

MANAGEMENT VIEWS

IEE Recommendation	Management Views
<p>5.4 (see also 8.19) Partnerships with the Rome-Based Agencies - Further develop collaboration with the three Rome-based agencies</p> <p>a) The three Rome-based agencies should continue working together on merging common services in Rome, including, as soon as possible, IT and communications applications that could be operated under common ownership, such as library management system platform and, eventually, enterprise resource planning.</p> <p>b) Undertake – with encouragement from the Governing Bodies– more ambitious efforts in strategic and programmatic partnerships, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) joint representation in field offices with IFAD (and in Latin America with IICA); ii) ensuring synergies with WFP at the technical level which would include early warning, food and nutrition assessments, and policy issues in safety nets and food aid; and iii) ensuring synergies with IFAD in a broad range of technical interfaces from rural finance to agribusiness and gender, and including project development, supervision and national policy dialogue (PRSP). <p>c) Build a joint communications and advocacy strategy with WFP and IFAD (details in recommendation 5.10).</p>	<p>Fully agree with regard to joint offices (5.4.b.i). [Other parts of this IEE recommendation – i.e. 5.4 (a), b (ii and iii) and (c) – would be addressed by other units of the Secretariat.]</p> <p>Work is ongoing to prepare a Framework Agreement with IFAD for hosting their staff in FAO Country Offices. Discussions have also been initiated with WFP. The possibility of joint offices with IICA can also be explored in due course.</p>
<p>6.13 Unify all major aspects of FAO field operations, and strengthen reporting and support relationships between headquarters and the field by creating a Regional and Country Operations and Coordination of Decentralized Offices Department</p> <p>* Regional ADGs would report directly to the DDG in charge of the Regional and Country Operations and Coordination of Field Offices Department, with both FAORs and the heads of the subregional technical teams reporting directly and exclusively to the Regional ADG.</p>	<p>Partially agree.</p> <p>The current operating model, adopted under the FAO Reform that was also reviewed by the Programme Committee in September 2006 and the Council in November 2006, was derived largely from the recommendations of the 2004 Independent Evaluation of FAO’s Decentralization. Specifically the 2004 report stated that: “<i>Regional Representatives should become the line of reporting for FAORs and regional technical officers on programme matters at country level and for the regional work</i>”, but at the same time “<i>FAORs should continue to report to the Director-General with respect to major policy and political matters and on the overall direction for FAO in the countries under their responsibility</i>”(para 287). The 2004 report further stated that: “<i>It is therefore proposed that, without in any way diluting the direct reporting lines between the regional representatives and the Director-General, the Director-General nominate the Deputy Director-General to handle on his behalf more detailed regional and country questions. The policy of overall management of appointment and posting of FAORs should continue to be managed through a unit in the office of the Director-General.</i>” (paras 35 and 293). It may be noted that these recommendations</p>

<p>* The Department would be comprised of three divisions: a) The Field Operations Division as the coordination and responsibility centre link between headquarters and the field; b) The Investment Centre whose activities are almost exclusively at field-level in support of project development; and c) The Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division.</p>	<p>were made in the 2004 report in the section on <i>Strengthening and Deepening Organizational Unity and Coherence</i>.</p> <p>Under the operating model adopted for the FAO Reform, FAO Representatives (FAORs) report inter alia to Regional Representatives (RRs) on country strategies and programme priorities, and to ADG/TC on implementation of field programmes and projects. Sub-regional Coordinators (SRCs) report to the RRs, and RRs report inter alia to ADG/TC and ADGs of technical departments on field programmes/projects and technical matters respectively. However, in order to preserve cohesiveness and unity of purpose of the Organization, the FAO Representatives and the Regional Representatives work in the line of command of the Director-General (through a unit in his office) who retains ultimate responsibility for the performance of both headquarters' managers and Heads of Decentralized Offices. Thus, FAO can ensure accountability, the consistent application of corporate policies, standards and good practices, equitable performance appraisal and appropriate balance between decentralized and headquarters interests.</p> <p>The headquarters structure will need to be discussed in detail in due course.</p>
<p>6.19 Restore balance between HQ and the field, including a radical change in the institutional structure, business model and decision-making processes of FAO, in order to re-position the institution and provide it with efficient and effective link to countries and regions.</p> <p>Structures should reflect differing levels of development as well as a number of features that characterize the food and agriculture landscape in each region. Our proposed structure for FAO introduces variations among regions, sub regions and the country level. Some elements may be applicable to all regions, and others will have to respond to these differing situations. Address a comprehensive set of issues (organizational structure, decision-making mechanisms, lines of communication, functions and procedures, critical mass and means-to-ends requirements) before pursuing future reforms in the direction of decentralization of functions and authority and of strengthening and rendering more effective FAO's field presence, in order to be relevant, credible and have a major development impact.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>The structure of the decentralized offices (DOs) should reflect the food and agriculture landscape of the different regions. Work on this is ongoing within the Secretariat. In this regard, it is expected that the Root and Branch Review will also be looking at issues related to administrative, financial and HR decision-making.</p>

<p>6.20 Establish new and clear roles for Regional Offices (ROs) maintaining their number and location. Streamline their functions and focus them more on analysis and policy advice, with greater autonomy and decision making powers.</p> <p>1. Change the reporting lines: Establish reporting lines between all professional staff in ROs and the Regional Representative (RR), rather than to their headquarters divisions. Assign ROs first-line responsibility and accountability for the development of strategies and programmes across their regions. Subregional Office coordinators (SRCs) and FAORs should report to the RR functionally and administratively, and the SRCs should have no administrative responsibilities for Country Offices. While reporting to the RR, all professional field staff would maintain regular knowledge exchange and communication with technical colleagues at headquarters and in other decentralized offices to ensure that the highest standards of technical quality are maintained and stimulated and to build corporate coherence. Technical colleagues, whether in headquarters or other decentralized offices, would exercise a quality assurance function <i>vis-à-vis</i> each other's work and rotation policies would build competencies and corporate interchange.</p>	<p>Partially agree.</p> <p>The reporting lines for Regional Outposted Technical Officers (ROTOs) would move from headquarters divisions to the Regional Representatives while continuing to ensure effective knowledge exchange and functional guidance between headquarters divisions and decentralized technical officers through corporate technical networking arrangements. Headquarters' technical divisions will have to retain an important role in the selection, briefing/training, technical guidance and mobility of all technical officers working in their discipline.</p> <p>The current responsibilities of ROs in regional strategies, programmes and perspectives, under the FAO Reform, would be further strengthened</p> <p>Subregional Offices are an integral part of the Regional Office and Sub-regional Coordinators report to the ADG/RRs, and have no administrative responsibilities <i>vis-à-vis</i> FAORs.</p> <p>In the case of FAORs, they receive guidance on subregional priorities, programming and coordination issues from the SRCs and on regional priorities from the RRs. They guide other FAO units at headquarters and in the field on country priorities, strategies and perspectives. They (as well as SRCs and RRs) receive guidance and oversight from the TC Department in their role of budget holder for field programme, and they report to the ADG/TC for the implementation of field projects entrusted to them. However, their close and direct link with the Director-General, through a unit located in his office, on major policy and political issues, as well as overall directives, should be continued if FAO is to coherently apply the corporate policies, standards and good practices adopted by its Governing bodies and Senior Management.</p>
<p>2. Devote much of the effort of the ROs to analysis and policy work in close collaboration with the relevant technical divisions. Provide the RO the necessary amount of financial and human resources for them to keep abreast of developments, trends, problems and opportunities affecting food and agriculture in their region. Strengthen and professionalize their activities related to policy dialogue, analysis and advice, evolving as the most authoritative source of knowledge and information in FAO regarding their respective regions. In cooperation with other relevant regional organizations and non-regional organizations, such as IFAD, entrust the ROs with the preparation of a biennial report on "The State of Agriculture, Food and Rural Life" in their respective regions. This report, which would build on, complement and strengthen the existing FAO flagship "State of" publications, would identify the major strategic issues, problems and opportunities, recognize regional priorities for common action and suggest possible national policies. It should aim to furnish genuine strategic direction by providing guidance to the organization as regards the major</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>ROs should prepare action plans for analysis and policy work in close collaboration with relevant technical divisions, together with proposals for covering any incremental costs. It is foreseen that the ADG/RR should prepare Regional Priority Frameworks building on results of Regional Conferences, NMTPFs and assistance needs of regional organizations.</p>

<p>food and agriculture issues and concerns in the region, and identifying regional programmes and priorities. Those that fall within the five or six priority themes subsequently agreed by the conference would form the basis for finalizing a regional strategy in each region. This work should cascade into country priority frameworks, including a basis for TCPs and a realistic alignment of objectives to what FAO can be expected to deliver.</p>	
<p>3. Assign the ROs responsibility for convening, conducting, codifying results, preparing the final reports for, and following up on, the Regional Conferences which would become part of the governance system of FAO on a trial basis (see Chapter 4). The ROs would prepare the agenda in consultation with governments and stakeholders in the region.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>A greater role for ROs in the management of the Regional Conference, in particular preparation of the agenda, is agreed (para 131 of the Management Response in Principle). [However, the role of the Regional Conference in the governance system, as well as the role of the Independent Chair of the Council in preparing the Executive Summaries of the Regional Conferences, including recommendations, priorities and costs, is part of wider discussion on governance. Ref. IEE recommendation 4.13 (c).]</p>
<p>4. The ROs should monitor regional perspectives and needs and ensure that these serve as guides to normative work conducted at headquarters.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>Effective means of communications and guidance would need to be designed.</p>
<p>5. The ROs should participate, with appropriate information and authority, in the preparation of the biennial budget and in the design and approval of regional and subregional projects.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>Effective procedures to achieve this would need to be designed.</p>
<p>6. The ROs should develop a strategy for capturing external funding that is consistent with the priorities, themes and the issues of the region. TCP funds should be allocated at regional level in line with PWB decisions and the RO should allocate them and monitor their use within the national medium-term priority frameworks. In doing so, it should concentrate the scarce resources available for regional projects in a few areas of strategic regional significance.</p>	<p>Management responses on fund mobilization and TCP allocation are to be finalized with the TC Department.</p>
<p>7. Consistent with the new reporting relationship, the RRs should provide direction and guidance to the work of the Subregional and Country Offices and be assigned authorities in the evaluation, appointment and removal, and monitoring of performance of SRCs and FAORs.</p>	<p>Partially agree.</p> <p>ADG/RRs are already entrusted with the supervision of Subregional Coordinators, who in turn provide guidance to FAORs. The latter also receive functional guidance from the Resident Coordinator as member of the UN Country Team.</p> <p><i>The recommendation with regard to appointment of the FAORs is in contrast with the recommendation of the 2004 Independent Evaluation of FAO's Decentralization which stated that: "the policy and overall management of appointment and posting of FAORs should continue to be managed through a unit in the office of the Director-General," (paragraphs 35 and 290). In line with that suggestion, and as agreed by the FAO Governing Bodies, the authority for appointment and removal of SRCs/FAORs, as well as evaluation of FAORs, should remain with the Director-General while, at the same time, the RR would be consulted on these issues.</i></p>

<p>6.21 The Subregional offices (SROs) would become the technical support arm of FAO in the respective regions.</p> <p>1. Refrain from opening new SROs unless sufficient staff and funds to ensure their success and efficiency can be provided.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>The decision to open new SROs is preceded by discussions on contributions from the host country and on costs. The outcome of these discussions is submitted to the Council for a final decision.</p>
<p>2. Link SROs' location to the sites of regional and subregional economic integration or agricultural organizations or to UN centres, as appropriate. Determine the work of SROs strictly by the needs of the countries (and UN Country Teams) they serve. Do not expect staff to undertake extensive normative or administrative work and appoint them with the seniority required to play a policy role and staffing should be adjusted flexibly in both disciplines and duty station in line with needs. Staff/consultants on call-down contracts can play a particularly important role in the SROs by providing a broader base of expertise. Sufficient non-staff resources will be critical to the workings of the SROs. An effective staff ratio should also be achieved before increasing staff numbers to ensure staff and consultants can fulfil their responsibilities</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>The work programmes of SROs are prepared following strategy/planning workshops. Subregional Priority Frameworks, that focus efforts on the assistance needs of Subregional Organizations and the countries / UNCTs / FAORs in the subregion, are being developed. The SROs are being provided increased non-staff resources to allow them to respond flexibly to emerging needs.</p> <p>With regard to location of any new SROs, this will take account of location of other institutions and organizations, the views of countries in the subregion, as well as cost implications – for example, offers from the host country to provide premises, staff and cash contributions.</p>
<p>3. Analyse the establishment of new SROs in the light of:</p> <p>a) the cost implications of sustaining Regional, Subregional, and Country Offices; and</p> <p>b) the implications of the dispersion of technical staff and budgets among such large numbers of units, for the capacity of the Organization to carry out its more normative work. FAO now risks losing some of its main technical core competencies and comparative advantage. If this risk is not addressed through convincing strategies to restore the FAO technical base in critical areas, comparative advantage will be lost and, once lost, will not be regained.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>a) Cost implications, including recurring costs and contributions are carefully assessed when establishing offices. However, despite major cost cutting efforts in the past years, the DOs network remains structurally underfunded. b) Staffing and skill mix of the SROs is the subject of discussion with technical divisions. There is an effort to balance the need to create strong and dedicated technical capacities that are quickly available to the countries and the need to have a critical mass of specialists at headquarters.</p>
<p>6.22 Establish quite new foundations for the presence, structure, functions and staffing of FAO Country Offices, including benchmarks such as cost-efficiency norms, for opening and closing such offices.</p> <p>Review existing COs against the criteria below, bearing in mind various alternative arrangements, such as the extension of dual coverage by FAORs and having FAO Country Coordinators stationed outside the country in a neighbouring Regional or Subregional Office.</p> <p>a) UN “Delivering as One” at Country Level: as it may present FAO with opportunities for “win-win” consolidations and administrative cost savings. An FAOR could be replaced by a technical specialist in a UN office under the umbrella of the UN Country Coordinator. FAO’s presence and effectiveness could increase and revised arrangements could yield cost efficiencies, but this would need to be handled on a case-by-case basis as placing FAO staff in UNDP offices and hiring services has in the past often proven to be a more costly option.</p> <p>b) Size of the programme: If the size of a country programme falls below a specified ratio to office costs for</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p> <p>Of the options suggested in case a full fledged office is not considered essential, the first, multiple accreditations, backed by a team of appropriate national staff, may be the most effective way to reduce costs. However, the other options suggested by the IEE would also be explored and analysed in detail with a view to using them as appropriate.</p> <p>The ten criteria proposed by the IEE for the review of the existing country offices could form the basis for a detailed analysis with a view to preparing possible scenarios. Some preliminary assessments of the criteria are shown in the Annex.</p>

<p>more than three years, the office should be transformed into some other lower cost arrangement (e.g. multiple country accreditations, RO coverage). Apply a ratio consistently above 1 to 3 as the benchmark in this regard.</p> <p>c) Size and poverty levels of agriculturally dependent population: The higher the dependence on agriculture and of national poverty levels, the greater the justification for keeping an office.</p> <p>d) Level of development of countries: Special consideration and criteria should apply to sponsoring and retaining FAOR offices in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) which are likely to be less able to access FAO services via other means.</p> <p>e) The existence of well-prepared FAO national priority frameworks: These instruments would need to be realistic in setting out what FAO can actually do, taking into account resource adequacy and linked to resource mobilization, as appropriate.</p> <p>f) The relevance of existing technical cooperation projects to FAO's overall strategy and the UNDAF: Consider the merit of retaining an office where activities have been determined by demand or donor-driven, but with no apparent strategy or purpose and where country studies have demonstrated little impact and spill-over effects.</p> <p>g) Ease of servicing the country from a nearby country and the cost-effectiveness of multiple accreditations, especially to smaller, reasonably contiguous countries.</p> <p>h) Potential for agriculture in economic growth.</p> <p>i) The potential for major gains through new partnerships: Rather than a single FAO presence at country level, consider partnerships with other organizations, both for technical support and representation needs.</p> <p>j) Willingness of governments to cover costs of FAO country presence (except for LDCs).</p>	
---	--