



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

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

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная  
организация  
Объединенных  
Наций

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## JOINT MEETING

**Joint Meeting of the  
Hundred and Fourth Session of the Programme Committee  
and the  
Hundred and Thirty-fifth Session of the Finance Committee**

**Rome, 27 October 2010**

**RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Queries on the substantive content of this document may be addressed to:

**Mr Boyd Haight**

**Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management**

**Tel. +3906 5705 5324 and**

**Mr Richard China**

**Director, Policy and Programme Development Support Division**

**Tel. +3906 5705 5242**

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

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The FAO resource mobilization and management strategy is being developed as an integral part of the reform process, and is expected to continue through 2011 under IPA Project 4. This document provides an update on progress on next steps in developing and implementing the FAO resource mobilization and management strategy, including specific information requested by the Joint Meeting on:

- a) a proposal on the format of the meeting, scheduled in the first quarter of 2011, bringing together interested Members, partners and other potential sources of voluntary contributions, to exchange information on voluntary funding requirements;
- b) in this context, a clear definition of partners; and
- c) information on: modalities of voluntary funding; efforts to develop good practices, including harmonization and alignment; how FAO could relate to the ongoing “good multilateral donorship” initiative.

### **GUIDANCE SOUGHT FROM THE COMMITTEES**

The Committees are invited to note progress achieved and provide guidance on the format of the informal meeting of Members, partners and other potential sources of voluntary contributions, to exchange information on extrabudgetary voluntary funding requirements, and the proposed definition of *voluntary resource partners*.

### *Introduction*

1. An important feature of the Immediate Plan of Action for FAO's Renewal (IPA) is a resource mobilization and management strategy, whereby assessed contributions are supplemented by voluntary contributions to support agreed priorities within the Strategic Objectives.<sup>1</sup> The strategy aims to articulate how FAO mobilizes resources from its partners, allocates these resources to agreed priorities, and reports on their use.
2. The strategy is being developed as an integral part of the reform process, involving consultations with headquarters and decentralized units, Strategy Teams and partners. Development of the strategy is expected to continue through 2011 under IPA Project 4 on Resource Mobilization and Management, which is led by the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP) and the Policy and Programme Development Support Division (TCS) in the Technical Cooperation Department.
3. The Joint Meeting of the 103<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Programme Committee and the 132<sup>nd</sup> of the Finance Committee considered the progress and next steps in the development of the resource mobilization and management strategy<sup>2</sup>, covering: a) managing the integrated budget; b) Impact Focus Areas (IFAs); c) National Medium Term Priority Frameworks; c) consultation with partners; and e) communications strategy. In this context, the Committees requested to receive at their next Joint Meeting:
  - a) a proposal on the format of the meeting, scheduled in the first quarter of 2011, bringing together interested Members, partners and other potential sources of voluntary contributions, to exchange information on voluntary funding requirements;
  - b) in this context, a clear definition of partners; and
  - c) information on: modalities of voluntary funding; efforts to develop good practices, including harmonization and alignment; how FAO could relate to the ongoing "good multilateral donorship" initiative.
4. This document provides an update on progress on next steps in developing and implementing the FAO resource mobilization and management strategy, including the specific information requested. The Committees are invited to note the progress achieved and provide guidance on the format of the informal meeting of Members, partners and other potential sources of voluntary contributions, to exchange information on voluntary funding requirements, and the proposed definition of *voluntary resource partners*.

#### **A. MANAGING THE INTEGRATED BUDGET**

##### ***a) Responsibility and accountability framework, training and information exchange***

5. To ensure that the corporate resource mobilization and management strategy is informed by actual challenges and experiences faced by FAO, a Capacity Assessment Survey was carried out in May-June 2010, involving all headquarters' technical units and the decentralized offices. Staff members were invited to assess their knowledge and experience of resource mobilization, explore the challenges encountered, express views on roles and responsibilities, and comment on the specific training that they might require.
6. Overall, 135 responses were received, of which 97 were from decentralized offices: 64 were from FAO representations (66%), 10 from subregional offices (10%), 23 from regional offices (24%) and 38 from headquarters. Respondents expressed interest in the establishment of a

---

<sup>1</sup> C 2008/4 IPA paragraph 34

<sup>2</sup> JM 2010.1/4

better coordinated, Organization-wide resource mobilization strategy (appropriately tailored to the needs of decentralized offices), and in receiving training to help them conduct their resource mobilization activities in a more targeted and better informed way. The survey confirmed the need to assert FAO's comparative advantages, particularly at country-level in addressing issues of national priority; and innovatively tap the interest expressed by potential resource partners in the Strategic Framework.

7. Building on the findings of the survey and further ongoing consultations, a draft framework of roles and responsibilities, together with corporate business rules on resource mobilization and management, will be finalized by end-2010. These include modalities for supporting FAO's Strategic Framework, developing relations with resource partners, and coordination, support and monitoring within FAO. This information will be made available to all staff in an *FAO Quick Guide to Resource Mobilization*, which will form part of a training curriculum and a Web-based knowledge repository and information exchange platform on resource mobilization.

***b) Corporate resource allocation mechanism for voluntary contributions***

8. Most voluntary contributions to FAO are earmarked in the form of specific projects. Earmarking results in transaction costs for negotiating project agreements, aligning the contributions to the results frameworks in the MTP-PWB, and individual project monitoring and reporting. Under the resource mobilization and management strategy, the aim is to attract voluntary contributions to be allocated by the Organization toward achievement of the approved Organizational Results. The IFAs are the main vehicles for resource mobilization efforts, while the resource allocation mechanism is under development.

9. A mechanism to allocate unearmarked or lightly earmarked voluntary contributions to Organizational Results would be based on a set of guiding principles, which could include: the degree of alignment with the IFAs; consideration of emerging regional and subregional priority areas of action as identified by the Regional Conferences; geographic eligibility and other indicators; opportunities for resource mobilization from other sources; and the capacity of the Organization to deliver. The principles are being tested in close dialogue with interested resource partners with the aim to put in place a resource allocation mechanism by mid-2011.

***c) Progress in the monitoring and reporting arrangements under the new results-based framework***

10. Under the new corporate work planning process for 2010-11, all organizational units have planned and allocated their resources from both the net appropriation and voluntary contributions. The inclusion of voluntary contributions in unit work plans and results aims to ensure that project-related work makes a clear and measurable contribution to achieving the Organizational Results. It lays the foundation for developing the monitoring and reporting system<sup>3</sup>, including for the use and oversight of voluntary contributions under the integrated budget.

11. The synthesis report of the annual Mid-Term Review will include information on estimated delivery funded by voluntary contributions as planned in the PWB, funding available at the time of preparation of the work plans, and expenditures at the end of the first year of the biennium. This will allow concerned parties to review progress in resource mobilization efforts, both in terms of alignment to the approved MTP-PWB and volumes forecasted for the biennium, and to identify any corrective action that may be required.

---

<sup>3</sup> JM 2010.2/2

## **B. IMPACT FOCUS AREAS**

### ***a) Prepare a strategy for mobilizing resources for each Impact Focus Area in 2010-11.***

12. The overall approach to developing a communications strategy for IFAs is being defined in consultation with the Office of Corporate Communications and External Relations (OCE). The scope and modalities for IFAs will be clarified, including an appropriate communications component inviting support from potential resource partners. The profiled areas of work within each IFA will aim at demonstrating to potential donors the value added of their eventual contributions.

13. There are already encouraging signs that FAO technical divisions are putting the IFAs to good use in the mobilization of resources. One example is the Science for Safe Food Strategy, launched within the wider context of FAO's reforms, and which seeks to garner extrabudgetary support through a newly-established Multi Donor Trust Fund, the Global Initiative for Food Related Scientific Advice (GIFSA). This falls under the IFA on global standard setting and implementation into national policies and legislation. Another example is the IFA on capacity building to strengthen information and statistics, which is being used to advocate for resources to prepare an Implementation Plan for the Global Strategy to Improve Agriculture and Rural Statistics for better food security and agricultural development policies.

### ***b) A framework for assessing the success of the IFAs in support of resource mobilization***

14. The new Programme Implementation Report (PIR)<sup>4</sup> will include an explanation of the main resource mobilization challenges encountered during the biennium; tables on voluntary contributions by source; a summary of delivery under voluntary contributions contributing to each Organizational Result and for Impact Focus Areas.

## **C. REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL PRIORITY AREAS OF ACTION AND NATIONAL MEDIUM TERM PRIORITY FRAMEWORKS**

15. The Strategic Evaluation of FAO Country Programming<sup>5</sup>, carried out in 2010, assessed the processes and strategies associated with FAO country programming, and in particular the current and potential future role of the National Medium Term Priority Framework (NMTPF). Management agreed with the integrated character of the Country Programming Process and its three components: national priorities developed by governments; FAO's Country Programming Framework (ex-NMTPF) formulated jointly with government; and FAO's Country Work Plan.

16. Under the IPA, the Organization will refine and test the Country Programming Framework (CPF) and Country Work Planning (CWP) processes, taking account of FAO's potential roles, actions in support of the national agricultural development plans and strategies and potential of leveraging resources, both at the strategic level (CPF) and operational level (CWP). Comprehensive guidelines for Country Programming will be put in place by the end of the biennium, with requisite training.

17. During 2010, the Regional Conferences are providing guidance on regional and subregional areas of priority action in the context of the MTP-PWB and region-specific issues and perspectives. They will inform the process of prioritization of the technical work of the Organization through the Programme Committee and Council, as well as providing a means to focus FAO's work in each region.

---

<sup>4</sup> cf. JM 2010.2/2

<sup>5</sup> PC 104/4 and Sup.1

## D. CONSULTATIONS WITH PARTNERS

### *a) Informal meeting on extrabudgetary funding requirements*

18. Under the revised cycle of preparation of the programme and budget documentation, but not as part of the governing body cycle, the IPA (action 3.9) foresees an informal meeting of interested Members and other potential sources of extrabudgetary funds and partnerships, to exchange information on extrabudgetary funding requirements, especially in relation to the Impact Focus Areas. The first such meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, 1 March 2011 at FAO headquarters in Rome. A concept note on the format of the meeting is provided in *Annex I*.

### *b) Definition of voluntary resource partners*

19. In this context, a definition of voluntary resource partners is presented in *Annex II*. It stresses FAO's special relationship with member governments, which are responsible for the governance and funding of the Organization. At the same time, governments are responsible for the overall direction of their national development in which FAO may be involved through partnerships with relevant national governmental institutions.

20. The definition also takes into account actors such as Regional Economic Integration Organizations (REIOs), locally-elected authorities such as regions and municipalities, international financing institutions, bilateral donor agencies and regional or subregional institutions, including regional development banks. The definition builds on the fact that the collaboration with different partners in the UN system has been growing considerably, especially among Rome-based agencies, while FAO also maintains multiple linkages at different levels with International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs) of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and collaborates with other research and academic institutions. It also takes into account the growing recognition of the increasingly significant roles of civil society, including people's organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector and foundations.

21. Whenever the Organization is reviewing existing partnerships or considering entering into a new partnership or alliance with any of the different categories of partners mentioned above, it will follow the guiding principles being developed in FAO's new partnerships strategy. While the guiding principles are of a general nature, specific and additional guidance will be provided for partnership arrangements with particular entities taking into account the requirements and conditions as related to such entities.

### *c) Efforts to develop good practices, including how FAO relates to the ongoing "good multilateral donorship" initiative*

22. Evidence of efforts to develop good practices can be found in the various sections of this document, where FAO is sharing the step-by-step implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and the efforts in improving the Organization's accountability and transparency in reporting to all Members and donors; and advocacy efforts to increase multi-year and less earmarked funding in direct support of the MTP-PWB.

23. The good multilateral donorship (GMD) concept emerged in the Report of the High-Level Panel on System Wide Coherence (2006), that laid the ground for the ongoing reforms of UN operational activities in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment. In their introductory letter to the report, the Co-Chairs emphasize their commitment to put into practice the principles of good multilateral donorship and to ensure adequate, sustained and secure funding for organizations that upgrade their efficiency and deliver results. Recommendation 34 of the report sets out that "the United Nations should establish benchmarks by 2008 to ensure the implementation of principles of good multilateral donorship, so that the funding provided at headquarters and at the country level do not undermine the coherence of development efforts and funding of the United Nations development system".

24. The issue of good multilateral donorship (GMD) continues to emerge as one of the consultation themes in the context of discussions on the Report on operational activities of the UN system for the General Assembly, to try and address issues that seem specifically related to Delivering as One and related funding of Funds and Programmes.

25. The concept of the GMD initiative is still not clearly established and has not received significant attention from donors. For instance, the OECD/DAC reports on aid effectiveness – including assessments of individual donor performance – hardly mention cooperation with the multilateral agencies. Thus far the GMD focus seems to be on the prevention of high transaction costs in terms of administration, in particular with reference to negotiation of agreements, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of voluntary contributions to Funds and Programmes.

26. FAO would support the objectives of the GMD concept, provided they are clarified and clearly related to support more principled assistance in line with the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda by both voluntary sources of funding to multilaterals agencies and by the multilateral agencies; and provided these comply with the governance of the Organization and the reform process.

27. In particular, the GMD concept could help reach alignment and harmonization among donors in recognizing the UN agencies' strategic frameworks and reporting mechanisms as a main point of reference for providing voluntary funding.

28. Multiple parallel systems to evaluate donorship need to be avoided as this involves more transaction costs and less transparency. For instance, MOPAN type evaluations should not be encouraged. Once the principles of good partnering/assistance are agreed (including by FAO's governing bodies), the principles should be integrated into the contributors' and multilateral agencies' evaluation criteria.

#### ***d) Other initiatives***

29. Negotiations are underway with key resource partners for less earmarked and multi-year voluntary contributions, including formulation of a standard Memorandum of Understanding for multidonor voluntary contributions support to the MTP-PWB. *Annex III* provides an overview of the voluntary contributions mobilized in 2008-09 with tables on the types and sources of voluntary contributions.

30. Efforts continue to engage a broader range of emerging partners. The draft private sector policy and guidelines would be available for consideration by the Joint Meeting at its next session in March 2011.

### **E. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY**

31. In addition to all aspects of the resource mobilization strategy that include elements of communication and that have been covered under the preceding section, a first draft concept note on the approach to the communication strategy on each Impact Focus Areas has been developed. It foresees the development of tailored communication and advocacy material around each IFA supported by documented examples of good practice, including at regional, subregional and national level. Progress on the development of the communication strategies for the IFAs will be reported to the Joint Meeting at its next session.

---

## ANNEX I: CONCEPT NOTE ON FORMAT AND CONTENT OF THE INFORMAL MEETING OF INTERESTED MEMBERS AND OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES OF VOLUNTARY FUNDS AND PARTNERSHIPS

---

### Background

Under the revised cycle of preparation of the programme and budget documentation but not as part of the governing body cycle, the IPA (action 3.9) foresees an informal meeting of interested Members and other potential sources of voluntary funds and partnerships, to exchange information on voluntary funding requirements, especially in relation to the Impact Focus Areas. The meeting would be held in the first quarter of the second year of the biennium.

The first such meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, 1 March 2011 at FAO headquarters in Rome. This note provides a proposal for the *purpose* and expected *outcome* of the meeting, *format* and *content* for discussion.

### Purpose and outcome

The *purpose* of this meeting is to serve as an informal means to raise awareness of how FAO is operating under an integrated budget; exchange information on delivery of voluntary contributions, with the possibility to highlight particular areas in the context of resources leveraged in the first year of the biennium, especially in relation to Impact Focus Areas (IFAs) and unmet priorities; and, provide a forum for informal interaction and information exchange between members, resource partners and other partners.

The meeting is *not* to serve as a pledging conference.

The main expected *outcome* of the meeting is greater knowledge of and advocacy for the integrated approach to FAO's programme of work and budget and a foundation for partnerships with potential sources of extra budgetary funding in this context.

### Format

The *format* of the full day meeting in the Atrium would comprise a joint session in the morning, and parallel break-out events in the afternoon. FAO staff would act as facilitators, as in the recent Informal Seminars. FAO will prepare displays on progress of areas of work covered by IFAs, while interested members and other potential sources of voluntary funds and partners will also be invited to display aspects of work in areas relevant to the Organization's work. Interpretation would be provided in all languages of the Organization.

The Secretariat will invite all Members and all resource partners that have provided voluntary contributions to FAO since 2008.

### Content

With regards to *content*, it is proposed that the meeting opens with an overview of experience with resource mobilization and recent programme delivery. The oral presentation will highlight success stories, lessons learned, and areas of critical requirements. An update on the development of the IFAs strategy will be shared. Two to three resource partners or interested Members will be invited to make short presentations on areas of particular relevance to FAO's work.

In keeping with the informal nature of the meeting, there will be no formal report. An oral summary will be provided by a rapporteur, which will also be provided to the CoC-IEE.

---

## ANNEX II: DEFINITION OF VOLUNTARY RESOURCE PARTNER

---

### General definition of partnership

The definition of voluntary resource partner will be inscribed in the overall definition of partnership.

The definition of partnerships, as described in the Organization-wide strategy on partnerships now under development, follows the one used by the IEE and as established in 2005 by the FAO Evaluation of partnerships and alliances<sup>6</sup>. The terms “partnerships” and “alliances”, which are used interchangeably, therefore refer to a “cooperation and collaboration between FAO units and external parties in joint or coordinated action for a common purpose. It involves a relationship where all parties make a contribution to the output and the achievement of the objectives rather than a solely financial relationship”.

A partnership can be characterized by the following elements:

- A partnership is a voluntary association of partners.
- Partners are expected to share a common interest.
- Partnership entails complementary resources (technical, financial or human).
- The dynamic performance of a partnership assumes the existence of an agreement on modalities.
- Each partner is expected to pursue specific benefits, which are the fundamental motivation for entering into the partnership.
- By deciding to get involved in an alliance or a partnership, partners accept the need to share risks and confront them together, based on a foundation of mutual trust.

It should be underlined that the existence of a mutual will among the partners to pursue a common goal is a necessary condition for the success of a partnership.

### FAO partners

Partnerships are firmly embedded in FAO’s way of doing business at global, regional, sub-regional and national levels. For the purpose of enhancing its strategic and operational programming, funding and advocacy roles, FAO collaborates with a large number of different entities in partnerships of a horizontal nature where the Organization and its partners are looking for complementarities, for example on inter-disciplinary issues or of a vertical nature where the partners share responsibilities for upstream (research) and downstream (outreach) activities as mentioned in the 2005 FAO Evaluation of partnerships and alliances. Collaboration with different entities through partnerships and alliances is important at all levels, i.e. at headquarters, regional, subregional and national levels. A distinction between various types of partnerships is generally made on the basis of the category to which a particular partner belongs.

### Definition of voluntary resource partners

A Voluntary Resource Partner is defined as *a resource provider/contributor/source, which includes FAO traditional voluntary contributors (governments, international financing institutions, other funds) and non-traditional (The Private Sector, and Foundations).*

---

<sup>6</sup> PC 95/4 b); PC 95/4 b) Sup. 1

---

**ANNEX III: EXTRACT FROM PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION REPORT  
2008-2009**

---

Over the last biennium 2008-2009, new approvals<sup>7</sup> of voluntary contributions to FAO reached USD 2.0 billion for development and emergency operations, compared with new approvals of USD 1.3 billion in the previous biennium. Delivery reached USD 1.2 billion in the 2008-2009 biennium. Below is the description of the sources and modalities of voluntary funding in FAO for the 2008-2009 biennium, based on actual delivery. The information provided is an extract of Section II A *Overview of Achievements – Resources* of the Programme Implementation Report 2008-2009<sup>8</sup>, dealing with extra-budgetary funding.

*FAO field programme and extrabudgetary support to Regular Programme delivery*

FAO's total field programme and extrabudgetary support to Regular Programme delivery reached USD 1,226.9 million, an increase of 37 percent over 2006-07. This reflects increased delivery under the Government Cooperative Programme (GCP) and Unilateral Trust Funds (UTF) with approximately 61 donors, the United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) and emergency and rehabilitation activities, while delivery under the UNDP programme (for FAO Implementation and Execution) continued to decline.

Decentralized cooperation contributed to the increase in delivery under GCP. This included new funding partners from Spain (Galizia and Castilla y León) and Italy (Valle d'Aosta, Parma and Lombardy).

The two existing strategic partnership agreements with the Netherlands and Norway were merged into the FAO Multidonor Partnership Programme (FMPP).

---

<sup>7</sup> New approvals include all agreements signed over the two-year period, regardless whether their duration extends beyond that biennium.

<sup>8</sup> C 2011/8 paragraphs 65-72

**Delivery of field programme and extrabudgetary support to the Regular Programme by type of contribution (USD million)**

<b>Description</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
FAO/UNDP		
FAO Execution	4.5	3.1
FAO Implementation	9.2	5.1
<b>Total UNDP</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>8.2</b>
TRUST FUNDS		
Trust Funds - Non-emergency		
FAO/Government Cooperative Programme (GCP)	235.3	319.9
Associate Professional Officer (APO) Programme	16.0	14.0
Unilateral Trust Funds (UTF)	84.9	115.6
FAO-Donors Partnership Programmes	45.4	27.2
UN Joint Programme (UNJP)	-	16.3
UN Environment Programme (UNEP)	5.8	7.4
Other UN Organizations	7.5	6.3
TeleFood	3.8	3.8
Miscellaneous Trust Funds	37.4	37.7
<i>Total - Non-emergency</i>	<i>436.1</i>	<i>548.2</i>
Trust Funds - emergency assistance		
Special Relief Operations – General	293.4	449.5
Special Relief Operations - Avian Influenza	63.7	71.6
Special Relief Operations – Tsunami	27.8	7.5
Special Relief Operations - Drought Affected Area	-	30.1
<i>Total - emergency assistance</i>	<i>384.9</i>	<i>558.7</i>
<b>Total Trust Funds</b>	<b>821.0</b>	<b>1,106.9</b>
<b>Total External Funding</b>	<b>834.7</b>	<b>1,115.1</b>
Regular Programme		
Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP)	58.0	109.8
Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS)	3.8	2.0
<b>Total Regular Programme</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>111.8</b>
<b>TOTAL FIELD PROGRAMMES*</b>	<b>896.5</b>	<b>1,226.9</b>
*Excludes administrative and operational support costs credited to the general fund and the cost of emergency operations incurred in the Division of Emergency and Rehabilitation.		

The Regular Programme-funded share of the field programme sharply increased in 2008-09 due to the support to the Initiative for Soaring Food Prices (ISFP). TCP delivery nearly doubled from the 2006-07 level. The shift in emphasis of the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) from small pilot projects to supporting broader national and regional food security programmes continued in 2008-09, resulting in a further decline in RP-funded SPFS projects (to about USD 2.0 million).

Expenditures for non-emergency trust funds increased from USD 436.1 million to USD 548.2 million in 2008-09. Major contributing factors were the good levels of cooperation with Members under the FAO Government Cooperative Programme and Unilateral Trust Funds. The growth in non-emergency trust funds, while substantial, was less than that experienced for emergency assistance so that their percentage share of total delivery declined from 49 percent to 45 percent in 2008-09.

Delivery of emergency assistance continued to expand in 2008-09, due to large-scale emergencies requiring FAO's involvement, reaching USD 558.7 million, a 45 percent increase over 2006-07. The main areas of emergency assistance included: i) Avian Influenza through the Global Programme for Prevention and Control of HPAI; ii) interventions within the framework of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices; iii) operations in Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe focusing on restoring livelihoods, in particular agricultural assets, livestock and natural resources protection; iv) operations throughout the Horn of Africa and Southern Africa covering emergency and rehabilitation interventions; and v) continued support to countries affected by the Indian Ocean Tsunami, including operations in Sri Lanka and Indonesia. In total, emergency assistance was provided to over 80 countries.

Sources of external funding in 2008-09 are shown in the following table. The contributions from the European Community are particularly noteworthy, increasing from USD 83.2 million to USD 189.7 million (15 percent of total delivery) in 2008-09, primarily due to the European Union Food Facility. The USA nearly doubled its voluntary contributions giving support mostly to emergency activities. Spain joined the top five voluntary contributors for the first time, more than tripling its contribution in 2008-09 to USD 64.7 million. The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) remained the fifth largest source of voluntary funding to FAO, for emergency and rehabilitation activities through the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). In total, more than 165 countries and organizations contributed extrabudgetary resources to FAO during 2008-09.

**Delivery by sources of external funding in USD million\***

<b>Donor Name</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2008-09</b>
European Community	83.2	189.7
Multilateral Contributions	58.0	116.3
United States of America	44.4	81.4
Spain	21.3	64.7
UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	39.7	63.4
Italy	54.0	57.1
Sweden	32.2	56.9
UNDP- and UNDP-administered donor joint trust fund	30.4	56.6
Netherlands	39.2	33.4
Belgium	29.0	28.9
Norway	36.0	28.7
Common Fund for Humanitarian Action in Sudan	20.6	25.9
Japan	36.3	24.8
United Kingdom	33.8	24.2
United Nations Development Group Office (DGO) Service and Support UNDG/EXECCOM Secretariat	31.4	23.9
Saudi Arabia	16.5	19.9
Germany	23.3	19.4
Brazil	12.0	12.3
World Bank	4.4	12.2
Australia	14.4	10.2
Canada	9.0	10.1
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>669.1</i>	<i>959.9</i>
Other donors	165.6	155.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>834.7</b>	<b>1,115.1</b>
* Total extrabudgetary expenditures exclude administrative and operational support costs credited to the General Fund and the cost of emergency operations incurred in the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division. In accordance with the Organization's accounting policy, Trust Fund contributions are recognised when expenditures are actually incurred.		

During 2008-2009, there were 21 sources of funding with contributions over USD 10 million, accounting for 86 percent of all extrabudgetary delivery and more than 3,600 projects had some level of activity. Multidonor funding of specific programmes or large projects continued to be a major component of delivery. There were 120 programmes and projects with delivery of over USD 2.0 million, accounting for 35 percent of total delivery.