



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

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

101st Session

Rome, 11 - 15 May 2009

IEE Recommendation on the Decentralization of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP)

Implementation of IPA Action Matrix

Table of Contents

	Pages
<i>LIST OF ACRONYMS</i>	<i>ii</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TCP APPROVAL CRITERIA	1
A. TCP CRITERION 1 – “COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY”	2
<i>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXISTING CRITERION</i>	2
<i>INCONGRUITIES IN THE EXISTING CRITERION</i>	2
<i>POSSIBLE MODIFICATIONS TO THE CRITERION</i>	3
B. TCP CRITERION 2 – “AIMS AND PURPOSES”	4
C. TCP CRITERION 6 – “SCALE AND DURATION”	5
III. CLARIFICATIONS ON THE TCP PROCESS	6

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

A.	MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM COUNTRIES	6
B.	PROJECT CYCLE STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	7
C.	TIMELINE	8
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND FOLLOW-UP	9

List of Acronyms

CoC-IEE	Conference Committee for the Follow-up to the Independent External Evaluation of FAO
IEE	Independent External Evaluation of FAO
IPA	Immediate Plan of Action for FAO Renewal
LDC	Least Developed Country
LIFDC	Low-Income Food-Deficit Country
LLDC	Land-Locked Developing Country
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NMTPF	National Medium-Term Priority Framework
PPRC	Programme and Project Review Committee
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) was the subject of an in-depth reform following a review initiated in 2003 and completed in 2005 through discussions by the Programme Committee at its 90th, 92nd, 93rd and 94th Sessions and decision by the Council at its 129th Session in November 2005.
2. The main outcomes of the agreed TCP reform were two new sets of TCP approval criteria for development and emergency projects, respectively, and the delegation of full authority to FAO Representatives for approval of commitments under the TCP Facility up to USD 200 000 per biennium and per country as an immediate first step towards further decentralization of TCP responsibilities. The Secretariat began implementing the above decisions from January 2006.
3. In the meantime, an Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO was commissioned and submitted its report in September 2007 leading to the preparation of an Immediate Plan of Action for FAO Renewal (IPA) and its adoption by the Conference at its 35th (Special) Session in November 2008. The IPA Action Matrix regarding the TCP provides for the decentralization of the management of the TCP appropriation as follows:
 - *“TCP resources to be allocated to regions under the authority of Regional Representatives, except for 15% retained under the authority of the Department responsible for Technical Cooperation for use in emergencies and 3% for interregional projects.*
 - *Indicative allocations to regions agreed as follows with review by the Council every four years in line with the Medium Term Planning cycle: Africa 40%; Asia and Pacific 24%; Latin America and Caribbean 18%; Europe 10%; Near East 8%. Developed countries are eligible for TCP but only on a full refund basis.”*
4. The IPA Action Matrix also provides for a discussion by the Programme Committee on the following:

“TCP project cycle and TCP approval guidelines to be reviewed in 2009, reaffirming priority to Least Developed Countries; Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries; Small Island and Land-Locked Developing States, further clarifying existing Council approved guidelines and specifying:

 - a) approval criteria including convergence of countries’ needs and the Organization’s agreed Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results;*
 - b) specify minimum information required from countries for consideration of requests;*
 - c) clarify the project cycle – specifying the steps and responsibilities for clearances at each stage of the process, simplifying the number of steps and with delegations to decentralized offices at the lowest level possible;*
 - d) clearly specify timelines for each stage of the process so that managers can be held accountable.”*
5. The present paper has been prepared to facilitate the discussion of the Programme Committee on the issues listed in paragraph 4 above.

II. TCP APPROVAL CRITERIA

6. The criteria approved by the Council in November 2005 are reproduced in the table contained in Annex 1. Changes are proposed below for criterion 1 on country eligibility, for criterion 2 on aims and purposes and for criterion 6 on scale and duration with particular reference to the TCP Facility.

A. TCP CRITERION 1 – “COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY”

Implementation of the Existing Criterion

7. In the course of the discussions of the Programme Committee in 2004 and 2005 held in the context of the TCP Reform on the TCP criterion regarding country eligibility, the Committee agreed¹, and the Council² subsequently stressed the importance of the following principles:

- universality of access to the TCP;
- special attention would be given in the allocation of resources to the neediest countries defined as the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs), the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS);
- the access by high-income developing and developed countries to technical assistance would be on a full cost-recovery basis only keeping the multilateral nature of the TCP;
- emergency assistance would remain accessible to all Members on a full grant basis.

The current list of “special attention” countries is attached in Annex 2. The LIFDC classification is reviewed regularly by FAO while the LDC, LLDC and SIDS lists are maintained by the UN Office of the High Representative for LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS. The Committee agreed to define high-income developing and developed countries as those contained in the list of high-income economies as maintained by the World Bank and updated every 1 July (Annex 3). Any country that is not part of the “special attention” category, but also not part of the list high-income economies is considered by the Secretariat as an “intermediate” country (Annex 4).

8. Since the TCP reform, the Secretariat has been ensuring adherence to the principles agreed upon for TCP Criterion 1 through a number of measures including:

- member countries in the high-income category that are not “special attention” have been informed that they can access national non-emergency TCP assistance on a full cost-recovery basis only;
- regular monitoring of the classification of countries within the above-mentioned groups. Any adjustments in the list of high-income economies resulting from changes in either FAO membership or in the country income classifications and impacting on a Member’s access to TCP is communicated to that Member;
- regular monitoring of the share of the TCP resources to ensure that priority is given to the “special attention” countries. Although no precise guidance has been given by the Governing Bodies on this matter, the Secretariat seeks to ensure that a share of at least 80 percent of the TCP appropriation is allocated to these countries, while also ensuring the full commitment of the appropriation.

Incongruities in the Existing Criterion

9. In applying the guidance provided by the Governing Bodies as indicated above, some incongruities have become manifest as some SIDS or LDCs (i.e. “special attention” countries) are also high-income economies (i.e. access to TCP on full cost-recovery basis only). In such cases, the Secretariat has interpreted the instructions of the Governing Bodies in the manner that most favours individual countries (i.e. high-income “special attention” countries are considered eligible for TCP assistance on a full grant basis).

10. At the time of adoption of the new TCP criteria in November 2005, there were 37 high-income FAO Members, one of which was also part of the “special attention” countries (SIDS list). This number has been continuously evolving with an increase of the number of high-income economies and also of the number of countries belonging to both the “high-income” and “special attention” categories. Thus, as at February 2008, there were 46 high-income FAO Members of

¹ Report of the 94th Session of the Programme Committee, September 2005

² Report of the 129th Session of the Council, November 2005

which six were also part of the “special attention” countries (five from the SIDS list and one from the LDC list). The Secretariat considers it likely that this phenomenon will continue in the future.

11. To manage such changes, the Secretariat has considered that a country eligible for assistance on a full grant basis at the time of receipt of the request will retain this eligibility even if a change of category occurs during the processing of the request.

12. No explicit guidance was provided by the Governing Bodies in the context of the TCP reform on limitations in access of high-income economies to regional and interregional assistance. However, considering the potential involvement of high-income countries in regional efforts at addressing such issues as transboundary animal diseases or plant pests, the Secretariat has considered that high-income economies can access TCP on a full grant basis in the context of regional and inter-regional projects that benefit also “special attention” or “intermediate” countries. Furthermore, as it would be difficult to determine the monetary value of the participation in such projects by the high-income economies, it would not be feasible to estimate the amount to be recovered.

13. In applying the Governing Bodies’ recommendations along the lines indicated in paragraphs 9, 11 and 12, the share of TCP resources allocated from January 2006 to December 2008, in percentage of the total value of approved projects for these three years, is as follows³:

- 84.1 percent for the 115 “special attention” countries;
- 15.6 percent for the 36 “intermediate” countries;
- 1.5 percent specifically for the “special attention” countries that are also high-income economies;
- 0.3 percent for one high-income economy that is no longer “intermediate”;
- the share of TCP resources which benefited high-income economies which are not “special attention” countries (i.e. emergency, regional, interregional) was nil.

14. As shown in paragraph 13, the impact to date on the TCP appropriation of the Secretariat’s interpretation of the country eligibility criteria has been very limited. However, given the expectation that the number of “special attention” countries also covered by the list of high-income economies will increase, the Secretariat would appreciate receiving guidance from the Programme Committee on the interpretation of the existing country eligibility criterion, in particular on:

- whether high-income economies that are **also** “special attention” countries have access to non-emergency TCP assistance on a full grant basis.
- whether high-income economies that are **not** “special attention” countries have access to non-emergency regional and interregional projects that benefit also “special attention” or “intermediate” countries, on a full grant basis.

Possible Modifications to the Criterion

15. As indicated in paragraph 3 above, the Conference decided at its Special Session in November 2008 that

“Developed countries are eligible for TCP but only on a full refund basis.”

16. It is further recalled that the Chair’s Aide Mémoire of the joint meeting on 28 July 2008 of the CoC-IEE Working Groups I and III indicates that:

“It was reaffirmed that all countries should have access to TCP, but for high-income developing and developed countries this should be on the basis of full cost recovery (for the purpose of this definition all members of the European Union were considered to be part of this group).”

³ National projects only, regional and interregional projects are not included.

17. The Secretariat wishes to draw the attention of the Programme Committee to the fact that there exists no agreed definition of “developed country”, and that no official list of these countries can be identified. The Secretariat would therefore recommend that in defining the countries eligible for TCP assistance on a full cost recovery basis, only officially agreed lists of countries be used. The lists of high-income economies (as maintained by the World Bank and updated every 1 July and reflected in Annex 3) and of European Union members (Annex 5) could be used for this purpose.

18. Taking the above into account, the Secretariat presents the following new formulation for criterion 1 on country eligibility for development assistance under the TCP for consideration by the Committee and eventual decision by the Council:

“All FAO Members are eligible for access to TCP-supported technical assistance. However, TCP gives special attention to assisting the neediest countries, especially the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs), Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs), and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Access by high-income economies and by members of the European Union to technical assistance through the TCP modality should only be on a full cost-recovery basis”.

The above criterion would be implemented with due regard for the guidance provided by the Committee under paragraph 14. All Member countries would continue to have access to emergency assistance under the TCP on a full grant basis.

B. TCP CRITERION 2 – “AIMS AND PURPOSES”

19. The Programme Committee has been requested to examine how the TCP approval criteria can be amended to ensure convergence of countries’ needs and the Organization’s agreed strategic and organizational results (paragraph 4 above).

20. In this regard, the Secretariat wishes to recall the current wording of TCP approval Criterion 2, for development projects as follows:

“TCP-supported assistance should contribute to household or national food security, improved rural livelihoods and poverty reduction, in line with the World Food Summit target, the MDGs, and FAO’s strategic goals and objectives, including those related to the provision of global public goods.”

and for emergency projects as follows:

“TCP-supported emergency and rehabilitation assistance should be provided in direct anticipation of or follow-up to emergencies that fall within FAO’s sphere of action; assistance should be directed explicitly at restoring the livelihoods of the poorest and most vulnerable households affected by the emergency, and should seek to reduce the vulnerability of emergency-affected households in the future.”

21. Considering the new Strategic Framework of the Organization, and without prejudice to the demand-driven nature of the TCP, the Secretariat submits the following revised wording of Criterion 2 for consideration by the Programme Committee and eventual decision by the Council:

For development projects:

“TCP-supported assistance should contribute directly to at least one Organizational Result of FAO’s Strategic Framework.”

For emergency projects:

“TCP-supported emergency and early rehabilitation assistance should contribute to Organizational Result 2 of Strategic Objective I, aiming at ensuring that countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture related interventions.”

C. TCP CRITERION 6 – “SCALE AND DURATION”

22. As recalled in paragraph 2 above, the TCP reform led to the endorsement by the Council of the establishment of a TCP Facility under the full authority and responsibility of the FAO Representative up to a total of USD 200 000 per country and per biennium, as an immediate first step towards greater delegation of authority over TCP-related matters. This decision is reflected in Criterion 6 as follows:

“No TCP project should require a budget of more than USD 500 000 and should be completed within 24 months. The duration may be extended to 36 months, when justified, and on a case-by-case basis. The budget ceiling for a TCP Facility project is USD 200 000 per biennium and the project should be completed by the end of the biennium in which it was approved.”

23. The TCP Facility is an umbrella project aimed at responding quickly to requests for immediate and focused technical expertise or training, to prepare background documents, or carry out small sector and subsector studies or assessments.

24. After a slow start in 2006 as guidance on the modalities for the use of the new TCP Facility was being prepared and as users became familiar with the new tool, the importance of the TCP Facility in allowing FAO Representatives to address very specific requests for technical assistance in a timely manner and based on the minimum documentation necessary to ensure accountability and monitoring was confirmed. For this reason, and following an appeal by the Regional Representatives and Subregional Coordinators, the TCP Facility was extended by the Secretariat in September 2007 also to them, up to USD 200 000 per region or subregion and per biennium.

25. Similarly, the success of the TCP Facility led to a demand by users for a more flexible ceiling, which was raised to USD 300 000, effective from January 2008, in cases when the implementation of the activities under the Facility has been undertaken effectively and on the condition that TCP resources are available, either in general in the Programme, or specifically for the concerned country, taking account of the need for equitable geographical distribution of TCP resources and the priority accorded to “special attention” countries.

26. The constraint in the use of the TCP Facility reflected in the above criterion that TCP Facility projects should have completed their activities by the end of the biennium in which they were approved has revealed itself not to be necessary. Not only did this constraint create a differentiation in the duration of TCP Facility projects as compared to other TCP projects, but more importantly, led to hesitation on the part of the FAO Representatives and other decentralized users to initiate new activities under the Facility during the second year of the biennium for fear of not being able to complete these activities before year-end. It was therefore decided to waive this requirement.

27. Based on the above, and in line with the aim to decentralize the management of the TCP to decentralized office at the lowest possible level, the Secretariat submits the following revised wording for Criterion 6 for consideration by the Programme Committee and eventual decision by the Council:

“A TCP project should not require a budget of more than USD 500 000 and should be completed within 24 months. The duration may be extended to 36 months, when justified, and on a case-by-case basis. The budget ceiling for a TCP Facility project is USD 200 000 per biennium which can be increased to a maximum of USD 300 000 per biennium subject to the agreement of the Regional Representative responsible for the regional allocation.”

III. CLARIFICATIONS ON THE TCP PROCESS

28. As mentioned in paragraph 4 above, the Programme Committee has been called upon to specify the minimum information to be provided by countries for their requests for TCP assistance to be considered for approval, to clarify the project cycle, including the steps and clearances required, with delegation to decentralized offices at the lowest possible level; and specifying the timeline for the process so that managers can be held accountable.

A. MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM COUNTRIES

29. Given that FAO's Governing Bodies have decided upon a series of criteria that govern the use of TCP resources, every request for TCP assistance is appraised against these approval criteria in order to determine its eligibility. In addition, each request must be reviewed by the concerned technical units of the Organization in order to assess its technical merit and feasibility. For these reviews to occur in a rapid, precise and transparent manner, all the information necessary must be available to analyse the request. This information includes a sectoral analysis, a clear identification of the problem to be resolved, the expected output of the project, the existing capacities of the counterpart institutions, the expected follow-up to the project, its catalytic effect, the priority accorded by the Government to the request, etc.

30. When the above-mentioned review is inconclusive due to the absence of important information, the FAO units involved are constrained to initiate a correspondence with the national counterparts, either directly or through the FAO Representative concerned, to obtain the necessary details. In some cases, missions by FAO technical staff or consultants to the requesting country have proven necessary in order to gather the required information. Thus, the absence of the minimum information needed can be costly, both in terms of significant delays in approval and in terms of financial resources. Moreover, it is important to avoid that stakeholders invest time in preparing project documents prior to having ascertained the technical merit or the eligibility of the proposal.

31. To address the above concerns, the official requests for TCP assistance should be accompanied by a document containing the minimum information required for an analysis of the request. The Secretariat has provided general guidance to requesting counterparts on how to prepare and present this information. However, this guidance, the respect for which is voluntary, has proved to be insufficient to avoid the receipt of requests composed of a letter indicating the title of the assistance required, but without further details. Similarly, in too many cases, requests are accompanied by a project outline or document that does not contain the necessary information.

32. In order to address the justified concerns expressed by Member countries regarding the delays in approval that can occur in the absence of the minimum information required to quickly and correctly assess the technical merit or the likely eligibility for TCP support of a request, the Secretariat is proposing to make the provision of some minimum information an explicit condition for FAO to consider a request as an official request for assistance. Although the full responsibility for the timely provision of this information would rest with the requesting counterpart, support could be obtained from the nearest FAO country, subregional or regional office, to whom the request together with any other pertinent documentation should ultimately be transmitted.

33. The minimum information to be provided by the requesting counterparts should be descriptive and should include:

- the critical technical or policy gap or problem to be solved, its underlying causes and its consequences for food security, rural livelihoods or poverty reduction;
- the stakeholders in the concerned sector or subsector and their roles and capacities;
- the main direct and indirect beneficiaries of the proposed project;
- any past or on-going activities in the same or related technical field;

- the expected outcome and outputs of the project, its impact and the change that it will cause;
- the actions that the government, the direct beneficiaries or other stakeholders intend to take to follow-up the project and ensure the sustainability of its results.

34. While the counterparts would also be encouraged to suggest ways that FAO could help solve the critical problem identified, it would be the responsibility of FAO's technical units to propose a possible solution based on the information provided and to assist with the formulation of the full project document.

B. PROJECT CYCLE STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

35. In light of the fact that the implementation of a TCP project does not differ from that of any other FAO field project, the project cycle description in this section focuses on the steps leading up to the approval of a TCP project and which are specific to the Programme.

36. The Secretariat is committed to decentralizing the management of the TCP to the lowest possible level of the decentralized structure and the proposed management model for a decentralized TCP was presented to the joint meetings of the CoC-IEE Working Groups I and III on 16 May and on 28 July 2008. It has been further refined to integrate the decision taken by the Conference in November 2008 regarding the decentralization of the TCP appropriation to the Regional Representatives as recalled in paragraph 3.

37. The principle underpinning the approval path for a request for assistance in the context of the decentralized TCP is that responsibilities should be decentralized to the lowest possible level in order to bring the process as close as possible to the users and to spread the work load without putting the quality of the approved projects at risk.

38. Given that the Conference decided to establish indicative regional, but not national, TCP allocations, the delegation of authority over the management of the TCP regional allocation is given to the Regional Representative. The Secretariat is currently planning the implementation of this decision which will be effective as of 1 January 2010. Documents aimed at providing guidance to the Regional Representatives on how to effectively carry out this responsibility are being drafted, while training will be provided to concerned staff in the Regional Offices before the end of 2009, subject to the availability of funds.

39. The Secretariat foresees that the FAO Representatives, Subregional Coordinators and Regional Representatives will be responsible for the entire cycle leading up to the approval of a national, subregional or regional development TCP project, respectively, and will act on TCP-related matters under the delegated authority of the Assistant Director-General responsible for technical cooperation, who, as is currently the case, acts on behalf of the Director-General. The approval path for projects will thus differ depending on whether the request concerns a national, subregional, regional or interregional development project, an emergency project or a TCP Facility. The path will also take account of whether the requesting country is covered by an accredited FAO Representative and/or a Subregional Office.

40. Annex 6 illustrates the main steps of the approval path for a national development project requested by a country covered both by a FAO Representative and by a Subregional Office. The FAO Representative will discuss the priority of the request with the national counterparts and will coordinate the formulation process in close consultation with them and with the concerned technical experts (either at decentralized level or at headquarters, depending on location of the available capacity and in line with the principle of subsidiarity), and taking account of the content of the National Medium Term Priority Framework, the United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) or any other priority setting agreed upon with the government. During the formulation process, the FAO Representative will consult with the Regional Office in order to ensure the availability of resources through the regional allocation. Quality assurance mechanisms will be introduced in order to ensure that approved projects are technically sound, meet the TCP

and Project and Programme Review (PPRC) criteria and are designed in a manner that will ensure smooth and cost-effective implementation. In this context, technical clearance by the concerned multidisciplinary team or headquarters division will need to be obtained before approval. At the end of the formulation process and when all clearances have been obtained, the Regional Representative confirms that the required financial resources have been allocated to the project, which is then declared operational.

41. Similar path descriptions have been developed for the other scenarios mentioned in paragraph 39 for situations in which the Subregional Coordinator or the Regional Representative is in charge of coordinating the formulation of TCP projects. It should be recalled that the processing of requests for emergency and interregional projects will continue to be coordinated by headquarters in the interest of speedy approval and given the related authority of the Assistant Director-General responsible for technical cooperation and given that such projects are usually operated by headquarter units.

42. The path shows that the FAO Representative is fully in control of the project identification, formulation and clearance process. In particular, the FAO Representative is responsible for the dialogue with the Government regarding the prioritization of project ideas and for coordinating the technical support to the formulation of the project from the best placed source (decentralized or headquarters). The responsibilities of the FAO technical units, both at headquarters and in the decentralized offices, for assisting in the formulation of TCP projects remain unchanged.

43. The decentralization of the TCP as described above requires a significant training effort in order to familiarize all actors in the process with their new roles and to allow them to play their parts in a manner that will neither create new delays in the processing of request nor jeopardize the technical quality or the respect for the TCP criteria and other rules. In this regard, in addition to the training foreseen for Regional Offices on the management of the regional allocation (paragraph 38), the Secretariat is developing new guidelines and training materials for staff in FAO Representations, Subregional and Regional Offices, and for technical staff at headquarters, on all new aspects of the TCP project cycle from the initial discussions with counterparts on ideas to the approval of the project. Furthermore, measures will be taken to eliminate or significantly simplify the procedures and rules that apply to the TCP, and to replace ex-ante control by ex-post monitoring in order to facilitate the transition from headquarters to decentralized TCP management.

C. TIMELINE

44. Historically, the main causes of delays, when they have occurred, in processing TCP requests have been the following:

- absence of sufficient information to analyse the request;
- need for reformulation of the project proposal for which the FAO technical units require inputs from various stakeholders;
- excessive number of requests received requiring prioritization; and
- work load of FAO staff at all levels, in particular in the technical units and the Service within the Technical Cooperation Department responsible for the TCP.

45. It is expected that the first constraint above will be addressed through the requirement for minimum information referred to in section III A above, which should also contribute to limiting the need for fundamental reformulations of project proposals. Similarly, the higher degree of involvement by the decentralized office closest to the origin of the request in the prioritization of TCP requests and in the coordination of project formulation, combined with simplified procedures and project documents, is expected to limit delays due to substantive reformulations or due to an excessive number of requests being pending simultaneously. However, while the absence of involvement by the Technical Cooperation Department in the approval path of most TCP requests eliminates some of the steps in the current approval process, the greatest remaining constraint to

rapid approval of projects is the difficulty for FAO technical staff to respond in a timely manner to calls for their assistance due to work pressure.

46. While this latter constraint cannot be solved in the specific context of TCP decentralization, the Secretariat expects that, over time, the time lag from submission to FAO of the request for national TCP assistance to approval will be reduced to an average of 4 months (as compared to the previous average of 6 months), as illustrated in annex 6. The time required to process a project under the responsibility of the Subregional Coordinator or Regional Representative is not expected to vary from this. As a consequence, the Secretariat estimates the average range of time required for the processing of a TCP request to approval is the following:

Average ranges for TCP approval process

Development projects	2 months < 4 months < 10 months
Emergency projects*	2 weeks < 2 months < 4 months
TCP Facility	1 week < 3 weeks < 6 weeks

* Processing and approval under the responsibility of the ADG/TC.

47. However, it is important to realize that this improvement will not be noticeable immediately following the decentralization as many actors whose prior contact with, and understanding of the details of the TCP management and request processing have been slight, will become very important players and will need to familiarize themselves with their new responsibilities.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

48. The Secretariat looks forward to receiving the Committee's recommendations and the Council's approval regarding the issues raised related to the TCP approval criteria with particular reference to the interpretation and possible modifications of country eligibility for TCP assistance (paragraph 14 and 18, respectively), to the reformulation of aims and purposes to ensure convergence of countries' needs and the Organization's agreed Strategic Framework and Organizational Results (paragraph 21), and to the introduction of a flexible ceiling for the TCP Facility (paragraph 27).

49. Taking into consideration any advice that the Committee may wish to provide regarding the minimum information requirements for requests and the project cycle steps and related timeline for approval of TCP projects, the Secretariat will, subject to the availability of the required funding, continue the preparations of the roll-out of the decentralization of the TCP management to FAO Representatives, Subregional Coordinators and Regional Representatives, to be effective as of January 2010.

ANNEX 1

TCP Approval Criteria

CRITERIA	DEVELOPMENT TCP ASSISTANCE	EMERGENCY TCP ASSISTANCE
1. Country Eligibility	All FAO Members are eligible for access to TCP-supported technical assistance. However, TCP gives special attention to assisting the neediest countries, especially the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs), Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs), and/or Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Access by high-income developing countries and developed countries to technical assistance through the TCP modality should only be on a full cost-recovery basis.	Fifteen percent of the TCP appropriation is indicatively earmarked for emergency and rehabilitation projects, accessible to all FAO Members.
2. Aims and Purposes	TCP-supported assistance should contribute to household or national food security, improved rural livelihoods and poverty reduction, in line with the World Food Summit target, the MDGs, and FAO's strategic goals and objectives, including those related to the provision of global public goods.	TCP-supported emergency and rehabilitation assistance should be provided in direct anticipation of or follow-up to emergencies that fall within FAO's sphere of action; assistance should be directed explicitly at restoring the livelihoods of the poorest and most vulnerable households affected by the emergency, and should seek to reduce the vulnerability of emergency-affected households in the future.
3. Country or Regional Priorities	TCP-supported assistance should be directed at national or regional priorities linked to the aims and purposes identified in Criterion 2 and, where they are in place, should be consistent with FAO's National Medium-Term Priority Frameworks and emerge from TCP priority-setting processes at the country level.	Emergency TCP assistance is not subject to any priority setting process.
4. Critical Gap or Problem	TCP-supported assistance should be directed at a clearly defined critical technical or policy gap or problem that has been identified by beneficiaries or stakeholders and which necessitates technical cooperation within the time frame that can be provided by the Programme but which either cannot or should not be provided through other resources.	Emergency TCP assistance should be designed for very rapid response in support of interventions in thematic areas in which the Organization has a demonstrated comparative advantage.
5. Sustainable Impacts	TCP-supported assistance should result in clearly defined outputs and outcomes leading to impacts. It should have catalytic or multiplier effects such as increased mobilization of investment funds. The outcomes and impacts should be sustainable. TCP requests will not be accepted when they are a consequence of the ineffective follow-up to previous TCPs.	TCP emergency assistance should be directed at the sustainable rehabilitation of productive activities and at technical cooperation to support effective government (or donor) responses. TCP-supported emergency and rehabilitation assistance should be directed at interventions that increase the likelihood of additional donor and/or government resources being directed to immediate relief and longer-term rehabilitation. Repetitive assistance to address recurrent types of emergencies in the same country should be avoided and be redirected towards more lasting impact assistance for the prevention of and preparedness for these same emergencies.

CRITERIA	DEVELOPMENT TCP ASSISTANCE	EMERGENCY TCP ASSISTANCE
6. Scale and Duration	No TCP project should require a budget of more than USD 500 000 and should be completed within 24 months. The duration may be extended to 36 months, when justified, and on a case-by-case basis. The budget ceiling for a TCP Facility project is USD 200 000 per biennium and the project should be completed by the end of the biennium in which it was approved.	
7. Government Commitment	Requests for TCP assistance should include a formal commitment by government/s or regional organizations to provide all necessary inputs, staff and institutional arrangements to ensure the timely and effective start-up, implementation and follow-up of the requested TCP-supported assistance.	
8. Capacity-building	Wherever possible, TCP-supported assistance should help build national or regional capacities to ensure that the critical gaps and problems to which they are directed would either not appear again or that they could be resolved effectively at the national or regional level.	TCP-supported emergency and rehabilitation assistance should increase the capacity of the government and affected communities and households to either withstand, or respond to, similar shocks in the future, without resorting to external assistance.
9. Gender-sensitivity	TCP-supported assistance must be gender-sensitive in identification, design and implementation, in line with the Organization's Gender Plan of Action.	
10. Partnership and Participation	Wherever possible, TCP-supported assistance should contribute to new or strengthened partnerships and alliances, including through co-financing, and should lead to the increased participation of food-insecure and poor men and women in key decision-making processes.	

ANNEX 2

List of “special attention” countries (as of 17 February 2009)
(FAO Members)

1	Afghanistan	33	Djibouti	65	<u>Marshall Islands</u>	96	Sri Lanka
2	Albania	34	<u>Dominica</u>	66	Mauritania	97	Sudan
3	Angola	35	<u>Dominican Republic</u>	67	<u>Mauritius</u>	98	<u>Suriname</u>
4	<u>Antigua and Barbuda</u>	36	Egypt	68	<u>Micronesia, Federated States of</u>	99	Swaziland
5	Armenia	37	Equatorial Guinea	69	Mongolia	100	Syrian Arab Republic
6	Azerbaijan	38	Eritrea	70	Morocco	101	Tajikistan
7	<u>Bahamas</u>	39	Ethiopia	71	Mozambique	102	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
8	<u>Bahrain</u>	40	<u>Fiji</u>	72	Myanmar	103	Timor-Leste
9	Bangladesh	41	Gambia	73	<u>Nauru</u>	104	Togo
10	<u>Barbados</u>	42	Georgia	74	Nepal	105	<u>Tonga</u>
11	Belarus	43	Ghana	75	Nicaragua	106	<u>Trinidad and Tobago</u>
12	<u>Belize</u>	44	<u>Grenada</u>	76	Niger	107	Turkmenistan
13	Benin	45	Guinea	77	Nigeria	108	Tuvalu
14	Bhutan	46	Guinea-Bissau	78	Niue	109	Uganda
15	Bolivia	47	<u>Guyana</u>	79	Pakistan	110	United Republic of Tanzania
16	Bosnia and Herzegovina	48	Haiti	80	<u>Palau</u>	111	Uzbekistan
17	Botswana	49	Honduras	81	<u>Papua New Guinea</u>	112	Vanuatu
18	Burkina Faso	50	India	82	Paraguay	113	Yemen
19	Burundi	51	Indonesia	83	Philippines	114	Zambia
20	Cambodia	52	Iraq	84	Republic of Moldova	115	Zimbabwe
21	Cameroon	53	<u>Jamaica</u>	85	Rwanda		
22	Cape Verde	54	Kazakhstan	86	<u>Saint Kitts and Nevis</u>		
23	Central African Republic	55	Kenya	87	<u>Saint Lucia</u>		
24	Chad	56	Kiribati	88	<u>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</u>		
25	China	57	Kyrgyzstan	89	Samoa		
26	Comoros	58	Lao People's Democratic Republic	90	Sao Tome and Principe		
27	Congo	59	Lesotho	91	Senegal		
28	Cook Islands	60	Liberia	92	<u>Seychelles</u>		
29	Côte d'Ivoire	61	Madagascar	93	Sierra Leone		
30	<u>Cuba</u>	62	Malawi	94	Solomon Islands		
31	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	63	Maldives	95	Somalia		
32	Democratic Republic of the Congo	64	Mali				

Countries indicated in **bold** are LDCs

Countries indicated in underline are SIDS

Source: FAO and Office of the High Representative for LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS

ANNEX 3

List of High Income Economies (as of 17 February 2009)
(FAO members only)

1	Andorra	17	Germany	33	Oman
2	Antigua and Barbuda	18	Greece	34	Portugal
3	Australia	19	Hungary	35	Qatar
4	Austria	20	Iceland	36	San Marino
5	Bahamas	21	Ireland	37	Saudi Arabia
6	Bahrain	22	Israel	38	Slovak Republic
7	Barbados	23	Italy	39	Slovenia
8	Belgium	24	Japan	40	Spain
9	Canada	25	Korea, Rep.	41	Sweden
10	Cyprus	26	Kuwait	42	Switzerland
11	Czech Republic	27	Luxembourg	43	Trinidad and Tobago
12	Denmark	28	Malta	44	United Arab Emirates
13	Estonia	29	Monaco	45	United Kingdom
14	Equatorial Guinea	30	Netherlands	46	United States
15	Finland	31	New Zealand		
16	France	32	Norway		

Countries indicated in **bold** are included in the list of “special attention” countries (annex 2)

Source: The World Bank

ANNEX 4

List of “Intermediate” countries (as of 17 February 2009)
(FAO members only)

1	Algeria	13	Iran	25	Poland
2	Argentina	14	Jordan	26	Romania
3	Brazil	15	Latvia	27	Russian Federation
4	Bulgaria	16	Lebanon	28	Serbia
5	Chile	17	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	29	South Africa
6	Colombia	18	Lithuania	30	Thailand
7	Costa Rica	19	Malaysia	31	Tunisia
8	Croatia	20	Mexico	32	Turkey
9	Ecuador	21	Montenegro	33	Ukraine
10	El Salvador	22	Namibia	34	Uruguay
11	Gabon	23	Panama	35	Venezuela
12	Guatemala	24	Peru	36	Viet Nam

Countries indicated in **bold** are members of the European Union

Source: FAO

ANNEX 5

List of European Union member countries (as of 17 February 2009)
(FAO members)

1	Austria	10	Germany	19	Netherlands
2	Belgium	11	Greece	20	Poland
3	Bulgaria	12	Hungary	21	Portugal
4	Cyprus	13	Ireland	22	Romania
5	Czech Republic	14	Italy	23	Slovak Republic
6	Denmark	15	Latvia	24	Slovenia
7	Estonia	16	Lithuania	25	Spain
8	Finland	17	Luxembourg	26	Sweden
9	France	18	Malta	27	United Kingdom

Source: The European Union

ANNEX 6

Approval path for TCP project and timeline

NATIONAL PROJECT

(under the coordination of a FAO Representative and with the peer review undertaken at the Subregional Office)

X= Indicates responsibility for action being taken

C= Indicates unit that can be consulted or call upon formally or informally for assistance or advice

Step	Recipient	FAORep	SRO/Peer ReviewQuality Assurance	Regional Office	Technical units*	Average time required and possible reasons for delays
Pre-request (idea stage)						Cannot be estimated, depends on national stakeholders
Problem identification	X	C			C	
1st check on availability of TCP resources from the regional. allocation		X		X		
Priority setting for TCP	X	X				
Preparation of minimum request info	X	C			C	
Submit request and minimum information to FAORep	X					
Official pipeline and preparation of project document						1 week
Inclusion of request in the official pipeline		X		X		Should the official pipeline be full, consultations on priorities may create delays. This should occur rarely.

Official contact to concerned technical units for assistance with review and formulation.		X				The technical officers concerned should have been made aware of issue at the pre-request stage.
Project formulation						10 weeks
If technically supported, preparation of project document		X			X	The greatest risk of delay occurs here as the technical officers concerned may be unavailable.

Appraisal						1 week
2nd check on availability of TCP resources based on estimated budget		X		X		
Technical clearance		X			X	Some delay may occur due to unavailability of technical officers, but rarely.
Appraisal against TCP and PPRC criteria		X				Delay may occur due to work load of the FAO Representative.
Check respect for standard project document format, TCP rules and operational feasibility		X				
Submission of project document, appraisals and clearances to the peer review committee for quality check		X				
Final quality assurance						1 week
Review of project review sheet of (technical clearance, respect for TCP and PPRC criteria, and project design)			X			Contacts between the committee and the submitter to solve any issues may delay the process
Finalization						3 weeks
Finalization of the project document and the budget	C	X			C	
Confirmation that resources have been allocated from the regional allocation				X		
Recipient informed of approval		X				
TOTAL TIME						16 weeks

* at decentralized level or at headquarters, as required