

Criteria for the regional allocation of TCP resources based on the principles proposed by the CoC-IEE Working Groups I and III

1. At their joint meeting of 13 June 2008, the CoC-IEE Working Groups I and III requested Management to provide further contribution for the regional allocation of TCP resources in applying a set of agreed principles (see Chairs' Aide-Mémoire).
2. As comparison and reference to the IEE observation that “...*the spread of allocations between regions has, broadly speaking, reflected relative needs, in terms of generally accepted criteria to measure and compare food security, poverty and dependence on agriculture*” (C 2007/7 A.1, par. 340), table 1 provides the average regional distribution of TCP funds over the last three biennia.

Table 1: Average regional distribution of TCP funds over the last three biennia

Regional Office	RAF	RAP	REU	RLC	RNE
Average share of TCP appropriation	38%	23%	8%	21%	10%

3. The present note provides a possible option for the regional indicative allocation using the criteria below, in line with the indications provided by the Working Groups. The weight that could be assigned to each criterion, expressed in terms of percentage of the TCP appropriation, is also suggested.
 - a) **The number of countries eligible for TCP assistance on a grant basis (weight 40%).**
The principle of universality requires that all 156 member countries eligible on a grant basis should have access to a share of the resources that would allow for meaningful technical assistance. A lower weight would reduce the resource availability per country under this criterion below the level of the TCP Facility (USD 200 000 per country and biennium) which was established by the Council in November 2005.
 - b) **The number of countries falling under the “special attention” category as defined by the Governing Bodies – LIFDC, LDC, LLDC and SIDS (weight 40%).**
The importance of the TCP giving particular attention to countries facing special needs due to their level of income, geographical isolation and resulting status of development, was confirmed by the Council in November 2005. It is therefore given the same weight as criterion one.
 - c) **The number of undernourished in each region (weight 10%)**
 - d) **The number of people dependent on agriculture (weight 10%)**
4. Giving a higher weight to criteria 3 and 4 would lead to a regional allocation that would significantly differ from the average effective allocation in the last three biennia (table 1) and in particular favour one region due to the high number of undernourished and people dependent on agriculture. Table 2 shows the numbers for each criterion and region.

Table 2: Allocation criteria and numbers for each region

Criteria	RAF	RAP	REU	RLC	RNE	Total
Number of countries eligible for TCP assistance on a grant basis (universality)	46	34	27	34	15	156
Number of countries falling under the “special attention” category	43	31	13	21	7	115
Undernourished in the region (in mill. people)	207	532	27	51	18	835
Population dependent on agriculture (in mill. people)	424	1 878	79	107	82	2 569

5. In applying the above model to the 2008/09 TCP appropriation of USD 104 million as an example, the distribution of resources would be as shown in Table 3 below. In line with the Working Groups and Governing Bodies’ proposal to earmark 15 percent for emergency assistance and the need to also reserve a minimum amount for inter-regional projects, USD 18 million are set aside for such projects. The remaining USD 86 million are distributed between criteria according to their respective weight (shaded cells to the right). This amount is then distributed between regions in proportion to the numbers in table 2.

Table 3: Example of distribution of TCP resources – in million USD

Criteria	weight	RAF	RAP	REU	RLC	RNE	Totals
Countries eligible for TCP assistance on a grant basis (universality)	40%	10.1	7.5	6.0	7.5	3.3	34.4
Countries falling under the “special attention” category	40%	12.9	9.3	3.9	6.3	2.1	34.4
Undernourished in the region	10%	2.1	5.5	0.3	0.5	0.2	8.6
Population dependent on agriculture	10%	1.4	6.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	8.6
<i>Subtotal</i>		26.6	28.5	10.4	14.7	5.9	86.0
Emergencies/Interregional (based on average over last three biennia)		7.1	5	0.9	3.3	1.7	18
<i>Totals</i>		33.7	33.5	11.3	18.0	7.6	104.0
<i>Totals (in percent)</i>		32%	32%	11%	17%	7%	100%

6. The above represents an open proposal to be utilized as a basis for discussions particularly concerning the weight to be assigned to each of the four above mentioned criteria and the actual number of criteria to be maintained.

7. As regards the management of regional allocations, a share of the indicative regional allocations will be set aside for the approval of regional and subregional projects to which all eligible countries in the region will have equal access. The balance of the regional allocation would be allocated indicatively to countries in the region in accordance with the same criteria listed above. However, allocations would only be indicative and would not constitute and entitlement. It will be the responsibility of the SRCs and RRs and, as a last resort, of headquarters to re-programme any allocation which is not fully committed to other countries, subregions or regions according to needs.