towards sustainable forest management remains uneven and the potential for cross-sector synergies, integrated management and landscape approaches is often underutilized. The continuing loss of forests and forest degradation in many developing countries, especially in tropical regions, is a major issue.

Rural livelihoods often depend on productive forests that support employment and income, thus reducing poverty. Increasing demand for food, fibre and fuel can trigger substantial unplanned land use changes, including large scale forest clearance. In many economically developed countries, environmental conservation and forest-based recreation are the dominant concerns of society. In all regions, the demand for ecosystem services from forests is increasing. A strategic approach is needed to ensure the health and productivity of forests, so as to optimize their capacity to help to mitigate climate change, conserve biodiversity, safeguard wildlife habitat and protect land and watersheds.

An increasing number of countries are managing their forests in a sustainable manner: the challenge for FAO is to help more countries improve the management of their forests so that this minority soon becomes a majority within the next decade. As the quantity of, and access to information about forests and forestry continue to expand, the need to share and manage knowledge more effectively is becoming more urgent. Countries also expect that FAO address effectively it's the changing environment, reach outside the traditional forest sector, engage in partnerships with new stakeholders, and serve as a global leader.

***Assumptions and Risks***

Success in achieving this Strategic Objective will depend on relatively consistent economic progress; improvements in forestry require investments. It is also assumed that countries will continue to recognize the importance of sustainable forest management (SFM) and will support FAO's key role in helping to promote SFM, both at national and international levels. It is further assumed that sufficient resources could be available to enhance capacities of countries to help them overcome obstacles to sustainable forest management through policy and legal advice, capacity development and technical assistance. Risks include: problems associated with continued population growth, political instability, or economic pressures resulting in the conversion of forests to agriculture, urban or other land uses.

There is a high level of risk that sustainable forest management may continue to fail in some key countries unable to combine political will, effective governance at all levels, and overall economic progress.

*Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective E*

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
E01	x	x			x	x	x	x
E02			x			x	x	x
E03			x	x	x	x	x	x
E04			x		x	x	x	x
E05	x	x		x				
E06			x	x	x	x	x	x

**Organizational Result E1 - Policy and practice affecting forests and forestry are: a: based on timely and reliable information; b: reinforced by international cooperation and debate**

Indicator	Targets (4 years)
<b>E.1.1</b> Number of countries that develop, through FAO support, improved national forest monitoring and assessment (NFMA).	Eight additional countries undertake NFMA's; others use FAO guides.
<b>E.1.2</b> Countries use FAO information or support to meet reporting requirements for national and international information about forests, including info about forest resources, livelihoods, economics and environmental services	Increasing trend in quantity & quality of country participation in FAO forest information processes
<b>E.1.3</b> Countries actively participate in global forest resources assessment process	At least 50 countries maintain their interest in participating in FRA 2015

**Primary Tools**

1. Serve as an authoritative global source of information on forests.
2. Prepare and disseminate the results of periodic Global Forest Resources Assessments and reports on the State of the World's Forests.
3. Support to national and regional forest monitoring and assessment, including interactions with other sectors through integrated land use assessments.
4. Effectively share knowledge and information through timely, high-quality use of the internet, networks, publications, and other media.

**Organizational Result E2 - Institutions governing forests are strengthened and decision-making improved, including involvement of forest stakeholders in the development of forest policies and legislation, thereby enhancing an enabling environment for investment in forestry and forest industries.**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>E.2.1</b> Active participation and follow-up by countries in regional forestry commissions, COFO, advisory committees, and expert consultations	To be identified before 12/09
<b>E.2.2</b> CPF organizations participate in specific collaborative initiatives	At least two initiatives in the four year period of the MTP
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a dynamic forum for governments and other stakeholders to address policy and emerging issues, including Ministerial Meetings, the Committee on Forestry, the World Forestry Congress, Regional Forestry Commissions, technical panels and commissions, expert consultations, and global and regional networks.</li> <li>2. Strengthen linkages between national, regional and global processes, including through an expansion of the role of Regional Forestry Commissions.</li> <li>3. Provide leadership for the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), including developing joint programmes or actions, and through other partnerships including hosting the Mountain Partnership and through active partnerships with the private sector and non-governmental organizations.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result E3 - Forestry is better integrated into national development plans and processes, considering interfaces between forests and other land uses.</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>E.3.1</b> Countries use FAO-generated knowledge and technical assistance to support national forest programmes (NFPs)	High level of satisfaction with FAO support for NFPs
<b>E.3.2</b> The NFP Facility is effectively enhancing stakeholder participation in NFPs and improving knowledge exchange	Positive impact assessments in a majority of partner countries
<b>E.3.3</b> Pilot countries take action to improve their land use practices, improving the interface between forests and other land uses.	
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support to effective national forest programmes, including capacity building and knowledge exchange.</li> <li>2. Host and support the National Forest Programme Facility.</li> <li>3. Support for integrated (cross-sectoral) policy analysis and planning to better understand the implications of policies of other sectors on forests and vice versa.</li> <li>4. Support participatory development of forest policy and law, institutional reform and efforts to improve governance at all levels.</li> <li>5. Sector studies, including regional forestry outlook studies, and comparative analyses of forest institutions.</li> </ol>	

<b>Organizational Result 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.</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>E.4.1</b> Number of countries using FAO-facilitated good practices to implement plans and strategies for SFM	50% increase
<b>E.4.2</b> Number of countries using community-based approaches to fire management	20 countries
<b>E.4.3</b> Increased number of countries participating in financial assistance related to reduced deforestation and forest degradation.	10 countries
<b>E.4.4</b> Use of FAO guidelines and advice for forest health and protection against insects and disease including the incorporation of these issues into NFPs and strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change	Assistance is provided to up to ten additional countries.
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development and use of guidelines for good forest practices through effective stakeholder consultative processes.</li> <li>2. Support development and implementation of strategies for conservation and sustainable use of forest genetic resources at global, regional and local levels.</li> <li>3. Support improved forest fire management including through community-based approaches.</li> <li>4. Support the development and implementation of national and international financial mechanisms to support sustainable forest management.</li> <li>5. Increased use of financial mechanisms to facilitate information sharing and database development, and to build capacity to strengthen forest management and to reduce deforestation and forest degradation (e.g., REDD).</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result E5 - Social and economic values and livelihood benefits of forests and trees are enhanced, and markets for forest products and services contribute to making forestry a more economically viable land-use option.</b>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>E.5.1</b> Analysis and knowledge of social and economic factors result in increase investment in forestry	Increasing trend in number of users and positive feedback
<b>E.5.2</b> FAO analyses of forest production, consumption and trade are used to support policy	Increasing trend in number of users and positive feedback
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analysis and knowledge of social and economic factors resulting in increased innovation and investment.</li> <li>2. Analysis of production, consumption and trade of forest products.</li> <li>3. Technical assistance and guidelines for community-based forest management, forest-based</li> </ol>	

enterprises that improve livelihoods and reduce poverty.	
4. Information and assistance on accessing carbon markets provided to forestry practitioners.	
<b>Organizational Result E6 - Environmental values of forests, trees outside forests and forestry are better realized; strategies for conservation of forest biodiversity and genetic resources, climate change mitigation and adaptation, rehabilitation of degraded lands, and water and wildlife management are effectively implemented</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>E.6.1</b> Number of countries using FAO technical assistance and documentation on conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity (at genetic, species and ecosystem levels)	Ten additional countries
<b>E.6.2</b> Number of countries with improved watershed management practices based on use of FAO technical assistance and documentation.	Ten countries
<b>E.6.3</b> Number of countries implementing new guidelines for dryland management and to combat desertification	To be developed in consultation with member countries
<b>E.6.4</b> Number of countries using FAO information, guidelines and technical assistance for integrating climate change strategies into national forest policies and into forest management plans	3 countries using the guidelines
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide technical, policy, and legal assistance in support of landscape and ecosystem approaches and the development of payment for environmental services schemes, with an emphasis on mountain ecosystems, arid zones and rangelands, coastal forests and other fragile ecosystems.</li> <li>2. Development and use of guidelines for adapting forest policies, institutions, practices and governance arrangements to improve climate change mitigation and adaptation.</li> <li>3. Support national and regional initiatives to conserve biological diversity including wildlife resources in protected areas and production forests.</li> <li>4. Provide policy and technical assistance to improve the management of watersheds, to rehabilitate degraded forest lands and combat desertification.</li> </ol>	

**Annex 7: Strategic Objective F - Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture****Issues and Challenges**

Natural resources (land, water, climate and genetic resources) and their services are essential to food production, rural development and sustainable livelihoods. Conflicts and competition over access to, and the use of these resources will increase in many regions, due to rising demands for food, water, fibre and energy. Increased intensity of natural resource use will result in the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of productive land and water resources. This will be exacerbated by the anticipated impacts of climate change on agricultural production, growing conditions, water availability, occurrences of extreme weather events and others, as well as by volatility in global markets. Hence, the sustainable management of natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations requires distinct technical disciplines to address key aspects of natural resources and their governance, as well as multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral approaches so that competition for natural resources can be reduced. This includes support of the development and use of international instruments. A central challenge is to ensure that the capacities to manage and regulate natural resource use are supported at all levels. These capacities will need to respond effectively to rapid socio-economic transitions and emergencies. They will need to be underpinned by key data (including geospatial), knowledge and approaches, available at the national, regional and global levels.

Many opportunities exist to limit the adverse impacts of climate change through improved knowledge and management of natural resources in agriculture, forestry and fisheries policies and practices. Adaptation and mitigation strategies will involve reduction of anthropogenic emissions and the enhancement of carbon sequestration. Financing mechanisms (e.g. CDM, GEF, PES and others) support means to mitigate and adapt to climate change that apply across sectors and that require multidisciplinary approaches. However, complex procedures and restrictive eligibility criteria have tended to hamper funding of activities relevant to agriculture, forestry and fisheries. There is increasing international recognition that bioenergy development both offers opportunities and challenges for sustainable agricultural and rural development. International and national data and information and consultative processes leading towards sustainable bioenergy strategies and policies are needed.

**Assumptions and Risks**

Within the **broader external environment**, the main assumptions and risks are that:

- Current international interest in and commitment to sustainable natural resources management, reflecting its critical importance for food security and poverty reduction, will continue and be converted into policy decisions and budget allocations to promote the adoption of appropriate management approaches and practices.
- International policies and arrangements can be agreed by countries for sustainable natural resources management, including, for example, in relation to access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits derived from their use; and in relation to climate change related instruments, such as the Kyoto protocol and any post-2012 arrangements, Clean Development Mechanism and other carbon market mechanisms, facilitating farmers' access to such financial resources.

- New challenges will develop in relation to natural resources and their sustainable management.

At the **national level**, the main assumptions and risks are that:

- Countries are able to set achievable goals and formulate relevant policies, programmes and practices for the sustainable management of their natural resources, including, for example, for access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits derived from their use, and for adaptation to and mitigation of climate change.
- Countries are able to develop the capacities to manage the opportunities and challenges and mobilise necessary resources for capacity building related to sustainable natural resources management.
- Countries are aware of and able to use effectively FAO capacities in sustainable natural resources management.

At the **institutional level** (of FAO and its partners), the main assumptions and risks are that:

- FAO capacity can contribute effectively to the formulation of relevant instruments related to sustainable natural resources management at the international level and their implementation at the national level.
- Continuing existence of FAO “critical mass” related to sustainable natural resources management to provide technical support and capacity building.
- Adequate mechanisms exist to ensure effective inter-unit collaboration.

Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective F								
Org Result	A – Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B – Information, knowledge, statistics	C – International instruments	D – Policy advice	E – Tech support, capacity building	F – Advocacy, communication	G – Inter-disciplinary approach	H – Partnerships, alliances
F1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F5	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F6	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

### Organizational Result F1 - Countries have strengthened capacities to promote and develop sustainable land management

Indicators	Target (4 years)
<b>F1.1</b> Number of countries that have improved their land resources databases and geospatial infrastructure in order to assess, monitor and report on the state of the land resource	10 countries
<b>F1.2</b> Number of countries that use FAO guidelines and policy, legal and technical advice for land use planning and sustainable land management including in environments at greatest risk (particularly drylands/ mountains/ coastal zones)	10 countries
<b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b>	
1. Provide policy and legal advice, capacity building and technical guidance and/or develop guidelines on how to use land in sustainable ways, including the analysis of food chains and their relative impact on the land resources, and ecosystem approaches.	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Strengthening the capacity of countries to generate and use soil, land cover and land use data at the national level, including through the establishment of appropriate Spatial Data Infrastructures and Standards.</li> <li>3. Contribute to the preparation of a periodic, high-profile FAO publication on the State of Land and Water Resources (SOLAW).</li> <li>4. Assess and monitor land resources, land use, land suitability, land degradation, and soil/land management practice and coordinate, compile and disseminate global level assessments notably through Geonetwork.</li> <li>5. Contribute to the long-term perspectives, harmonised monitoring, assessment and reporting of trends at various levels: global, regional and national.</li> <li>6. Strengthen the contents, coverage, and quality of statistics on land resources, use, and management in FAOSTAT to enable it as an important information system in support of design, monitoring and implementation of effective and efficient global and national policies.</li> <li>7. Support international conventions where land use, land use change and land degradation are relevant and support countries in their reporting obligations under these international instruments and in implementing these conventions through appropriate national legislation.</li> <li>8. Assess interactions between land and climate change, including greenhouse gas emissions and sequestration, and payments for environmental services.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result F2 - Countries address water scarcity in agriculture and strengthen the capacities to improve water productivity of agricultural systems at national and river-basin levels including trans-boundary water systems</b>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>F2.1</b> Number of countries or river-basin organizations adopting recommendations on water-scarcity coping strategies as a result of FAO policy, legal and strategy support	8 countries or river basins or sub/supra-national organizations
<b>F2.2</b> Number of institutions which have adopted FAO water productivity enhancement tools and approaches.	20 institutions
<b>F2.3</b> Uptake of FAO Water information products and global datasets	50% increase above the baseline
<b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthening of FAO Water platform to promote joint technical work and disseminate results on the multi-functional use and cross-sectoral management of water within FAO (through collaboration between relevant units, including water, land, agriculture, livestock, economics, forestry, legal, policy and investment units).</li> <li>2. Provision of water policy services to address water management strategies in support to rural development and agricultural productivity enhancement, and the adoption of effective water allocation under conditions of scarcity. Deployment of water audit, irrigation and water investment framework methodologies to account for agriculture's water use and related investment in institutional and infrastructure assets.</li> <li>3. Provision of technical support to promote responsive agricultural water management. Strengthening of national capacity to address irrigation performance and modernization, water use efficiency and productivity enhancement, water quality management and technological development using FAO main products (including MASSCOTE, AQUACROP, etc.) and guidelines.</li> <li>4. Networking with key partners for the effective promotion of best practices in agricultural water management. Support to knowledge hubs and communities of practice for knowledge</li> </ol>	

<p>synthesis, dissemination, and capacity building at requisite scales.</p> <p>5. Provision of water information services to underpin field and normative water activities across FAO. Coordinate, compile and disseminate assessments of water resources and water use at global level (AQUASTAT, and linkage with FAOSTAT, GeoNetwork), and develop global analysis on status and trends of water resources (specifically, for FAO's AT2030/50 projections, the World Water Development Report and inter-agency coordination on water issues – UN-Water).</p>	
<p><b>Organizational Result F3 - Policies and programmes are strengthened at national, regional and international levels to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity for food and agriculture and the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources</b></p>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>F3.1</b> Outputs and milestones achieved, as agreed by the intergovernmental Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) in its Multi-Year Programme of Work on biodiversity for food and agriculture	6 major outputs/ milestones achieved
<b>F3.2</b> Countries having developed or strengthened their programmes and policies on biodiversity for food and agriculture, including on access and benefit-sharing, in response to or on the basis of policies or recommendations from the CGRFA	10 developing countries
<b>F3.3</b> Joint work plans or cooperation arrangements with international forums (IT/PGRFA, CBD, WIPO/UPOV, WTO, CGIAR, etc.) on biodiversity for food and agriculture	5 joint work plans or cooperation arrangements
<p><b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide an intergovernmental forum for policy making, including the negotiation of effective international instruments and the up-dating of existing instruments (e.g. Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources), on all components of biodiversity of relevance to food and agriculture, including through facilitating sessions of the CGRFA.</li> <li>2. Guide and oversee: 1) assessments of the state of the world's different components of genetic resources for food and agriculture, and 2) the implementation of policy instruments on biodiversity for food and agriculture.</li> <li>3. Facilitate the achievement of outputs and milestones established by the Commission's Multi-year Programme of Work.</li> <li>4. Establish partnerships and strengthen cooperation with relevant international organizations, <i>inter alia</i> through the coordination of FAO expertise/ cooperation with allies, to facilitate through policy and technical advice the implementation of instruments of relevance to biodiversity for food and agriculture.</li> <li>5. Monitor trends regarding the use and exchange of genetic resources for food and agriculture to assist in articulating policy and strategy options for access and benefit-sharing policies, at national, regional and international levels, aiming at improving food security.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result F4 - An international framework is developed and countries' capacities are reinforced for responsible governance of access to and secure tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources</b></p>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>F4.1</b> Increased international consensus on measures to	Adoption of voluntary guidelines

improve governance of access to and secure tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources	
<b>F4.2</b> Number of countries that have increased capacity to implement secure and equitable tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources.	Additional 15 countries
<b>Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support for the development of consensus on voluntary guidelines and policies on responsible governance of tenure, including through the development of partnerships and alliances, and undertaking advocacy and communication.</li> <li>2. Tools and methodologies for building capacity in the administration of natural resource tenure, including through the development of partnerships and alliances to stimulate the dissemination and application of information.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result F5 - Countries have strengthened capacities to address emerging environmental challenges, such as climate change and bioenergy</b>	
<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>F5.1</b> Number of countries with enhanced capacity to address challenges related to climate change mitigation and adaptation in agriculture	At least 15 countries have developed action plans and projects
<b>F 5.2</b> Interactions and linkages between food security, sustainable natural resources management, poverty reduction and adaptation to climate change recognised and addressed in international dialogue and Multilateral Agreements.	10 countries have developed projects and are actively involved in dialogue
<b>F5.3</b> Number of countries with enhanced capacity to address challenges and opportunities related to sustainable bioenergy development.	15 countries
<b>F5.4</b> Interactions and linkages between food security, sustainable natural resources management, poverty reduction, and sustainable bioenergy development recognised and addressed in international dialogue and Multilateral Environmental Agreements.	10 countries have developed projects and are involved in dialogue

**Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result**

1. Generation and management of knowledge, data, tools, technologies, approaches, communication for development and extension practices, related to sustainable bioenergy development and climate change mitigation and adaptation, including impact assessments, (climate related) disaster risk reduction, and financial implementation mechanisms, such as payments for environmental services.
2. Technical assistance, policy and legal guidance to strengthen countries' capacities related to environmental challenges including climate change impact assessment, mitigation and adaptation, (climate related) disaster risk reduction, sustainable bioenergy development and adapted production systems.
3. Training, appropriate information, Website developments and other types of communication and capacity building support related to the challenges of climate change and sustainable bioenergy development.
4. Participation in international dialogues on climate change mitigation and adaptation and sustainable bioenergy development and in Multilateral Environmental Agreements, including technical support to countries to facilitate and make more efficient their participation in these international dialogues.
5. Advocacy and provision of inputs to intergovernmental processes to ensure that the dimensions of food, crop, livestock, forestry and fisheries are reflected in the negotiations, financial mechanisms and the implementation of international instruments addressing global challenges.

**Organizational Result F6 - Improved access to and sharing of knowledge for natural resource management has been facilitated.**

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>F6.1</b> Number of countries with enhanced capacities of research and extension systems for sustainable natural resource management	10 countries have enhanced capacities
<b>F6.2</b> Number of programmes and strategies of communication for development for sustainable natural resource management	10 programmes and strategies developed and implemented

**Primary Tools for achievement of the Organizational Result**

1. Technical assistance and policy advice to Member Countries on strengthening national research and extension systems.
2. Development of a coalition with CGIAR, GFAR and other international agricultural research entities for sustainable agricultural development and knowledge availability and transfer.
3. Development of assessment tools and strategies for countries' research, extension systems and communication for development plans in sustainable agricultural development and natural resources management.
4. Facilitation of dialogue to establish functional linkages among stakeholders of agriculture innovation systems

**Annex 8: Strategic Objective G - Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods*****Issues and Challenges***

Agricultural producers, workers, traders, processors, input suppliers, exporters, importers and consumers are linked through local, national, regional and international markets. As a result of these multiple exchanges, incomes and employment can be generated. Livelihoods are therefore affected by the extent to which participants exploit market opportunities, and markets function efficiently in a changing environment. However, the effective participation of developing country producers in markets is limited and the efficient functioning of markets is constrained by *inter alia* inappropriate policies, low volumes, limited competitiveness, lack of information, inadequate infrastructure, weak institutions and market power asymmetries. At the same time, markets are evolving as a result of changes in technology and trade rules, structural developments, the proliferation of demanding standards and a variety of other emerging issues.

Stakeholders need to be aware of the nature and the implications of such changes for growth, rural poverty and food security. They also need to participate effectively in international fora negotiating international trade rules so that their interests are taken into account. While policies, regulations, stronger institutions, and agribusiness and agro-industry development can increase competitiveness in international and domestic markets, these changes may also pose difficulties, especially for smaller producers. To reduce poverty and meet development and food security needs, policy makers should facilitate the response of the private sector, including small producers, to the emerging demands for product quality and safety and adherence to increasingly high industry standards brought about by rapid urbanization and the expanding urban middle class. Employment creation in agriculture or through rural enterprise and agribusiness development needs to be accompanied by policies that ensure fair and safe conditions in rural areas.

***Assumptions and Risks***

- It is assumed that there is a significant need for assistance to countries, regional bodies and other stakeholders to assess the implications of key developments and to identify market, institutional, policy and legal responses and resource mobilization strategies. It is assumed that those involved directly in production, processing and marketing activities generally need to adopt a more commercial approach and improve their technical, managerial and marketing skills in order to benefit from remunerative markets. Given the globalization of value chains, it is assumed that stakeholders need to be cognizant of developments in international markets and policy and in international trade rules. Analysis and information concerning markets are needed to support the development of appropriate national and international policies. Countries must support policy design and implementation and FAO and its partner organizations should have the capacity to assist them.
- Some ministries of agriculture and other relevant organizations may be ill-equipped to analyze, formulate or implement appropriate policies, regulations and legislation and to develop other aspects of an enabling environment for rural producers, workers, and agribusinesses. Governments may not demonstrate the political will and financial commitment to improve the functioning of national and international markets and other institutions and infrastructural investments to encourage greater market orientation of small producers may not be in place. There are also exogenous risks. The market possibilities of smaller enterprises may be adversely affected by the power of larger enterprises, including multinational companies. Efforts to create an enabling environment may be compromised by political, economic (including food price volatility), and environmental crises that may transcend national boundaries. Countries may not have enough human or institutional capacity to implement policies and provide services required.

*Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective G*

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
G01		x		x	x		x	x
G02	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
G03		x		x	x		x	x
G04	x	x	x	x	x	x		x

**Organizational Result G1 - Appropriate analysis, policies and services enable producers to improve competitiveness, diversify into new enterprises, increase value addition and meet market requirements**

Indicator	Targets (4 year)
<b>G1.1</b> Policy makers and development partners are better informed about markets and opportunities and about effective policies and strategies to help producers respond and improve their access to output and input markets	Six countries have initiated policy developments or reforms related to market access and revised strategies -four regional or sub-regional organizations have increased awareness of appropriate policies and strategies
<b>G1.2</b> Countries have improved institutional capacity to formulate and implement relevant policies and programmes to strengthen producers' capacities to access markets, access financial services and access input and equipment supply	Countries and sub-regional organizations in six sub-regions have participated in capacity building workshops on contract farming, linking farmers to markets, financial services and related topics - countries and organizations in all sub-regions have utilized examples of programmes to strengthen farm-business linkages - Farm-business linkages have been developed by national stakeholders in four countries
<b>G1.3</b> Countries, working with the private sector, donors, NGOs and producer organizations, develop market-oriented institutions and services to support producers in exploiting market opportunities	Eight countries have updated plans indicating commitment to reorientation of extension to give a greater market focus -eight countries have launched in-service training programs to reorient extension officers -25 heads of extension have considered requirements for market-oriented extension refocusing
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A global analysis/framework on the future of smallholder farmers as agriculture and food systems transform.</li> <li>2. Appraisal of market trends at country level.</li> <li>3. Develop methodologies to assist countries to carry out competitiveness, value chain, impact studies and institutional analysis</li> <li>4. Identify best practices for developing equitable, efficient and sustainable linkages between the private sector and small producers</li> </ol>	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Support to countries on policies to reorient extension services</li> <li>6. Extension guides on farm management, marketing and post-harvest handling</li> <li>7. Promote policies and mechanisms for improving financial services provision for all value-chain actors</li> <li>8. Advisory support on the planning and design of market-oriented infrastructure</li> <li>9. Support to value chain actors and organizations that work with producers on rural finance, post-harvest operations, contract farming, linking producers to markets, market infrastructure and inclusive value chains</li> <li>10. Contribute to the development of appropriate risk management tools for producers</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result G2 - Rural employment creation and income diversification are integrated into agricultural and rural development policies, programmes and partnerships.</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>G2.1</b> Policy makers, partners, and FAO units use FAO analyses of patterns and trends of farm and non-farm employment and effective policies and programmes to promote sound approaches to rural employment and income diversification	60 Citations 8 countries/partners 8 FAO units/offices
<b>G2.2</b> Countries are developing food security, agriculture and rural development programmes and policies that explicitly promote sound approaches to rural employment and income diversification	8 countries ; 8 units/offices
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishment and maintenance of a database with primary data and information on sources of income and other socioeconomic characteristics of rural households</li> <li>2. Policy relevant analytical work on rural households' sources of income and patterns and trends in farm and off-farm employment, including gender differences</li> <li>3. FAO self-assessment, strategy, and work programme on decent rural employment developed to reflect all relevant FAO technical areas and accessible to member countries and partners through the FAO-ILO website and other channels.</li> <li>4. Policy advice to create both more and better rural employment in agricultural and non-agricultural rural sectors</li> <li>5. Capacity building and advocacy work to support policies that are more conducive to decent rural employment</li> <li>6. Capacity building in data collection and analysis of rural employment and income issues</li> <li>7. ILO standards and conventions (i.e. gender discrimination, child labour, youth employment, occupational health and safety, rural enterprise creation, rights of association, labour standards) and FAO negotiated and voluntary standards and codes of practice relevant to rural employment concerns (i.e. chemicals/pesticide use, distribution and disposal, equipment safety, Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), logging, and safety at sea (on board of vessels); maritime convention; code of conduct of responsible fisheries, etc.)</li> <li>8. FAO-ILO Memorandum of Understanding (2004) and ILO, IFAD, FAO, IFPRI, IFAP, IUF Declaration of intent on cooperation on child labour in agriculture (2007)</li> </ol>	

<b>Organizational Result G3 - National and regional policies, regulations and institutions enhance the competitiveness and developmental impacts of agribusiness and agro-industries</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>G3.1</b> Policy makers and development partners are better informed about agribusiness and agro-industry trends, opportunities and risks, and effective public sector actions to promote agribusiness and agro-industries development	Ten countries with strategies for improving agribusiness competitiveness in their ARD policy documents -at least ten member countries and private sectors within those countries have an enhanced understanding of issues relating to value chain financing for agribusiness development
<b>G3.2</b> Countries with agribusiness development strategies mainstreamed in agricultural and rural development (ARD) policies and plans, and with clarified institutional mandates and enhanced capacity for agro-industry sector oversight and coordination, and stronger public-private cooperation	Six countries have clarified institutional mandates for agri-business and agro-industries. - four countries receiving direct assistance from FAO to build public sector capacity for agri-business, mechanization, value chain and agro-industries development
<b>G3.3</b> Governmental and non-governmental organizations with improved capacity to provide services for strengthening farm-agribusiness linkages, agribusiness management, and agro-industry product, process and technological innovation, including through SME development	Ten countries have official documented mechanisms for including the private sector in policy development. -six countries have received direct FAO assistance on strengthening and diversifying support services to the SME sector. six countries have received direct FAO assistance on developing agro-industry product, process and technological innovation
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appraisal of trends and policy responses</li> <li>2. Support countries in developing sectoral strategies for agribusiness and agro-industries</li> <li>3. Identify sector specific indicators and benchmarks to guide policy development and institutional reform</li> <li>4. Promote actions to improve financial services to agribusiness</li> <li>5. Support governments in formulating strategies and policies for mechanization</li> <li>6. Provide guidance on public sector roles and responsibilities for contract intermediation, conflict resolution, and promotion of responsible business practices</li> <li>7. Build capacity of organizations that provide support to agricultural SMEs</li> <li>8. Support piloting and appraisal of SME value adding technologies and value chain innovations</li> <li>9. Contribute to the development of appropriate risk management tools for agro-enterprises</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result G4 - Countries have increased awareness of and capacity to analyze developments in international agricultural markets, trade policies and trade rules to identify trade opportunities and to formulate appropriate and effective trade policies and strategies</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>G4.1</b> Policy-makers and other stakeholders are better informed about trends in international agricultural commodity markets, trade policy and related trade negotiations issues	Increase/same
<b>G4.2</b> FAO analyses of international agricultural commodity markets, trade policies and	Higher ranking +10 percent

negotiating issues found relevant and of high technical quality	
<b>G4.3</b> Capacity to analyse policy options, formulate appropriate trade policies and participate effectively in trade negotiations enhanced	80 percent
<p><b><i>Primary Tools</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. monitoring, statistical information and analysis of situation and outlook for international markets for agricultural products</li> <li>2. analysis of standards in international agricultural trade</li> <li>3. analysis of trade policies and strategies</li> <li>4. monitoring and analysis of changes in trade rules under multilateral and regional trading arrangements</li> <li>5. advice, training support and assistance in market information and analysis</li> <li>6. advice, training support and assistance related to standards and certification</li> <li>7. advice, training support and assistance in policy formulation and legislative development</li> <li>8. advice, training support and assistance on international trade negotiations - workshops, roundtables and technical assistance.</li> </ol>	

**Annex 9: Strategic Objective H - Improved food security and better nutrition.*****Issues and Challenges***

As progress towards reaching internationally-agreed goals has been much too slow, this poses a huge challenge to the international community, and ways and means must be identified of addressing rising levels of food insecurity, hunger and malnutrition in many parts of the world.

FAO's most recent estimates put the (rising) number of hungry people at 963 million in 2008, an increase of more than 120 million since the 1990-92 base period. Moreover, about 150 million children under five worldwide are undernourished, and under-nutrition is a key contributor in more than 3 million preventable child deaths every year.

As events in 2008 have demonstrated, national, regional and also global capacities in support of appropriate and effective food security governance are quite weak. Economic, political, institutional, legal and social frameworks for better food security governance and in support of the realisation of the right to food must be strengthened.

The magnitude of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition has been assessed in many countries; however, there remains insufficient understanding of the prevalence of food insecurity and malnutrition among most vulnerable groups at sub-national levels. Timely and forward looking assessments and analysis are needed for the design and implementation of adequate rights-based responses to address food security and nutrition challenges, as well as prioritised investment programmes.

Up-to-date information, analyses, policies and programmes are needed, not only for determining the underlying causes of food insecurity and malnutrition, but also for identifying and implementing effective solutions. Bringing together FAO knowledge, targeted initiatives and programmes supported by coherent and effective action at country (at both at sub-national and national), regional and global levels is a prerequisite to achieve this Strategic Objective.

***Assumptions and Risks***

- National governments and the international community have the policy, institutional and technical mechanisms necessary to implement cross-sectoral food security and nutrition programmes and actions
- Adequate human resources and budgets are made available by member countries and development partners to overcome the constraints to achieving sustainable food and nutrition security
- Given the multi-disciplinary nature of food security and nutrition issues, there is willingness among concerned national line ministries and institutions, and among international agencies and other development partners to work cross-sectorally at all levels
- National information systems have minimum capacity needed to assess and monitor developments in food security and nutrition, while also providing the necessary data for the compilation of Supply Utilization Accounts and Food Balance Sheets used for the estimation of undernourishment
- Member countries and development partners provide adequate attention and resources in support of dietary diversification and nutrition improvement in the food and agriculture sectors
- Households and household members have entitlement and access to sufficient economic resources
- Risk: Political instability, lack of financial commitment and insufficient policy dialogue hinder the implementation of needed reforms
- Risk: Insufficient capacity of key stakeholders to effectively participate and contribute to decision-making processes

*Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective H*

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
H01	x			x	x	x	x	x
H02	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
H03				x	x	x	x	x
H04	x	x			x	x	x	x
H05	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

**Organizational Result H1 - Countries and other stakeholders have strengthened capacity to formulate and implement coherent policies and programmes that address the root causes of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition**

Indicator	Target (4 years)
<b>H1.1</b> Countries and other stakeholders formulate sectoral and cross-sectoral policies and strategies that better incorporate food security and nutrition dimensions	(i) 10 countries; 2 regions (ii) ex-ante assessment 6 countries
<b>H1.2</b> Countries implement cross-sectoral policies, strategies and programmes that address food security and nutrition concerns and objectives, in particular for most vulnerable groups	(i) 33 NPFS and 8 RPFS (ii) 10 countries
<b>H1.3</b> Stakeholders establish cross-sectoral results-based policy monitoring systems	Methodology implemented in at least 5 pilot countries

*Primary Tools*

- Advocacy and cross-sectoral collaboration: Development and dissemination of lessons learnt on policy processes and management, raising awareness of, and developing evidence-based advocacy strategies, while working through partnerships and alliances across agencies (e.g. SCN/REACH, IAAH/NAAH, UNDP/Spain MDG Fund) and at national and regional levels to advocate for investment in prioritised cross-sectoral food security and nutrition programmes, including through improved information and communication
- Monitoring and analysis: Develop and deliver methods and tools for strengthening global, regional and national food security information and early warning systems including support to national FIVIMS, poverty and vulnerability assessments in support of better-targeted and prioritised policies and programmes. In addition, provide methods and tools for ex ante socio-economic policy impact assessments, policy monitoring and intelligence systems, and technical assistance for results-based policy monitoring system
- Provision of FAO policy and programme advice: Conduct global, regional and country analysis of impacts of macroeconomic, agricultural and socio-economic policies on food and nutrition, and the impacts of food security and nutrition policies on development objectives of the country; preparation of policy profiles and frameworks on food security and nutrition-related emerging issues, and technical advice on ways to integrate food security and nutrition goals and objectives in national development and sector policies, strategies and programmes
- Capacity development and institution building: Provision of technical and institutional support for the development of analytical and methodological tools for ex-ante policy impact analysis

and policy monitoring, priority setting for programme development and implementation, food security and nutrition linkages, negotiations skills, participatory and sustainable food security and nutrition strategy and policy formulation; furthermore, strengthen capacities of national and local institutions to formulate, implement, monitor and evaluate food security and nutrition strategies and programmes, reduce post-harvest production losses and enhance efficiencies in the food system/value chain	
<b>Organizational Result H2 - Member countries and other stakeholders strengthen food security governance through the triple-track approach and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>H2.1</b> Countries adopt a triple-track strategy and apply good governance principles in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of policies, programmes and other public actions	5 countries
<b>H2.2</b> Countries implement enabling institutional, legal and/or social environments for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food	10 countries
<b>H2.3</b> Countries target specific food insecure and vulnerable groups and apply human rights principles when implementing policies and programmes	10 countries
<b>H2.4</b> Countries undertake advocacy, communication and education strategies in support of good food security governance and the right to food	10 countries
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual guidance on the development and implementation of a triple-track approach</li> <li>• Capacity development and advocacy on the application of triple-track approach and the principles of good governance (including transparency, accountability, participation, non-discrimination, empowerment, and respect for the rule of law)</li> <li>• Application and adaptation of FAO's Right to Food Methodological Toolbox (comprising guides and methodological tools on how to legislate, monitor, assess, budget for the right to food, including the right to food curriculum development) to guide and promote policies, strategies, programmes and public actions</li> <li>• Assessment and analysis of population groups most vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition (FAO-FIVIMS)</li> <li>• Knowledge generation and exchange with national and international partners on the application of the right to food and human rights-based approaches, including the collection, analysis and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned</li> <li>• Provision of a multi-stakeholder platform for dialogue and exchange of lessons learned on the implementation of good governance and the right to food (e.g. CFS, GPFS, RTF Forum)</li> <li>• Technical and policy advice on legal, institutional and social reforms</li> <li>• Integration of the right to adequate food and human rights principles and approaches in FAO's normative and operational work</li> </ul>	
<b>Organizational Result H3 - Strengthened capacity of Member countries and other stakeholders to address specific nutrition concerns in food and agriculture</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>

<b>H3.1</b> Countries and other stakeholders incorporate nutrition objectives into agricultural and other sector policies, strategies and programmes	10 countries
<b>H3.2</b> Countries have strengthened capacity to assess and analyse the impact of changing food systems on nutrition	10 countries
<b>H3.3</b> Countries have strengthened institutional capacity to address nutrition problems through relevant training, education and regulations	10 countries
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of household food security and nutrition expertise, methods, guidelines and analytical tools for nutrition and dietary assessment to support food and nutrition policy, strategy and programme development, to select appropriate food-based interventions and to assess impact</li> <li>• Household and individual level dietary diversity and food access measures (food security and nutrition assessment and monitoring)</li> <li>• Assessment and analysis of population groups most vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition (FAO-FIVIMS)</li> <li>• Advice on incorporating nutrition objectives into food and agricultural policies and programmes to address food-related nutrition problems</li> <li>• Build capacity in the development of science-based national dietary guidance and regulations and develop educational and communication resources on improving nutrition and the diversity of diets for dissemination and adaptation at local, national and regional levels</li> <li>• Upgrade countries' institutional abilities to develop and implement nutrition curricula and professional training programmes at all levels to assist countries raise the level of capacity and understanding of the importance of nutrition concerns in the broader policy/programme environment</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Organizational Result H4 - Strengthened capacity of Member countries and other stakeholders to generate, manage, analyse and access data and statistics for improved food security and better nutrition</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>H4.1</b> Countries use FAO guidelines, methodologies and standards for collecting, analyzing and disseminating data and statistics on food and agriculture	50 countries
<b>H4.2</b> Countries strengthen their capacity in data management, analysis and dissemination to support decision-making at national and sub-national levels	30 countries
<b>H4.3</b> Countries and other clients access FAO databases and statistical publications on food, agriculture and nutrition at global, regional and country levels	1.5 million hits for FAOSTAT
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building on food balance sheets, agricultural census and household budget surveys</li> <li>• Developing global datasets on food security situation and trends</li> <li>• Promoting greater sharing and consolidation of food security and nutrition data and statistics</li> <li>• Promoting the adoption or development of data and information management systems, such as CountrySTAT</li> <li>• Adapting and developing new and appropriate statistical methods</li> <li>• Providing technical support to improve countries' capacity to analyse data and statistics in</li> </ul>	

<p>order to better assist decision-makers to formulate sound food security and nutrition policies and programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing strategies in support of sustainable national statistical services</li> <li>• Promoting the production of supply/utilization accounts and food balance sheets (SUAs/FBSs), including statistics on macro-nutrient and micro-nutrient availability</li> <li>• Promoting the generation and dissemination of food security statistics from household surveys</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Organizational Result H5 - Member countries and other stakeholders have better access to FAO analysis and information products and services on food security, agriculture and nutrition and strengthened own capacity to exchange knowledge</b></p>	
<p><b>H5.1</b> Member countries and other stakeholders access FAO knowledge and information resources, products and expertise to address food security and nutrition concerns</p>	<p>30 countries, regional institutions</p>
<p><b>H5.2</b> Member countries and other stakeholders use FAO research and analysis on food security, agriculture and nutrition</p>	
<p><b>H5.3</b> Member countries and other stakeholders use FAO standards, tools, and systems for information management and knowledge sharing</p>	
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish country, regional and global FAO research and analytical materials on food security, poverty, agriculture and nutrition (i.e. Working papers, journal articles, policy briefs, etc)</li> <li>• Publish FAO targeted information/knowledge products including flagship publications (SOFA, SOFI, SOCO, SOFIA), periodic reports and key documents on emerging issues relevant to food security, agriculture and nutrition (Food Outlook, CPFS, CFSAM Reports, Agricultural Outlook)</li> <li>• Conduct socio-economic analysis on global perspective issues related to major long-term global food, nutrition, agriculture and natural resources issues with the objective to inform policy decisions and development plans based on analytic information and informed judgement</li> <li>• Conduct household analysis relevant to address rural poverty, food insecurity, income and employment issues</li> <li>• Develop and deliver methods, tools and guidelines to standardize and harmonize food security and nutrition information (FIVIMS, EC/FAO Food Security Programme)</li> <li>• Develop global analysis and monitoring services and advocacy for improved decision-making in food security and nutrition (CFS, FAOSTAT, GIEWS, FIVIMS, Nutrition Country Profiles)</li> <li>• Global, regional and national fora on food security and nutrition supported by FAO (CFS, technical meetings, high level meetings)</li> <li>• Development of face-to-face and virtual knowledge exchange events and platforms and knowledge sharing services on current and emerging issues at global, regional and national and local levels (e.g. CFS, CCP, Regional/national fora)</li> <li>• Development and dissemination of FAO standards, methods, tools, and systems related to information management and knowledge sharing (including for digital information)</li> <li>• Undertake assessments and appraisals of capacity gaps in information and knowledge to strengthen food security and nutrition</li> <li>• Support to national/local capacity development in management and exchange of information and knowledge</li> <li>• Development of platforms for documenting experiences, sharing good practices and lessons learned</li> </ul>	

## **Annex 10: Strategic Objective I - Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies.**

### ***Issues and Challenges***

Every three out of four people in developing countries live in rural areas and are mostly dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods. Emergencies tend to have the most severe consequences on the food security and livelihoods of poor vulnerable and agriculturally-dependent populations - in short, disasters can move people off the development track. These emergencies include: sudden natural disasters, slow or chronic disasters such as those related to drought, and complex crises such as civil conflict, market shocks, and the consequences of climate variability. Climate change is not only increasing the frequency and severity of natural disasters, but may also affect transboundary pests and diseases. Pro-active strategies are thus essential if vulnerable countries are to avoid large-scale loss of life and destruction of environment, infrastructure and economic activity, as well as degradation of livelihoods and nutrition. Emergency preparedness and response must address the specific needs of agriculture-based populations, particularly smallholders, pastoralists, fishers, forest users, landless farm workers and their dependents, with particular emphasis given to food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable groups. Effective support should involve all elements of disaster risk management (DRM), including early warning, contingency planning, disaster risk reduction (preparedness), needs assessment, timely response and support to national DRM planning. Collaboration with primary partners, such as UN System ones (UNISDR, GFDRR), regional organizations and national counterparts, as well as other sectors, such as health, education, social affairs, need to ensure integrated support at global, regional and national levels.

The financial and institutional environments in which FAO needs to operate (particularly concerning emergencies) are evolving: (1) the level of funding related to emergencies has increased and is becoming more diversified; humanitarian action is increasingly financed by pooled funds at the global and country levels; (2) the high number of UN agencies and NGOs involved in food, nutrition and agricultural emergency and rehabilitation work, creates opportunities for collaboration and cooperation, but also coordination challenges, particularly those associated with transition from immediate response and rehabilitation to development; (3) the ongoing UN reform process offers opportunities for FAO with regard to coordination and leadership on food security and nutrition issues at the global, regional and national levels; (4) capacity building of national disaster management institutions enables the governments of countries experiencing emergency situations to play new and stronger roles in risk reduction and the coordination of external assistance.

### ***Assumptions and Risks***

- Governments assign sufficient priority to capacity building in risk analysis, early warning, contingency planning, preparedness, coordination of response in emergencies and supporting transitions from relief to development programming. Countries support national preparedness and early warning systems, and promote capacity development in community, national, regional and international systems to identify new threats and risks, and related impact and mitigation measures. Cost effective and sustainable preparedness methodologies are available for implementation in developing countries. FAO will manage food chain emergencies applying the Crisis Management Framework for Preventing and Responding to Transboundary Animal Diseases and Plant Pests and Food Safety Emergencies [CMC for the Food Chain]. FAO will augment its rapid response capacity through the progressive corporate implementation of the Incident Command System (ICS) within the Crisis Management Framework for large emergencies. Core capacity of FAO technical divisions generally remain consistent with the need to support work in emergencies, rehabilitation and transitions, and to assume leadership when appropriate.

- Major potential risks include: the number and severity of crises may become far greater than the capacity of the Organization to respond effectively; FAO may not be able to ensure the integrated and coordinated approach necessary to provide appropriate and timely support across all elements of disaster risk management associated with food and agriculture; and the global financial crisis precludes adequate levels of funding for humanitarian relief, recovery and transitions programming over the next four years.

### *Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective I*

Org Result	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
I01		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I02		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
I03		x	x	x	x	x	x	x

### **Organizational Result II - Countries vulnerability to crisis, threats and emergencies is reduced through better preparedness and integration of risk prevention and mitigation into policies, programmes and interventions**

Indicator	Target (4 years)
<b>I.1.1</b> National early warning systems for agriculture and food security established/ strengthened	With FAO support, X countries have shifted from category 2 to category 1, or from category 3 to 2
<b>I.1.2</b> Contingency plans for agriculture and food security prepared and tested	With FAO support, X countries have shifted from category 2 to category 1, or from category 3 to category 2
<b>I.1.3</b> Strengthened institutional capacities for disaster risk reduction	DRR training strategies in agriculture field tested and implemented in at least 10 high risk disaster hotspot countries
<b>I.1.4</b> Risk reduction strategies for Agriculture, included in national disaster risk management plans.	Sector specific DRR action plans for agriculture included in 15 national DRM plans
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early warning systems and preparedness: - Development and application of services and products for EW food security situation analysis (GIEWS information and tools, GIEWS Workstation, IPC, climate forecasts) -Products and services supporting assessment and EW systems and food security situation analysis (Livelihood Analysis, Vulnerability Analysis, CFSAM methodology IPC) - Streamlined/ strengthened/ funded local, national, regional and global early warning systems through appropriate partnerships - Developed and implemented FAO Training Package in Disaster Preparedness, internally and with partners - Hazard, Livelihood and Vulnerability Baseline methodology - Guidelines to build/ strengthen capacity to produce, monitor, analyze and manage early warning data in high risk developing countries with significant vulnerable rural populations - Guidelines/ support to contingency planning - FAO response teams established and trained for rapid deployment with core functions</li> </ol>	

delivered for different types of emergencies - Agriculture cluster operational including contingency plan and networks in country (including DRM) - Technical support to emergency preparedness and response provided - Development of disaster preparedness plans and practices (to be an inter-agency - UN, NGOs, Governments and donors) exercise with a holistic approach inclusive of local communities - Disaster preparedness further mainstreamed in emergency and rehabilitation activities - Contingency plan available and owned by the Government - FAO leadership established for coordination of agriculture-based livelihood and food security

2. Policy and technical support for integrating risk reduction practices and principles into sectoral policies and programmes, including: -FAO and partners (within contingency planning and within cluster groups of UNCT) facilitate Governments to develop DRM strategy and plan (rolling document and linked to the NMTPF) and based on most likely scenarios -DRM mainstreamed in national policies and institutions, with multi-partner collaboration on transition -Integrated policy and technical support for integrated risks reduction practices and principles -Cost benefit analysis tool developed to support mitigation choices/ activities - Countries allocate resources to prevention and mitigation and train surge teams or quick intervention leaders -Countries allocate resources and implement policies on DRR (evidence-based analysis to contribute to national programming processes and capacity building) -Best practices on knowledge sharing and lessons learnt for preparedness, prevention and mitigation communicated through a systematic approach and integrated into projects/ programmes
3. (CONTD) Policy and technical support for integrating risk reduction practices and principles into sectoral policies and programmes, including: -Promoting sustainable natural resource management practices (for example: land, water, watershed, forestry, or coastal areas) - Farming options development and adoption for Agriculture (forestry, fishery and livestock) in the context of extreme events -Support Household adaptive capacities through the support to food systems resilience -Disease and pest monitoring and control in a crisis context, including climate change -Land use planning and tenure in the context of extreme events or encroachment into new habitats -Infrastructure and agricultural services (for example, seeds systems, seed storage, vaccine banks and cold chain) development in the context of recurrent crises -Infrastructure and appropriately designed food safety risk management programmes - Access to integrated databases for food chain risks -Technical advice and/or assistance provided on food security, nutrition and livelihoods in at risk areas and emergency contexts - TECA database on good practices for DRM, particularly good practice options for climate risk management documented in international DRR and CCA databases - Developing guidance on the principles of good practice options associated with DRR/DRM and documenting lessons learned from application and replication of context-location specific good practice options at the local level - Developing guidance on how to integrate conflict analysis with DRR (focus on complex emergencies and associated rehabilitation)- Farming good practices adopted - Guidance on how to integrate conflict analysis with DRR
4. Institutional and technical Capacity building for comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction(Preparedness prevention and mitigation ), including: - Assessing and enhancing institutional and technical delivery capacities for DRR within sectoral line departments and extension services; - capacity building and training (Policy and technical support) for integrating DRR practices and principles, into sectoral development plans or country programming exercises (United Nations Development Assistance Framework [UNDAF], National Medium-Term Priority Framework [NMTPF]); -EMPRES-led capacity building programme at national and regional levels on risk assessment, management and communication, including the establishment of regional [laboratory] networks [Regional Animal Health Centres] to share information and deliver training - Provision of targeted FAO expertise and knowledge products in disaster risk profiling, monitoring and analysis and disaster preparedness and mitigation policies and planning - Capacity building programmes (such as EMPRES, GIEWS) at national and regional levels focused on risk assessment, preparedness and contingency planning - Internal built capacity on DRR mitigation, at headquarter and at field level - Trained and experienced core staff group in FAO supporting national efforts in capacity building

<p>5. Advocacy, coordination and provision of inputs to national, interagency and intergovernmental processes, including: -Participating in inter-agency and intergovernmental processes, and conventions and conferences; -Contributing to integration of DRR and CCA concepts within UNFCCC process; - DRR/DRM advocacy tools focused on Agriculture are used to enhance focus on global DRM agenda (ISDR and UNFCCC) and attract funding for preparedness, prevention and mitigation. - Improved communication strategy and dissemination of information CMC Food Chain contributions to improved risk analysis and coordination of food chain risk management in intergovernmental processes</p>	
<p><b>Organizational Result I2 - Countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture related interventions.</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>I.2.1</b> Proportion of countries where post disaster needs assessments lead to coordinated national response plans and activities	Increase by 25% of countries that are supported through joint post disaster needs assessments leading to coordinated national response plans and activities
<b>I.2.2</b> Countries are able to coordinate timely and technically sound response with national, local and international partners.	50% of countries responding to a new crisis are applying the Cluster approach and implementing a technically sound agriculture and food security cluster plan.
<b>I.2.3</b> Countries are able to implement emergency programmes using socio-economic and gender analysis tools (developed by FAO or with FAO assistance).	Increase by 10% the number of countries utilizing the socio-economic and gender analysis tools and approaches developed by FAO or with FAO assistance.
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved partnerships, coordination and leadership, including: * Global and country level support for effective cluster leadership * Relevant, reliable information on food security related to crisis disseminated to the right people at the right time * Cluster communication and information toolkit developed * Active partnership in IASC, UNCT and international and national fora</li> <li>Advocacy and resource mobilization, including * Advocacy strategies and tools developed and in place * Emergencies communication strategy implemented * Resource mobilization strategy developed for and with headquarter, liaison and field offices * Flexible and fast funding mechanisms established</li> <li>Standardize protocols and procedures for organized response, assessments, and strategic planning, including * Coherent Emergencies Handbook developed for FAO * Active use of internal and external partnerships in well designed, relevant, timely and multi-disciplinary assessments * Training programme for partners developed and implemented * Region-specific, relevant strategic emergency frameworks in place * Crisis Management Centre approach for food chain emergencies * Emergency response system development for FAO rapid response to sudden-onset and large emergencies * Emergency Response Roster and surge capacity development * Plan of Action Guidelines * Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT) * Resilience Tool * IPC</li> <li>Standards, "Do no harm" and "building back better" principles and Good practices for response, including * Implement various toolkits and guidelines developed for emergencies dependent on the type of emergency (e.g seed specifications, fertilizer, use of pesticides,</li> </ol>	

<p>processing and storage technologies to facilitate interim food preservation, livestock emergency guidelines, fisheries and aquaculture emergencies guidelines, food safety emergency guidelines, needs assessment guidelines, watershed management approaches, slope stabilization techniques, rehabilitation of livelihood principles, etc)</p> <p>5. Appropriate and timely recovery interventions, including * Response plan developed based on appropriate partnerships and promoting high quality standards * Implementation : targeted households have improved conditions compared to pre-emergency * Project/ programme monitoring aligned with RBM SO I monitoring * Enhanced capacity of partner institutions, organizations and households for direct emergency response * Support to development of national policies relating to emergencies</p>	
<p><b>Organizational Result I3 - Countries and partners have improved transition and linkages between emergency, rehabilitation and development.</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>I.3.1</b> Level of funding provided to agricultural transition.	TBC pending baseline review
<b>I.3.2</b> Number of government agricultural recovery strategies and/or programmes that integrate short, medium and long-term needs.	15 transition strategies for agricultural livelihood recovery prepared approved by Governments in countries with emergencies
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of governments, local institutions, communities and other stakeholders enhanced to address immediate and long term needs, including: * Increased national institutional capacity through appropriate capacity building * Resilience tool * Sector analysis in support of Agriculture systems * Short-term contingency plans are integrated into longer term planning</li> <li>Formulated response, rehabilitation and transition strategy plans that are harmonized and aligned with government policies and programs, including: * NGOs/CSOs/ community groups / women's groups involved at all stages of programme design * Increasing national ownership and development of a livelihood recovery strategy * Harmonised national development plans through one-UN type approaches which should start with one FAO programme * Multidisciplinary team (FAO, donors, local institutions) set up and deployed to assess "transitional needs", based on which country response programme should be amended * NMTPF formulation and implementation, ensuring linkage between emergency design to UNDAF, PRSP, etc. * Joint training with planning workshops * Involving local institutions * Fisheries co-management with government and communities * National Forest Programs</li> <li>Knowledge management for informed decision making by partners, including: * Good practices and lessons learned are documented and disseminated to appropriate audiences * HPAI intervention facilitating policies and programmes to other diseases * Feeding back lessons learnt into policies and training * Partners have access to relevant information and references guidelines</li> <li>Mainstreaming of good development practices into emergency transition programs, including: * Response planning incorporates transition plans starting from initial stages of emergency * Strategic documents for emergency and transition include 'exit strategies' and are harmonized and aligned with national plans * Establish procedures to adopt programme approach - should include: elements of medium- to long-term development goals; availability of appropriate expertise; ToRs; leadership and delegation of authority; human resources * Strategies to increase resilience, enhance productivity, sustain livelihoods * Type of programmes: Seed policy formulation, Mangrove rehabilitation, Fishery rehabilitation programmes, Farmers field</li> </ol>	

schools, Integrated food safety programmes, Production planning and coordination of farmer market linkages, Enterprise management, Watershed management programmes

5. Effective advocacy and donor coordination in favour of transition, including: \* Resource allocation mechanisms for transition established \* Advocacy tools for donors to secure longer-term funding \* Donors sensitized to the importance of funding for transition \* Resources allocated identified for transition during emergency phase (including SFERA-like funding and long-term cluster coordination) \* Adequate resources are mobilized for post-emergency activities \* Advocacy and communication for funding transition (and building in-country support and ownership) \* IPC analysis \* CWGER: policy dialogues to create space for transition funding

## **Annex 11: Strategic Objective K - Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas.**

### *Issues and Challenges*

Gender inequalities and other forms of social inequities will remain a significant challenge in the quest for equitable social and economic development. This will certainly exacerbate the challenges of food, nutrition and income insecurity threatening the achievement of the World Food Summit and Millennium Development Goals. The truism is that in many rural societies largely dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods, pervasive patterns of gender and social inequities and low levels of women's empowerment have hitherto impeded progress in defeating hunger. Although men and women may play different and complementary roles in agriculture, gender bias in a range of institutions, including government, social norms, families and markets, limits women's ability to access resources, goods and services and to make informed decisions about their productive use. Evidence indicates that economic strategies intended to promote agriculture and rural development are not always beneficial to rural populations and sometimes amplify existing socio-economic disparities and marginalization, notably among specific food insecure rural populations (poor households including most female headed ones, indigenous peoples, communities affected by HIV and AIDS, the landless, precarious rural workers, etc.). Like society itself, the causes and drivers of inequality evolve over time.

Although many countries have shown some progress in embracing a more gender and socially inclusive approach in agricultural policy formulation and implementation, critical gaps remain. First, low political will and cultural bias have resulted in the uneven adoption and implementation of internationally agreed policies and conventions on gender and social equality and women's empowerment. Second, the data needed to understand gender differentiated access to productive resources and its impacts on rural poverty reduction and economic growth are scarce. Third, "gender blindness" in policies and programmes has decreased slightly, but the capacity of policymakers and technical staff in many developing countries remains weak, slowing progress and hindering the integration of gender issues in development programmes. Fourth, even where progress has been made, monitoring and evaluation of results and impact is often weak. To address these critical gaps, it is indispensable for FAO to support countries in strengthening capacity for the formulation and implementation of well targeted and gender-sensitive policies and programmes for agriculture and rural development.

Internal to FAO, progress has been made over the years including formulation, adoption and implementation of successive Gender Plans of Action (GAD PoA). Presently, three critical issues are that: a) the existing Gender and Development Plan of Action (GAD PoA) is fully integrated into the overall Strategic Framework, b) the capacity of staff and the Gender Focal Point (GFP) network is sustained to integrate evolving gender issues into the various technical areas of the Organization, and c) capacity to monitor and evaluate progress on gender mainstreaming is further enhanced.

FAO has a clear comparative advantage in working for the achievement of gender and social equality in agriculture, particularly in rural areas. Within the UN, FAO plays a lead role on rural gender issues critical for food and agriculture. The accumulated experience, skills, tools, methodologies and partnerships confer a unique opportunity for the Organization to carry on this work in the next decades.

### *Assumptions and Risks*

- National priorities include strategies to deal with emergencies and consider the needs of women and poor/vulnerable groups
- Political, economic and cultural biases do not diminish stakeholder appreciation, understanding, and implementation of the social and economic changes needed to address gender inequalities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate financial and human resources are made available for FAO staff, member countries and key development partners to address gender issues.</li> <li>• Member countries, UN agencies, other development partners, FAO governing bodies and senior management become and/or remain committed to achieving gender and social equality.</li> <li>• Data are available to adequately evaluate gender issues, identify the needs of women and poor/ vulnerable groups, and support the development of appropriate gender plans and policies.</li> <li>• The One UN pilot programme succeeds and UN joint programming becomes the modus operandi for UN support at country level.</li> </ul>	
<b>Organizational Result K1 - Rural gender equality is incorporated into UN policies and joint programmes for food security, agriculture and rural development</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 year)</b>
<b>K.1.1</b> Countries are implementing UN joint programmes which contain a significant rural gender equality component as a result of tools and methodologies developed by FAO or with FAO's assistance.	7
<b>K.1.2</b> (New) UN system-wide policy instruments comprise rural gender issues as a result of FAO inputs.	2
<b>K.1.3</b> Partners are introducing rural gender equity issues with FAO support particularly in countries under the One UN pilot programme.	4
<b>Organizational Result K2 - Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources.</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 year)</b>
<b>K.2.1</b> National institutions are formulating projects and programmes based on socio-economic and gender analysis (SEAGA) and use other relevant approaches and tools developed by FAO or with FAO's assistance.	30
<b>K.2.2</b> National institutions are collecting, analyzing, using and disseminating sex-disaggregated data as a result of FAO supported training programme.	20
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess current and emerging capacity building needs in order to identify areas requiring FAO intervention in gender mainstreaming in agriculture, food security, and rural development.</li> <li>2. Support efforts of governments and other stakeholders to design and provide training that develops skills for gender and socio-economic analysis, participatory policy making and programme development.</li> <li>3. Provide technical support for the collection, analysis and dissemination of sex-disaggregated data and statistics in policy-making.</li> <li>4. Develop, revise and/or adapt materials and resources including tailor-made training modules to address rural gender issues in specific technical areas (e.g. nutrition, forestry, fisheries, livestock, etc).</li> <li>5. Provide training focused on the "how to" of gender mainstreaming both within FAO and among member countries based on the SEAGA approach and tools.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result K3 - Governments are formulating gender-sensitive, inclusive and participatory policies in agriculture and rural development</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>

<b>K.3.1</b> Countries and partners are using FAO's analyses, information and data related to gender and social equity for policy and programme formulation, revision, and review.	15
<b>K.3.2</b> Agricultural and rural development policies, laws, and regulations include measures and/or introduce favourable changes to address rural gender issues in access to land, natural resources and other productive assets and services based on FAO technical advice or analysis.	5 additional
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthen national government efforts to use gender sensitive information and to formulate, implement, and revise policies and programmes that are gender sensitive, socially inclusive and legally empowering of the rural poor.</li> <li>2. Assist national governments, civil society organizations and research institutions to enhance gender and socio-economic analysis of emerging issues which have the potential to undermine gender and social equity in food security and rural development.</li> <li>3. Collect, analyse and disseminate information and statistics on the social and gender equality dimensions of emerging social, economic and environmental issues (e.g. climate change, environmental degradation, bioenergy, population dynamics, emerging diseases (i.e. AIDS), undernutrition, property rights regimes, and employment opportunities) to support policy-making and implementation processes.</li> <li>4. Disseminate participatory tools and approaches relevant to agriculture and rural development to member countries and partners through the FAO Participation website and other information channels.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result K4 - FAO management and staff have demonstrated commitment and capacity to address gender dimensions in their work</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Targets (4 years)</b>
<b>K.4.1</b> Organizational results deliver gender-sensitive outputs as a result of gender mainstreaming effort.	20% increase
<b>K.4.2</b> FAO units at headquarters and decentralized offices are able to integrate gender issues and monitor programme implementation against gender-sensitive targets and indicators.	50% increase
<p><b>Primary Tools</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrade the gender analysis skills of FAO staff at headquarters and decentralized levels using SEAGA-based gender mainstreaming modules or through catalytic technical support.</li> <li>2. Develop a new monitoring and reporting mechanism which allows divisions and Gender Focal Points to report periodically on gender mainstreaming activities.</li> <li>3. Facilitate the appointment of senior staff as Gender Focal Points (GFPs) of FAO technical units as an essential mechanism in the Organization's effort to mainstream gender in its technical programme.</li> <li>4. Advocate for the allocation of regular programme and extrabudgetary resources to ensure commitment and delivery on agreed gender targets.</li> </ol>	

## **Annex 12: Strategic Objective L - Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development.**

### ***Issues and Challenges***

Volatile food and energy prices, the current financial crisis, climate change and biodiversity loss are among the major threats to global food security, pose a broad range of humanitarian, human rights, socioeconomic, environmental, developmental, political and security-related challenges and seriously undermine the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Over the past two decades, public funding of agriculture has declined sharply, in both relative and absolute terms and at both international and national levels. The share of agriculture in Official Development Assistance (ODA) declined from 18% in 1979 to 3.5% in 2004, rising to 4.4% in 2007. Improved agricultural productivity will require firm reversal of this reduction in development assistance to agriculture, along with the commitment of increasing amounts of domestic resources to the sector. In 2008, the UN High-level Task Force on Food Security estimated that the share of ODA for food and agricultural development needs to increase to ten percent within five years to boost agricultural production and productivity, especially of the world's 450 million smallholder farms.

In order to achieve the highest possible impact of public and private investments in food, agricultural and rural development, a number of conditions must be met: among others, appropriate policies, strategies and institutions creating an enabling environment supportive of private investment; state-of-the art formulation of public/private investment programmes and projects; and timely and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation of results and impact. Analysis is needed to increase the viability of investments and to identify barriers to investment options.

With rising untied donor assistance, public financial management needs to be strengthened, in the context of medium-term expenditure frameworks, public expenditure reviews and others. With increased amounts invested *via* sector-wide approaches, direct budgetary support and basket funding, aid effectiveness needs to be improved in accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008). Improvements in the design of concrete investment operations are needed, and a shift from international to national expertise in this design process accomplished. Limited public funding must be applied in core areas to maximize leverage and impact on poverty reduction and food security and attract private sector funding. Finally, impact monitoring must be enhanced in many countries, as well as the capacity of staff in ministries and agencies.

### ***Assumptions and Risks***

Risks within the broader external environment:

- The recent strong momentum for investment at national and international levels is not sustained over time so that pledges (both from national budgets and ODA) are not converted into actual investment in support of food security and poverty reduction;
- Volatility in producer price levels for food staples in developing countries inhibits small producers and agribusiness investors from increasing local food production and processing capacity.
- Market distortions resulting from agricultural subsidies and non-tariff trade barriers in OECD countries are not reduced over time
- Developing countries do not adopt more effective policies and institutions to help farmers and agri-businesses take advantage of export opportunities
- The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action (2008) are not put into effective practice, resulting in incoherence between various sources of funding/support to the benefit of the recipient countries

## Risks at the national level:

- Governments do not have the competency to drive a predictable economic reform agenda that applies public funding to leverage private investment, while reducing private investment risk and transaction costs
- Governments do not have the sufficient capacity and incentives to effectively manage investment projects

## Risks at the institutional level:

- There is insufficient flexibility in use of resources to meet the specialized investment needs and requests of countries for support to sectoral and policy analysis, investment strategy development and capacity building efforts
- Skills are not available, or cannot be brought into the Organization to support investment related priorities of countries

*Application of Core Functions to Strategic Objective L*

Core Function	A - Perspectives, trend monitoring, assessment	B - Information, knowledge, statistics	C - International instruments	D - Policy advice	E - Tech support, capacity building	F - Advocacy, communication	G - Interdisciplinary approach	H - Partnerships, alliances
L01		x	x	x		x	x	x
L02					x		x	x
L03		x		x		x	x	x

**Organizational Result L1 - Greater inclusion of food and sustainable agriculture and rural development investment strategies and policies into national and regional development plans and frameworks.**

Indicator	Target (4 years)
<b>L.1.1</b> Public investment in rural roads, irrigation, research and agricultural support services	<b>TBD</b>
<b>L.1.2</b> Percentage of ODA allocated to FSARD	6%
<b>L.1.3</b> Agribusiness and agro-industries investment climate	TBD

*Primary Tools*

1. The provision of targeted FAO expertise and knowledge products in government investment framework formulation.
2. FAO FSARD appraisals, policy advice and technical support in advancement of FAO Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results.
3. Develop tools tracking private investment in agriculture and business environment to attract additional private investment.

<b>Organizational Result L2 - Improved public and private sector organisations' capacity to plan, implement and enhance the sustainability of food and agriculture and rural development investment operations.</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>L.2.1</b> National experts contribution to investment planning and implementation	TBD
<b>L.2.2</b> Competent practitioners in FSARD investment planning and implementation	TBD
<b>L.2.3</b> Country satisfaction with FAO-provided capacity building in support for investment	TBD
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The provision of FAO-led capacity building and mentoring of national counterparts in investment cycle management</li> <li>2. Advocacy and communication, to mobilize political will and promote global recognition of required actions in areas of FAO's mandate</li> <li>3. Development and application of related information and knowledge products including lessons learned from IFI and regional/ thematic evaluation studies in support to investment</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result L3 - Quality assured public/private sector investment programmes, in line with national priorities and requirements, developed and financed</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>L.3.1</b> Investment funding of FSARD operations	TBD
<b>L.3.2</b> Private sector financial flows to agriculture	TBD
<b>L.3.3</b> FSARD investment quality rating	TBD
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The integrated provision of FAO interdisciplinary technical and investment cycle management expertise to member countries</li> <li>2. The application of innovative approaches to the Organization's technical work and support services</li> <li>3. Effective partnerships with IFIs and Donors to jointly achieve Member Country development goals</li> <li>4. FAO guidelines and technical support on developing Public Private Partnerships for investment in food and agriculture</li> </ol>	

**Annex 13: Functional Objective X - Effective collaboration with member states and stakeholders****Issues and Challenges**

Governing and statutory bodies need to be serviced effectively, and their decisions implemented in a responsive and transparent way. The advocacy role of FAO, as enshrined in its Basic Texts, is dependent on a robust internal communication culture and effective external communication policy and strategy. FAO also needs to operate in a complex environment, delivering a wide variety of activities, including dissemination of technical knowledge and field and emergency projects. Interdisciplinary work is carried out across a network of geographical locations (headquarters, regional, subregional, country and liaison offices) requiring due attention to coherent action, while allowing for sufficient autonomy and responsiveness at all levels.

Other key means of action need to benefit from a context of overall coherence and continuous improvement. The Organization engages in partnerships with many other entities, particularly other UN system organizations. This provides both opportunities and challenges to work together to deliver services to member countries more effectively under the umbrella of UN cooperation, and to share services with the aim of reducing administrative costs.

FAO's programmes and operations require oversight to help the Organization achieve its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and internal governance processes. Fraud, corruption and unsatisfactory conduct pose a grave threat to the effective implementation of the Organization's policies and objectives. An environment of integrity throughout the Organization's operations is promoted through the detection, investigation and prevention of fraud and unsatisfactory conduct, development of lessons learned and procedural and policy changes needed to enhance integrity within FAO.

**Assumptions and Risks**

- Continued commitment of the stakeholders to the mission of the Organization, matched by a climate of transparency and trust between member nations and the secretariat;
- the same level of trust and transparency to govern relationships with partners and funding sources for field programmes;
- while FAO is accustomed to the lack of predictability for extra-budgetary contributions, it remains an obvious constraint.

**Organizational Result 1: Client priority needs at global, regional and national level are reflected and increasingly funded in FAO programmes**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>X.1.1</b> Proportion of policy assistance requests met	To be defined
<b>X.1.2</b> Proportion of countries with results-based MTPFs adopted	tbd (At country level all UNDAF roll out countries and large programme countries that are also eligible for TCP grant technical assistance should be covered by a results-based NMTPF.)
<b>X.1.3</b> Number of Regions where priority action plans are formulated as requested	All five regions produce a regional priority action plan for discussion at the 2010 Regional Conference followed by progressive roll out to the subregions, as requested.

<b>X.1.4</b> Proportion of EB unearmarked funds mobilized	
<b>X.1.5</b> Overall funding trend in comparison with trend of other UN specialized agencies	Max 5 % deviation from trend of best performing Specialized Agencies in EB Resource Mobilization
<b>X.1.6</b> Percentage of decentralized offices covered by benchmarking and performance measurement system  Percentage of countries covered – by type of FAO country presence	75% of DOs covered within next four years
<b>X.1.7</b> Proportion of units complying with established corporate standards for performance monitoring and operational planning	corporate standards and new monitoring and operational planning model defined, implemented and operational
<b>X.1.8</b> Share of donor funded projects/programmes (and TCP) meeting FAO corporate quality standards during implementation and at exit.  Percentage of accepted evaluations recommendations accepted within timeline	tbd: performance indicators to be developed during second half of 2009  To be defined (on basis of 2008-09 performance)
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demand-driven policy assistance at national, subregional, regional and global levels;</li> <li>2. Results-based national medium term priority frameworks to focus FAO's efforts on national needs, informing and aligned with Organizational Results and Strategic Objectives;</li> <li>3. Structured and consultative identification, including through Regional Conferences, of areas of priority action at sub-regional and regional levels;</li> <li>4. Resource mobilization strategy through a double track approach at global and decentralized levels in support of medium term priority frameworks</li> <li>5. Allocation of resources from all sources according to corporate strategies and priorities</li> <li>6. Framework for efficient and effective working arrangements of FAO's network of field and headquarters units</li> <li>7. Implementation of result based operational planning, monitoring and reporting and creation of corresponding capacity</li> <li>8. Corporate quality assurance framework including strengthening of monitoring and evaluation and lesson learning</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result X2 Clients' capacities made sustainable and adapted to deal effectively with global challenges through FAO services</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>X.2.1</b> % of resources deployed across organizational boundaries	

<b>X.2.2</b> Share of projects/programmes for which technical oversight has been delegated to Decentralised Offices for all funding sources	
<b>X.2.3</b> Share of technical support and quality assurance outsourced to partners certified to adhere to FAO corporate technical standards	
<b>X.2.4</b> Percent of outputs within the Strategic Objectives having an information/knowledge exchange, statistics, technical publishing or information systems component in which the related products and services provide greater benefit to FAO clients as a result of the implementation of the related core function or other strategies.	
<b>X.2.5</b> Percent of Departments and Regional Offices providing input to the Corporate Communication Plan	
<b>X.2.6</b> Percent of capacity building (CB) outputs in Strategic Objectives implemented in accordance with FAO's CB strategy	
<b>X.2.7</b> Percent of outputs within the Strategic Objectives designed and implemented in accordance with the corporate strategy to improve coherence in delivery of policy assistance.	
<b>X.2.8</b> Percent of outputs within the Strategic Objectives implemented in accordance with the corporate programme to improve coherence in delivery of legal and legislative assistance	
<b>X.2.9</b> Percent of outputs in the Strategic Objectives which intend the use of tools to collect, maintain and disseminate information on the creation, governance and use of international instruments	
<p><b><i>Primary Tools</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instruments for ensuring interdisciplinary approaches</li> <li>2. Strategy to ensure optimal deployment of technical expertise, including internal delegation, outsourcing, etc.</li> <li>3. Formulation and implementation of strategies to ensure coherent approaches in the areas of information and knowledge management and statistics, technical publishing and information systems</li> <li>4. Strategies and tools to ensure coherent approaches in the areas of communication and advocacy</li> <li>5. Corporate strategy to enhance FAO support to Capacity Building at global, regional and national levels, addressing policy, institutional and individual dimensions</li> <li>6. Strategy to improve coherence and coordination in delivery of policy assistance</li> <li>7. Programmes to enhance coordination and consistency in delivery of legal and legislative advice</li> <li>8. Tools to collect, maintain and disseminate information on the creation, governance and use of international instruments</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Organizational Result X3 - Clients benefit from partnerships, which leverage and complement FAO and partners' services</b></p>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>X.3.1</b> Number of primary tools in Strategic Objectives that use partnerships.	
<b>X.3.2</b> Proportion of FAO programmes and projects (unit outputs)	

implemented in partnerships at regional, sub-regional and country level.	
<b>X.3.3</b> Strengthened partnership with the UN system including increased collaboration with the Rome-based agencies, WFP and IFAD.	
<b>X.3.4</b> Number of non-state stakeholders participating in FAO events and activities at all levels	
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Organization-wide partnership strategy, and specific partnership strategies, developed and implemented at corporate and regional, sub-regional and country level.</li> <li>2. Engagement in increased UN system coherence at all levels, including FAO's role in UNDAF formulation within the UNCTs and in Joint Programming and Joint Programmes.</li> <li>3. Partners, including civil society and the private sector, engaged through new consultative mechanisms.</li> <li>4. Guidelines for formal and informal partnerships, incorporating lessons learned.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result X4 - - Effective direction of the organization through enhanced governance and oversight</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>X.4.1</b> % of the Organization's budget (Regular Programme and Extrabudgetary) accruing to the Evaluation Function	
<b>X.4.2</b> % of management responses to evaluation reports and follow up reports to the Governing Bodies that are assessed as satisfactory by the Programme Committee	
<b>X.4.3</b> % of AUD recommendations that are accepted and implemented by management	
<b>X.4.4</b> % of all complaints/allegations of fraud and misconduct that are processed and/or investigated within set timeframes	
<b>X.4.5</b> % of actions taken on Conference and Council decisions by deadlines.	
<b>X.4.6</b> % of documents produced according to Statutory Requirements	
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Charter for the Evaluation Function in FAO</li> <li>2. A Charter for the Office of the Inspector General</li> <li>3. Develop and implement a comprehensive risk based audit plan</li> <li>4. Identify, process and/or investigate in a timely manner all complaints of fraud and misconduct in the programmes and operations of the Organization</li> <li>5. A comprehensive plan for the satisfactory servicing and transparent conduct of meetings of Governing and Statutory Bodies</li> <li>6. The timely implementation of amendments to the Basic Texts relating to the role of the Governing Bodies</li> </ol>	

**Annex 14: Functional Objective Y - Efficient and effective administration*****Issues and Challenges***

The IEE described FAO as a heavy and costly bureaucracy characterized by excessive transaction-control processes, high levels of overlap and duplication, and low levels of delegated authority. It noted that FAO's administrative structure excessively focuses on ex-ante controls and does not emphasize delegation, which leads to a negative impact on efficiency and staff motivation. FAO will meet its challenges by becoming more flexible and overcoming risk aversion, which will require changing the way it works. Therefore, major changes are needed in the way FAO works. Management and administrative services need to meet high standards of efficiency and quality, while discharging fiduciary responsibilities. Clear lines of authority, responsibility and accountability are required, especially in a context where resources -- and decisions on their use -- are increasingly decentralized to locations where projects and programmes are implemented. As a knowledge organization, FAO must attract and retain high-quality and well-motivated staff, providing a learning environment in which people can grow and improve their professional and managerial skills.

***Assumptions and Risks***

- Projects related to the reform of administrative and management systems in the Immediate Plan of Action are resourced and executed.
- Lack of required resources would impede implementation.
- FAO's ability to implement the changes required to respond to the IEE and achieve Functional Objective Y would require culture change in the organization and in the way FAO works. Expectations for immediate change may overwhelm the Organization's capacity to adjust.
- In a resource-constrained environment, the various reform processes will require prioritisation and inter-dependencies and potential conflicts will need to be managed carefully.
- "Silo" mentality, entrenched attitudes, inertia, and fragmented processes may inhibit ability to change.
- The corporate restructuring will involve the integration of services that were formerly separate. This will imply transitional costs that need to be minimised.
- Lack of transition funding to meet costs for improvements to administrative services would constitute a major risk.

**Organizational Result Y1 - FAO's support services are recognized as client-oriented, effective, efficient and well-managed**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>Y.1.1</b> Percentage of corporate services covered by a Service-Level Agreement (SLA).	40%
<b>Y.1.2</b> Share of services benchmarked.	40%
<b>Y.1.3</b> Percentage of processes and procedures streamlined.	40%
<b>Y.1.4</b> Introduction of formal internal control reporting.	Introduction of formal internal control reporting.
<b>Y.1.5</b> Improvement in client satisfaction.	75% satisfied

***Primary Tools***

1. Efficient and effective monitoring of all service-related contracts with external suppliers.
2. Efficient and effective monitoring of all internal services.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Training of staff to implement Service-Level Agreements (SLAs), client surveys, and to gather data for benchmarking.</li> <li>4. Effective communication with clients.</li> <li>5. Availability of expertise to assist in gathering data for benchmarking database.</li> <li>6. Mechanisms to manage user feedback and implement lessons learned.</li> <li>7. Introduction of best practices and recognised standards for continuous process improvement.</li> <li>8. Yearly client surveys</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result Y2 - FAO is recognized as provider of comprehensive, accurate, and relevant management information</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 year)</b>
<b>Y.2.1</b> FAO receives unqualified annual external audit opinion.	Annual unqualified external audit opinion
<b>Y.2.2</b> Increasing percentage of stakeholder organizational units utilize information retrieved from the administrative corporate management information system on a regular basis.	80 percent of administrative management information that is requested by stakeholders is made available through the corporate management information system.
<b>Y.2.3</b> Improved ability to produce final reports on corporate information through use of standard reporting tools.	Dependent on establishment of baseline.
<b>Primary Tools</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ongoing preparation and communication of relevant and timely financial-performance information to managers, members, and donors.</li> <li>2. Corporate management information system.</li> <li>3. Procedures to manage the administrative information that reflect user feedback.</li> <li>4. Establishment of relevant institutional financial polices and procedures in accordance with IPSAS requirements.</li> <li>5. Accurate, complete and timely recording of accounting and financial information in FAO accounts.</li> </ol>	
<b>Organizational Result Y3 - FAO is recognized as an employer that implements best practices in performance- and people-management, is committed to the development of its staff, and capitalizes on the diversity of its workforce</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (4 years)</b>
<b>Y.3.1</b> Increased percentage of managers who completed FAO core managerial training (% of all P5-above).	50%
<b>Y.3.2</b> Competency improvement ratios (based on PEMS rating).	90% of staff participate in PEMS; 50% increase in competency ratings
<b>Y.3.3</b> Percentage increase in mobility in workforce.	11%
<b>Y.3.4</b> Improved gender representation at all	GS: 50%; P: 40%; D: 30%

levels.	
<b>Y.3.5</b> Percentage increase in the number of countries that are equitably represented.	42%
<b><i>Primary Tools</i></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Core Management Training Programme for all FAO managers to undertake within a 24 months period from appointment, which includes development, management, leadership, and coaching programmes.</li><li>2. Staff performance evaluation system linked to work plans, competencies, and a rewards and recognition system.</li><li>3. Communication strategy for staff and managers.</li><li>4. A function and system to monitor, administer, and report on staff mobility to all Departments/Offices.</li><li>5. HR policies that contribute to implementing best practices in people-management.</li></ol>	