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1. Introduction

1 This Annex is a supporting document of the main report of the Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations’ (FAO’s) contribution to Strategic Objective (SO) 2. The scope, methodologies and limitations are described in the Terms of Reference of the evaluation.

1.1 The SO2 Programme

2 The arrangements for the implementation of FAO’s Strategic Framework were first established for the 2014-15 biennium and evolved in subsequent years, with adjustments of the delivery and monitoring processes based on emerging needs and lessons learned.

3 The delivery mechanisms used by FAO to achieve Strategic Objective 2 include Country Programming Frameworks (CPF), Major Areas of Work (MAWs), Regional Initiatives and Corporate Technical Activities (CTAs). These delivery mechanisms are managed by multidisciplinary “delivery teams”, comprising staff from across FAO who are assigned the roles of focal points and/or delivery managers. As of the 2016-17 biennium, Major Areas of Work have been largely discontinued as a delivery mechanism, to be gradually replaced by Global Knowledge Products.¹

4 Regional initiatives were first assigned to one of the Strategic Objectives, although they bring together multidisciplinary teams which contribute to multiple Strategic Objectives. SO2 was initially in the lead for four Regional Initiatives: in Africa for the Regional Initiatives Integrated Management of Agricultural Landscapes; in Asia-Pacific for the Regional Rice Initiative and the Regional Blue Growth Initiative; and in the Near East and North Africa for the Regional Water Scarcity Initiative. In addition, regional initiatives led by other Strategic Objectives also incorporate work areas which contribute to SO2.

5 Corporate Technical Activities are FAO mandated areas of work managed directly by heads of organizational units, contributing to respective Strategic Objective programmes and aimed at facilitating the adoption and implementation of international instruments and governance mechanisms. There are 125 CTAs in FAO, of which 30 are linked to SO2. A full list of CTAs related to SO2 is available in Table 3.

6 At the country level, the primary delivery channel is the Country Programming Framework, an agreement between the Government and FAO defining where FAO should focus its activities over a period of two to four years.

2. Overview of Major Areas of Work (MAWs)

2.1 Major Areas of Work

Major Areas of Work are amongst the delivery mechanisms defined under SO2 which were introduced shortly after the design of the Strategic Framework. MAWs were introduced to promote cross-sectoral dialogue within FAO and contribute to some of the priority areas identified by Strategic Programme (SP) 2. The MAWs were mainly designed at the corporate level, as a niche to FAO headquarters cross-sectoral work. SO2’s five MAWs were: i) Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA-MAW); ii) Ecosystems and Biodiversity Services (ESB-MAW); iii) Efficient Resource Use (ERU-MAW); iv) Blue Growth Initiative (BGI-MAW); and v) Sustainable Food and Agriculture (SFA-MAW).

2.2 Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA-MAW)

Climate-Smart Agriculture existed prior to SO2, led by the Department of Natural Resources, and was an inherently cross-sectoral concept. CSA aims at combining action to increase agricultural productivity and incomes with adaptation to climate change; and reduce, when possible, greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sectors.

CSA components were:

- Support to countries to ensure that the agricultural sectors and the CSA approach are included in the mid- to long-term development planning processes and investment decisions.
- Support to countries in creating the required policy, financial and enabling environment.
- Technical support and capacity development of key institutions and organizations.
- Identification and assessment of technological, management and policy options for climate change adaptation and mitigation under a climate-smart agriculture approach.
- Support countries in the preparation of, and readiness for, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) related planning, implementation, reporting and financing mechanism.
- Support to international governance mechanisms that assist in the transformation of the agricultural sectors towards becoming more climate-smart, which includes support to the Global Alliance on Climate-Smart Agriculture.

CSA was then adopted as a MAW. The CSA-MAW was mentioned as the one with the most tangible deliverable, around which contributors could articulate their respective contributions. As reported by FAO staff, a reason for the recognized success of the CSA-MAW was that indeed quite early, it identified a deliverable that would combine the efforts of all CSA-MAW participants - the CSA Sourcebook. This document compelled the MAW members (e.g. ESA, AGP and NRC) to contribute towards identified outputs and motivated collaboration on a common deliverable. The CSA sourcebook was for technically interested policymakers and development aid workers.

2.3 Ecosystems and Biodiversity Services (ESB-MAW)

The ESB-MAW’s goal was to demonstrate the importance of multi-disciplinary approaches to the management of ecosystem services and biodiversity. As reported by FAO staff who were
involved in the ESB-MAW’s cross-sectorial work, the process that brought people from various FAO units and sectors together was valued as useful. However, ESB-MAW’s work was more inclined to support specific sectors (e.g. forestry) and the Conference on Biodiversity brought about better examples of collaboration across divisions (e.g. CBL and CBD).

One of the main results of this MAW was a publication on Landscape for life: approaches to Landscape management for sustainable food and agriculture released in 2017. This report was presented at the Global Landscapes Forum in Bonn and was well received, indicating high demand and appreciation. In addition, the conference held in FAO from 29 to 31 May on biodiversity mainstreaming can also be considered a by-product of the work under this MAW. Feedbacks from participants to the Biodiversity Mainstreaming Conference held in May gave indications that FAO, through its work on Ecosystems and Biodiversity Services managed to raise the profile of biodiversity in agriculture. The work initiated under this MAW continued under two global knowledge products: one on Landscapes and Seascapes and one on a Biodiversity mainstreaming platform.

2.4 Efficiency of Resource kUse (ERU-MAW)

The rationale for this MAW focused on promoting the Efficiency of Resource Use aligned to FAO’s Save and Grow approach, suggesting ways to use fewer inputs to produce greater yields to tackle the need for increase production in a context of degraded natural resources. This MAW is thus quite central to the SO2 concept. The ERU-MAW’s purpose was to foster programmes and projects that have considered the various dimensions of resource use efficiency with a broader outlook by facilitating cross-divisional exchanges.

This was done by convening meetings every two weeks, among technical officers of various relevant sectors, to screen projects or concepts. Meetings were attended on a voluntary basis and the MAW had limited financial resources to offer. Notwithstanding, attendance and interest was reported as high. Beyond the benefits of these discussions on the integration of programmes, the ERU-MAW was reported to have resulted in building stronger relationships across technical sectors and disseminating a cross-sectoral, collaborative and integrated working culture, and collaborative through bridging various divisions at various hierarchical levels.

To some degree, the discontinuation of the ERU-MAW reduced its potential to improve related projects’ quality and integration of inter-sectoral perspectives. Some of the inter-departmental relationships are reported to have continued to some extent after the ERU-MAW was terminated, both formally (e.g. the global knowledge product Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) has to a large extent build on the group of ERU-MAW for their meetings) and informally.

2.5 Blue Growth Initiative (BGI-MAW)

Within the Strategic Planning Framework and for the implementation of the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) 2014-15, the Global Initiative on Blue Growth in Support of Food Security, Poverty Alleviation and the Sustainable Management of Aquatic Resources (BGI) was identified as a MAW anchored in SO2. The BGI-MAW aimed at improving the governance and management of aquatic resources, the conservation of their biodiversity and habitats, the empowerment of concerned communities, adaptation of vulnerable communities to climatic changes and improved resilience to natural disasters and crises. It aimed at
supporting improved national policies and processes for the management of fisheries and aquaculture, better practices in intensification of aquaculture and reduction of aquatic animal disease risks, more efficient seafood value chains and status of aquatic ecosystems and habitats, and reduced proportion of overfished stock.

17 The BGI-MAW was intertwined with the Blue Growth Initiative-Regional Initiative implemented in Asia, and was built on certain corporate technical areas which presented a challenge for discerning respective outcomes. At the Global level, the BGI supported the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), the related International Plans of Action (e.g. for managing fishing capacity, for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing), International Agreements and Guidelines, the international guidelines on securing sustainable small-scale fisheries, the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests, the FAO/International Labour Organization (ILO)/International Maritime Organization (IMO) instruments on the safety of fishing vessels and fishers, the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), and improving practices in fishing, aquaculture.

18 The BGI intended to build on successful cases that could be replicated in a wider range of countries, with the aim of scaling up proven solutions for the benefit of communities and countries. Focus countries for the BGI were: Algeria, Gabon, Indonesia, Morocco and Senegal. Using Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) Facility and other funds, FAO supported these countries to promote and implement the Blue Growth concepts in their national policies and strategies on fisheries and aquaculture.

2.6 Sustainable Food and Agriculture (SFA-MAW)

19 Sustainable Food and Agriculture is SO2’s overarching principle and its concept needed to be clarified for the Organization. This MAW was therefore quite different in nature in that it intended to frame the Organization’s vision to sustainable agriculture. In fact, the deliverable coming out of this MAW is a publication titled: “Building a common vision for sustainable food and agriculture” which aimed to develop a common approach for FAO’s work on sustainability, and identify key underpinning principles. This MAW thus consisted in framing a set of consultations and discussions as a basis for developing an overarching framework and key principles for the Organization.

20 The publication was communicated at the corporate level and well received, and despite coming in late (2017) it may contribute to bringing clarity within FAO and to external stakeholders on what are FAO’s driving forces towards sustainability.
3. Overview of the Regional Initiatives

From the 2014-2017 Mid-Plan and Programme of Work and Budget, FAO identified a total of 15 Regional Initiatives. These include:

- Regional Office for Africa (RAF) (3): Africa’s 2025 Zero Hunger Challenge, Sustainable production intensification and value chain development in Sub-Saharan Africa; Building resilience in Africa’s drylands.
- Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) (3): Asia and the Pacific’s Zero Hunger Challenge, Asia and the Pacific’s Regional Rice Initiative, Asia and the Pacific’s Blue Growth Initiative, Value chains for food security and nutrition in the Pacific Islands.
- Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU) (2): Empowering smallholders and family farms in Europe and Central Asia; Agrifood trade and regional integration in Europe and Central Asia.
- Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean (RLC) (3): Support to the Hunger-Free Latin America and Caribbean; Family farming and inclusive food systems for sustainable rural development; Sustainable use of natural resources, adaptation to climate change and disaster risk management.

Initially, Regional Initiatives had been tagged to contribute to one or more Strategic Objectives. However, there was a clear demarcation that a specific Strategic Programme closely supports a Regional Initiative. In addition, in countries where the Regional Initiatives are being implemented there is often a Strategic Programme that acts as a lead. In the case of Strategic Programme 2, the Regional Initiatives that it closely supports are in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and the Near East and North Africa (listed below). The Regional Initiatives in Latin America and the Caribbean, and Europe and Central Asia are linked to SO2 but are led by other Strategic Programmes.

- "Sustainable production intensification and value chain development in Sub-Saharan Africa" (Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda).
- "Asia and the Pacific’s Regional Rice Initiative" (Indonesia, Lao PDR and the Philippines).

---

2 In the 2014-2017 MTP, this Regional Initiative was called: Integrated management of agricultural landscapes in Africa.

3 In the 2014-2017 MTP, this Regional Initiative was stated as two separate initiatives: (1) The initiative on family farming and rural territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean; and (2) Improving food systems in the Caribbean.

4 SP 5 is the lead SP in this Country.

5 SP 5 is the lead SP in this Country.

6 SP 1 is the lead SP in this Country.
• “Asia and the Pacific’s Blue Growth Initiative” (Bangladesh, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka,7 Timor Leste and Viet Nam).
• “The Near East and North Africa’s Water Scarcity initiative” (Egypt,8 Iran, Jordan, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia,9 United Arab Emirates, West Bank and Gaza Strip10 and Yemen11).

3.1 Sustainable production intensification and value chain development in Sub-Saharan Africa

The Regional Initiative “Sustainable production intensification and value chain development in Africa” aimed at supporting the development of value chains of livestock, crop and aquaculture, including promoting better access to markets in order to reduce losses and enhance food quality and safety. The Regional Initiative planned to support the development of transboundary trade in agricultural products. A large part of its capacity development component was to foster sharing of knowledge and best practices on innovative and sustainable production systems, technologies and inclusive value chain development (e.g. small-scale irrigation, climate-smart agriculture and conservation agriculture, cassava value chain development and gender mainstreaming).

While Kenya was identified as a focus country for the Regional Initiative “Sustainable Production Intensification and Value Chain Development in Africa”, the evaluation team did not identify any SO2-related activities being carried out under this initiative, and the Regional Initiative was not identified by stakeholders as a significant driver of activities or of enhanced integration. Nevertheless, some respondents say that the value chain approach promoted by this Regional Initiative influenced the development process, which has gone beyond focus on production and ensured that constraints in food systems are handled holistically. For example, the project GCP/KEN/082/USA relates to Regional Initiative 2 but does not receive funding from this initiative.

Though Uganda and Zambia were not focus countries for the Regional Initiative, there were positive results observed. In Uganda, the Regional Initiative’s positive results could be attributed to the funding source – the Africa Solidarity Trust Fund. This funding mechanism demonstrated SO2-related projects in Uganda that linked youth employment and increase in aquaculture and livestock production. In Zambia, resources from the Regional Initiative were used to develop a Green Climate Fund (GCF) proposal. This process also facilitated collaboration among the representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and various partners from the civil society.

Also, in Zambia communication was the key factor that facilitated the positive results of the Regional Initiative. The FAO Representative (FAOR), together with the government counterparts from the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, and Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock attended the 2016 event organized by SO2 in Rwanda. This awareness-raising initiative helped the FAO Country Office and counterparts in embedding the SO2 concepts in their Country Programming Framework. It also assisted the

---

7 SP 4 is the lead SP in this Country.
8 SP 3 is the lead SP in this Country.
9 SP 3 is the lead SP in this Country.
10 SP 5 is the lead SP in this Country.
11 SP 4 is the lead SP in this Country.
Government of Zambia in addressing a multi-sectoral approach in their 7th National Development Plan.

3.2 Asia Regional Rice Initiative (RRI) and Asia Blue Growth Initiative

27 The Regional Rice Initiative formulation was in response to the 2008 rice price crisis. Regional Rice Initiative had two phases. The RRI Phase I (RRI-1) was approved at the 31st Session of the FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Pacific (APRC) held in Hanoi in March 2012. RRI-1 had two foci: first, to strengthen the capacities of Member Countries on rice and to develop a regional rice strategy to harmonize diverse rice-related issues. In 2014, Regional Rice Initiative Phase 2 was approved by the 32nd Session of the FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Pacific. This Phase had three major thrusts:

i. Innovative and sustainable farming practices applied through a Save and Grow approach adopted by rice farmers and local communities in rice ecosystems to sustainably produce more and better with less inputs, thereby increasing incomes and ultimately improving food and nutrition security (pilot and demo projects).

ii. Knowledge and evidence based on sustainability and resource use efficiency expanded to corroborate the effectiveness of the "Regional Rice Initiative" approach tested by local rice farming communities (monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and knowledge management).

iii. National rice policies or strategies (re)formulated and implemented drawing on the vision and strategic options suggested by the "Regional Rice Strategy for Asia and the Pacific", while contributing to regional and global policymaking processes.

28 The strategic goal of the Blue Growth Initiative is that "Blue Growth is the sustainable growth and development emanating from economic activities in the oceans, wetlands and coastal zones that minimize environmental degradation, biodiversity loss and unsustainable use of living aquatic resources, and maximize economic and social benefits". The Blue Growth is rooted on the concepts of the green economy and blue economy promoted at the Rio+20 Conference, and Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. In the Asia-Pacific Region, FAO’s Blue Growth Initiative as approved by the 32nd Regional Conference has four broad objectives: i) improve the utilization efficiency to aquaculture resources; ii) improve production efficiency with reduced impacts on the environment; iii) increase the resilience of farmers and the sector; and iv) improve equity and social acceptability along the aquaculture value chain.

29 There was strong support coming from the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) for the Rice Initiative. This was evident in the multitudes of regional-based technical cooperation projects that were approved. During 2015-17, rice-fish promotion trials have been running in five provinces in Lao PDR and there were various documents produced in support of rice-fish farming. However, most respondents were apprehensive about adopting the technology because of the limited guidance on scaling up. In some cases in Bangladesh, when rice-fish farming were piloted, due to the high productivity of the fish within the paddy fields (with additional inputs), some farmers shifted to fish farming instead.

30 In Lao PDR, the Blue Growth Initiative organically merged with the Rice Initiative and promoted a strong rice ecosystem approach that was taken up by the Government and renamed as “Green Rice Landscape”. This is promoted as a practice, a vehicle to consolidate
development activities focused on rice. The success of the adoption of the approach could be attributed to the rice production target of Lao PDR which was strategically being assisted by FAO.

31 The rice production sector in Lao PDR is dwarfed by its neighbours, Thailand and Viet Nam. Strategically, the Government of Lao PDR decided to focus on the production of high-quality sticky rice, which is what it is known for and ventures into niche markets (including organic markets). This was in perfect synchronicity with the “Green Rice Landscape” approach. Aside from the technical assistance on the production side, to an extent, FAO has also assisted in the packaging and marketing. In 2018, the Regional Rice Initiative was discontinued. This poses a potential gap in the support for the Government who has seriously bought in to the Regional Rice Initiative through the Green Rice Landscape programme.

32 In Bangladesh, ‘Blue Economy’ is a term used explicitly in government strategy and lends its name to the “Maritime Affairs Unit (for the Blue Economy)” which leads work in this area. However, joint initiative with FAO under this banner does not appear to have taken place, beyond FAO’s participation in a conference on the Blue Economy organized by the Maritime Affairs Unit in November 2017. The Maritime Affairs Unit explicitly requested that FAO provide more assistance in this area, especially with respect to potential underexploited offshore fishery resources. The Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock noted that the original Blue Economy Initiatives were funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Malaysia, and the World Bank is now developing initiatives which FAO is reported to only play a minor role in.

33 As the Strategic Objectives mature in the Asia-Pacific Region, two new Regional Initiatives have emerged, the One Health Initiative and Climate Change Initiative. It is anticipated that the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific’s (RAP’s) work on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and the Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Diseases (ECTAD) will be positioned under One Health. In addition, the broad range of activities such as Climate-Smart Livestock and the United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD) will be under the Climate Change Initiative. In the countries visited by the evaluation, there are opportunities for FAO to situate itself to respond to emerging sustainability using the entry point of regional initiatives such as climate change. In Viet Nam, respondents made it clear that production systems need to be made adaptable to climate change issues. For example, in the crop production and fisheries in the southern part of the country, FAO is working with the Government to further study rice and shrimp farming. This practice makes it possible to adapt flood plains used for rice farming for production of shrimp, when there is salt intrusion due to climate change.

34 Regional Initiatives should be flexible and should be used to fit the CPF and Regional Priorities, guided by the Strategic Objectives as a large and general framework. It should be flexible enough to access needed technical support stemming from the Strategic Objective focal points or Strategic Programme teams, rather than being boxed in a particular Strategic Objective.

3.3 The Near East and North Africa’s Water Scarcity Initiative

35 The FAO Regional Water Scarcity Initiative was formulated in response to the request of the FAO Regional Conference for the Near East and North Africa that identified the issue as a central priority of Member States. The initiative aims at supporting countries in streamlining
policies, governance and practices to formulate effective investment plans and adopt efficient agricultural practices. The Initiative supports the major policy processes in the region, including the "Arab Water Security Strategy 2010-2030" and the "Regional Initiative for the Assessment of Climate Change Impacts on Water Resources and Socio-Economic Vulnerability in the Arab Region". The initiative is being implemented in Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Morocco, Oman, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, West Bank and Gaza Strip and Yemen.

The creation and implementation of the Regional Water Scarcity Initiative has been useful for FAO and Member Countries in a number of ways. For external stakeholders, it has been effective in organizing and communicating FAO’s work in a specific thematic area in a clear way, by compiling several initiatives and projects into a cohesive programme. According to FAO staff, the Regional Initiative has been instrumental in starting a debate around the strategic use of water resources and introducing the concept of water productivity. However, some government stakeholders indicated that such ideas were already present irrespective of FAO. Whether FAO has led or followed this debate, the fact remains that creating the Regional Initiative was appreciated by partners and was useful for FAO to present itself as an important player in the area of sustainable water management in agriculture. Also, it helps in positioning FAO as a leading organization in technical assistance on water use in agriculture.

In Morocco, the Regional Initiatives were used to respond to gender issues, as the experience in gender-sensitive use of groundwater in Berrerchid. Counterparts involved in Morocco appreciated the inter-sectorial dialogue that this created, a key achievement in a context where inter-sectoral conflicts on water are very common. Owing also to FAOR’s dynamism, the inter-sectorial dialogue helped reach decisions and move forward, with FAO playing an important facilitation role in the establishment of a national multi-disciplinary and inter-ministerial team to work on water issues.

For FAO, the value of the Regional Initiative lies in the fact that it created an umbrella framework which focuses FAO’s work in this area. The creation of the Regional Initiative, with a designated Delivery Manager who can draw on staff and non-staff resources, ensured to some extent that the efforts of various thematic areas are aligned with the broad themes which are relevant for the region, around which the regional initiatives are structured. In this sense the Regional Initiative has created a more programmatic approach; however, this exists within the boundaries of the FAO business model of a membership organization responding to country needs and mobilizing donor contributions. On the other hand, the greater responsibilities given to Delivery Managers has come at the expense of some areas of work which do not have a major role in the regional initiatives, and therefore have been receiving less FAO resources. In the Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa (RNE), examples of these include Fisheries and Forestry, important SO2 areas, however do not have a role in the Regional Water Scarcity Initiative and therefore have been overall reduced in recent years. In fact, the Regional Initiative evolved over time and narrowed its focus from all SO2 related areas to greater emphasis on water, thereby de-emphasizing other SO2 areas. This demonstrates that the Regional Initiative as a delivery mechanism has been effective in responding to Member Countries’ needs and in drawing on FAO technical expertise.

12 SP 3 is the lead SP in this Country.
13 SP 3 is the lead SP in this Country.
14 SP 5 is the lead SP in this Country.
15 SP 4 is the lead SP in this Country.
Resource mobilization at the regional level remains a challenge, as most donors maintain presence and activities at country level. However, the establishment of the Regional Initiative on Water was instrumental to the mobilization of resources for the region. This challenge in acquiring regional funding is also evident in the fact that the country level portfolios are significantly larger, on aggregate, than regional portfolios. However, regional projects remain significant. The most notable case is the approval in 2017 of a USD 10 million regional project funded by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), which according to FAO staff was mobilized partially because of the creation of the Regional Water Scarcity Initiative which provided an effective communication tool to ensure resource mobilization.

3.4 Regional Initiatives in the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC)

In the Regional Office for Latin America the Caribbean (RLC), there are three Regional Initiatives that are being implemented but none are led by SP2. These include “Support to the Hunger-Free Latin America and Caribbean”; “Family farming and inclusive food systems for sustainable rural development”; “Sustainable use of natural resources, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management”. The last Regional Initiative mentioned is the closest to SP2 and is implemented in Belize, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay and St. Vincent and Grenadines.

Regional Initiatives have provided the main structure to the regional offices' work. Although SP2 was not formally leading any of them, it totals the largest number of results reported by the region, and therefore SO2 acknowledged to be of major importance in the region. Nonetheless, the absence of a formal role by staff assigned to SP2 implies that measuring the contribution of SP2 to regional results is challenging.

Work related to supporting sustainable production (SO2-related) was integrated as a part of the Regional Initiative on family farming and inclusive food systems for sustainable rural development, and a large part of the management in the region. The Regional Initiatives provided a platform for a multidisciplinary team within FAO to collaborate. It is also thought of as a potential resource mobilization tool, especially for South-South Cooperation.

However, the evaluation also recognized that Regional Initiatives have added an additional planning and reporting structure to the corporate strategic framework structured around Strategic Objectives. This overlap, adding to the technical responsibilities of teams in the region, has implied that some staff needed to combine multiple responsibilities and manage multiple planning and reporting lines. This also runs the risk of fragmenting the work into new silos brought about by various delivery mechanisms. To an extent, this has created some confusion in the Region.

3.5 Regional Initiatives in the Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU)

In the Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU), there are two Regional Initiatives that are being implemented, as in the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean

---

16 In the 2014-2017 MTP, this Regional Initiative was stated as two separate initiatives: (1) The initiative on family farming and rural territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean; and (2) Improving food systems in the Caribbean.
(RLC). None of these Regional initiatives are led by SP2. These Regional Initiatives include: “Empowering smallholders and family farms in Europe and Central Asia”; “Agrifood trade and regional integration in Europe and Central Asia”.

In the Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU), the Regional Initiatives are considered to be the central platform that embraces regional and country needs in a programmatic and strategic manner, while fostering cross-Strategic Programme collaboration. Regional Initiatives are not understood as a parallel delivery mechanism but as a long-term umbrella approach to deliver results, plan, programme resources as well as monitor and report results. REU believes that this programmatic Regional Initiative approach is more likely to simultaneously achieve regional objectives and FAO’s corporate objectives, enhance the regional dimensions of FAO’s work and regional and national ownership, as well as the value of the Regional Organizations functions instead of focusing too strongly on SO2 (or SOs in general) as a planning and resource allocation framework.

3.6 Corporate technical activities (CTA)

Corporate technical activities are mandated areas of work managed directly under the responsible technical divisions, contributing to Strategic Objectives and to the quality and integrity of FAO’s technical work. Resources for carrying out these activities are allocated directly by the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP) to the delivery manager concerned, and not through the Strategic Programme teams. CTAs fall under twelve possible categories: i) statistics; ii) flagship publications; iii) core units for cross-cutting themes on gender and governance; iv) internal technical networks; v) Investment Centre; vi) FAO Regional Conferences; vii) bodies established by Article III of the FAO Constitution (Committee on World Food Security - CFS); viii) bodies established by Article V of the FAO Constitution (Committee on Commodity problems (CCP), Committee on Agriculture (COAG), Committee on Fisheries (COFI), Committee on Forestry (COFO)); ix) bodies established by the Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution; x) bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution; xi) UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates; and xii) other formal agreements apart from projects (bilateral and non-governmental).

The FAO Strategic Framework identifies the “support to countries in the development and implementation of normative and standard-setting instruments” (international agreements, codes of conduct) as one of FAO’s core functions. FAO is mandated to develop these instruments at “global, regional and national levels through global governance mechanisms, policy dialogue and support and advice, coupled with the development at country level of the necessary policies and institutional capacities for their implementation”.17 The role of these instruments is particularly important for the work undertaken within the SO2 framework, which has the largest number of CTAs deemed to be linked to this Strategic Objective.18

---

17 Reviewed Strategic Framework, C 2013/7, adopted by the Conference at its 38th Session in 2013.
18 Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP) document, 11.11.2015, “Part B: All Corporate Technical Activities, showing 2016-17 Programmatic Contribution and total resources”.
48 There are 30\textsuperscript{19} CTAs which have been linked primarily to SO2, although they also contribute to other Strategic Objectives. A summary of CTAs according to each category is shown in Table 1, while the full list is shown in Table 2. Each of these groups has a distinct business model and operational structure, however they share a thematic focus on the technical areas related to SO2. The financial contribution to the CTAs consists of staff time, allocated to the respective host divisions for them to carry out activities which contribute to SO2. In some cases, CTAs also receive additional funding and contributions from other Strategic Objectives or external partners. In terms of programming, CTAs are integrated into SP2 as the delivery managers are responsible for preparing work plans in coordination with the SP2 team and for reporting achievements.

**Table 1**: Corporate Technical Activities under SO2, by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CTA</th>
<th>No. of CTAs</th>
<th>Total budget 2016-17 (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,074,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,151,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagship Publication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,132,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,568,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,926,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Most of the CTA’s work is normative and relates to the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issue (such as Gender and Climate Change), the publication of statistics and the support to international instruments and governance mechanisms (such as international agreements and conventions). The majority of CTAs under SO2 are part of the latter group, with 20 CTAs relating to adoption and implementation of international and regional agreements and conventions. An example of this work is FAO’s recent efforts towards the implementation of an international framework to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing by promoting accession to the 2009 Port State Measures Agreements (PSMA) and implementing national plans of action to combat IUU fishing. Another example relates to FAO’s work which, jointly with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), maintains the Secretariat for the implementation of conventions on harmful pesticides: the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. Table 2 below provides a breakdown of CTAs according to their host division within FAO.

\textsuperscript{19}This excludes the six items which are classified as CTAs for accountability and budgeting purposes by the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP), namely: CT11 Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division (ESP), CT58 Joint FAO/International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture (AGE), CT66 Gender focal point, CT69 Statistics Division (ESS), CT70 Investment Center Division (TCI), CT72 Climate Change Division (NRC).
Table 2: Corporate Technical Activities under SO2, by host division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host division</th>
<th>No. of CTAs</th>
<th>Total budget 2016-17 (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGA - Animal Production and Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>516 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGD - Office of the Director of the Agriculture Department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 051 704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP - Plant Production and Protection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 153 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC - Climate and Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL - Land and Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>665 059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDN - Office of the Deputy Director General for Climate and Natural Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 164 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIA - Fisheries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>961 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOA - Forestry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 363 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13 926 440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike other delivery mechanisms, CTAs relate to core activities which are relatively less affected by the introduction of the reviewed strategic framework and the Strategic Objectives as compared to Regional Initiatives and Major Areas of Work, which are new mechanisms. CTAs also have a stronger political dimension than other delivery mechanisms as they relate to FAO’s role in negotiation, standard-setting, and binding and non-binding agreements. Finally, as the financial resources available to CTAs are not managed by the SP2 team, and come directly from the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP), the SP2 team has a limited ability to direct their work towards the focus areas of SO2. This means that results and achievements of CTAs, while making important contributions to FAO’s goals do not exemplify the core focus of SO2.

Since its establishment, the SP2 management team has made efforts to establish closer links between CTAs and the other delivery mechanisms, namely Major Areas of Work and Regional Initiatives. A mapping exercise was undertaken to scope the areas of greater relevance and potential collaboration. This resulted in the identification of selected CTAs and concrete ideas for operational collaboration. For instance, SP2 identified the Investment Centre Division (TCI) as a potential partner for resource mobilization for SO2 initiatives; the Statistics Division (ESS) for collaboration on the development of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicators related to sustainable agriculture; the Commission on Genetic Resources to support Member Countries in managing their genetic resources through FAO country programmes.
4. Overview of SO2-related CTAs

This section contains a short description of some of the 36 CTAs linked primarily to SO2. It is meant to illustrate the work they undertake and how it contributes to the achievement of SO2 outcomes.

4.1 Forest Resources Assessment (FRA)

The FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment provides essential information for understanding the extent of forest resources, their condition, management and uses. These assessments are utilized within the context of the SO2/SP2 framework and programmes by providing crucial information to inform design of policies, mechanisms and interventions that contribute to improved livelihoods and resilience, better use of resources such as food, wood energy, fodder and fibre, promote biodiversity and facilitate stabilization of soils and climate. Recent FRA’s surveys rely on two sources of data: country reports and satellite imageries. Country data is collected through the Collaborative Forest Resources Questionnaire (CFRQ). This was developed by FAO with the Central African Forests Commission, Forest Europe, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the Montréal Process and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). It is intended to reduce the reporting burden and increase data consistency across organizations, as well as to standardize definitions and timing of data collection. Satellite imagery is collected through remote sensing technologies and subsequently reviewed by selected national forestry or remote sensing experts. For the FRA 2015, for instance, the global remote sensing survey was conducted with over 200 specialists from about 100 countries.20

4.2 African Forestry and Wildlife Commission (AFWC)/European Forestry Commission (EEFC)/Near East Forestry Commission (NEFC) Committee on Mediterranean Forestry Questions - Silva Mediterranea

The mission of Silva Mediterranea is to review trends in the use of forest land in the Mediterranean area and to assess the impact of changes implemented in the agricultural, industrial and urban sectors.21 Silva Mediterranea has six country-lead technical Working Groups. It also organizes the Mediterranean Forest Week every two years. This has become a regional platform for cooperation on Mediterranean forests. Silva Mediterranea is strong on partnerships: it has 12 regional partners who are mainly research organizations, three national partners comprising a ministry and two research organisations, as well as three financial partners.

4.3 Agriculture, Land and Water Use Commission for the Near East (ALAWUC)

The Agriculture and Land and Water Use Commission was established as a merger of two previous regional commissions for the Near East: the Regional Commission on Agriculture and the Regional Land and Water Use Commission, following FAO Council Resolution No.13/97. The merger was meant to further strengthen the multidisciplinary approach and promote integrated and comprehensive agricultural and rural development programmes.

---

21 http://www.fao.org/forestry/45685-0aad87e3a1d4ccc359b37c38ffcb5b1fc.pdf
Current Members are: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Cyprus, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar and Saudi Arabia.

This Commission aims to provide a forum where Member Countries can exchange information and experience, and promote joint programmes at regional and subregional levels. It provides support to FAO and other partners to identify issues and future work programmes in the Region. Support includes technical cooperation to tackle problems related to: i) land and water resources inventories for their sustainable utilization and management; ii) land use planning; iii) maintaining and updating regional databases on natural resources; iv) promoting programmes for food production, plant protection, animal health and livestock production; and v) developing agricultural research systems and efficient agricultural services to farmers.

4.4 Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA)

The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture oversees and guides the preparation of global sectoral and cross-sectoral assessments of genetic resources for food and agriculture. With its 177 Member Countries, the Commission is an intergovernmental forum where global consensus can be reached on sectoral and cross-sectoral policies relevant to biodiversity for food and agriculture. The Commission’s mandate covers all components of biodiversity for food and agriculture. Its main objectives are to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources for food and agriculture, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from their use, for present and future generations. The Commission oversees and guides the preparation of periodic global assessments as well as negotiates global action plans, codes of conduct and other instruments (e.g. the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture) relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources for food and agriculture.22

At the request of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, FAO regularly assesses the state of plant, animal, forest and water genetic resources worldwide, together with Global Plans of Action through which CGRFA Members commit to take action to promote the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources in the respective sector.23

The sectoral and cross-sectoral assessments of genetic resources for food and agriculture are prepared by FAO through a participatory, country-driven approach. The reports on the state of the world’s genetic resources are assessments of the state of the resources, their use, the drivers of genetic erosion and the challenges and opportunities to conserve and use these resources in a sustainable manner to contribute to food security and nutrition. The assessments address the state of genetic resources in the respective sectors, along with their uses, drivers that contribute to their erosion, and the challenges and opportunities involved in conserving and using them in a sustainable manner to contribute to food security and nutrition. To address the main gaps and challenges identified in the global assessments, the Commission may decide to agree on policy responses, such as Global Plans of Action through which governments commit to take action to promote the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources in the respective sector. The Commission’s Multi-Year Programme of Work foresees regular updates of the global assessments.

4.5 Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA - ITWG on AnGR)

The Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources was established by the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in 1997. The Secretariat of the ITWG on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) lies with the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) at FAO headquarters. The role of the Working Group is to review issues related to animal genetic resources and their management, to consider progress made in the implementation of the Commission’s Multi-Year Programme of Work and to address any other matters referred to by the Commission. The Working Group advises and makes recommendations to the Commission. In accordance with its statutes, the Working Group is composed of 27 countries. Members are elected at each of the Commission’s regular sessions. Meetings of the Working Group are held when required and no more than once per year.

4.6 Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA - ITWG on PGRFA)

The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture established a subsidiary Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture at its Seventh Session in 1997, to address issues specific to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. The Terms of Reference and activities of the Working Group are described in its Statutes. The Secretariat of the ITWG-PGRFA lies with the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) at FAO headquarters.

4.7 Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA - ITWG on FGR)

The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture established a subsidiary Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources in 2009 to review the situation and technical issues related to biodiversity in the area of FGR, and advise and make recommendations to the Commission on these matters. The 28 Members of the Working Group are elected every two years during regular sessions of the Commission. The Secretariat of the Working Group lies within the Forestry Department (FO) at FAO headquarters. Under SO2, the FAO Forestry Department (FO) is doing work on forest genetic resources as part of FAO’s work on genetic resources for food and agriculture for which FAO has had the global mandate since 1983. FAO’s global instruments covering GRFA work are State of the World (SOW) reports on GRFA (plant, animal, forest and soon also aquatic genetic resources and biodiversity) and their associated Global Plans of Action (GPAs).

Since 2009, FAO has been operating the Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources. This CTA represents FAO’s traditional core work. The Secretariat has organized the ITWG-FGR biannual sessions during the evaluation period, the latest one taking place in May 2018.

4.8 Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA ITWG-AQ)

At its 15th Regular Session, the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture agreed to establish the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (Working Group), specifically with the task to guide the preparation of and review the first State of the World’s Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The Working Group will be composed of 28 country delegates selected by the Commission at its 15th Session. The Commission decided that the Working Group will have the following activities: i) review the situation and issues related to aquatic genetic resources for food and agriculture and advise and make recommendations to the Commission on these matters; and ii) consider the progress made in implementing the Commission’s programme of work on aquatic genetic resources for food and agriculture as well as any other matters referred to by the Commission. The first meeting of the Working Group was held at FAO headquarters (Rome, Italy), from 20 to 22 June 2016.

4.9 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM)

In early 2007, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between the World Health Organization (WHO) and FAO on cooperation in a joint programme for the sound management of pesticides. It was agreed that joint technical meetings would be conducted, when appropriate, to discuss and strengthen particular areas of pesticide management. The first FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management was held to respond to the provisions of the MoU. It allowed additional experts in the field of pesticides and public health to complement the expertise present in the FAO Panel of Experts.

4.10 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Specifications (JMPS)

The "Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specifications" is an expert ad hoc body administered jointly by FAO and WHO, composed of scientists collectively possessing expert knowledge on the development of specifications. Their opinions and recommendations to FAO/WHO are provided in their individual capacities, not as representatives of their countries or organizations. The primary functions of the JMPS are to produce recommendations to FAO and WHO on the adoption, extension, modification or withdrawal of specifications and to develop guidance and procedures in establishing pesticide specifications and equivalence determination which also have relevance to the registration and quality control in national or regional authorities.

FAO and WHO specifications developed under the new procedures started in 1999. A specification published under the new procedure normally supersedes and cancels any earlier specification for the material involved. However, more than 300 FAO specifications based on the old procedure - hence without hazard evaluation - are still published and used. At the 2016 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Specifications in Tokyo, it was agreed that the issue of FAO old specifications should be addressed.

http://www.fao.org/fishery/static/WG-AgGR-1/SideEvents/
4.11 Panel of PAAT Advisory Group Coordinators

68 The Programme Against African Trypanosomosis (PAAT) is a partnership between United Nations agencies and the African Union/Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) that supports policy and strategy at regional level. PAAT was established in 1997 to assist African Member States to control and eventually eradicate the human and animal disease trypanosomosis (commonly known as sleeping sickness). The founder members were FAO, WHO, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and AU-IBAR. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the International Federation for Animal Health (IFAH) have also contributed to PAAT’s work. A collaborative agreement was established with the African Livestock Partnership (ALive), an international partnership convened by the World Bank approximately ten years ago.

69 In 2001, the African Union launched the Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign (AU-PATTEC). From November 2012 to June 2018, PAAT was supported by the Government of Italy to implement a regional project, with the FAO project officer based in the AU-PATTEC office to promote collaboration between PAAT and PATTEC. Following an evaluation in 2008, the management of PAAT was restructured. The former Programme Committee and Advisory Group Coordinators were disbanded and their roles taken over by the Secretariat, hosted by FAO and with representation from FAO, IAEA, WHO and AU-IBAR.

4.12 Agreement to promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas

70 This Agreement was adopted under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution. It applies to all fishing vessels used or intended for fishing on the high seas. The Agreement contains three basic requirements: i) each flag State must ensure that its vessels do not engage in any activity that undermines the effectiveness of international fishery conservation and management measures, whether or not the flag State is a member of the regional fishery organization that adopted such measures; ii) no flag State shall allow any of its vessels to be used for fishing on the high seas unless the flag State has specifically authorized it to do so; iii) no flag State shall grant such authority to a vessel unless the flag State is able to control the fishing activities of that vessel.

71 Flag States must now actively oversee the high seas fishing operations of their vessels. They must decide on a case-by-case basis whether to authorize any vessel to fish on the high seas. Most importantly, they may not permit any vessel to fish on the high seas at all, unless they are able to prevent the vessel from undermining agreed conservation rules. The Agreement also seeks to increase the transparency of high seas fishing operations through the collection and dissemination of data. Parties must submit to FAO a wide range of information on each

32 The evaluation was unable to locate a copy of the evaluation document to check the date. The last documented meeting of the Programme Committee was in 2008 and recommended a review of PAAT and its structures http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/paat/documents/reports/Report-12th-PAAT-PC.pdf
33 http://ec.europa.eu/world/agreements/prepareCreateTreatiesWorkspace/treatiesGeneralData.do?step=0&redirect=true&treatyId=558
of their respective high seas fishing vessels. Application of the Agreement (Article II) is aimed at all vessels that are used or intended for fishing on the high seas unless a Party exempts fishing vessels of less than 24 meters in length. Article III is one of the most important in the Agreement for it sets out the responsibility of the flag State.

It places an obligation on the flag State to take "such measures as may be necessary to ensure that fishing vessels entitled to fly its flag do not engage in any activity that undermines the effectiveness of international conservation and management measures". Parties undertake to, inter alia, take all necessary measures to ensure that fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag do not engage in any activity that undermines the effectiveness of international conservation and management measures (Article III), and adopt enforcement measures in respect of fishing vessels which act in contravention of the provisions of the Agreement. Parties further agree to, when and as appropriate, enter into cooperative agreements or arrangements of mutual assistance, make available to the FAO relevant information (Article IV), and encourage any State non-Party to the Agreement to accept and adopt measures consistent with its provisions (Article VIII).

4.13 Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC)

The Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission was established under the APFIC Agreement as the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council (IPFC) in 1948 by FAO. APFIC is an Article XIV FAO Regional Fishery Body established by FAO at the request of its members. The Secretariat is provided and supported by FAO. APFIC has a more than 50-year history and is one of the longest established regional fishery bodies (or RFBs). The history of APFIC is reviewed in the document "50 Years of the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission". The direction of the Commission was reviewed in the document "The Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission - its changing role".

The Commission aims to promote the full and proper utilization of living aquatic resources by the development and management of fishing and culture operations and by the development of related processing and marketing activities in conformity with the objectives of its Members. The functions that have relevance to the work undertaken/reported under SO2 include: i) review of the state of these resources and of the industries based on them; ii) recommendations on increasing the efficiency and sustainable productivity of fisheries and aquaculture; iii) conservation of resources and protection from pollution; and iv) assembling, publishing and disseminating information regarding the living aquatic resources and fisheries based on these resources.

Recent sessions have elaborated that APFIC will act as a Regional Consultative Forum that works in partnership with other regional organizations, arrangements and members. It provides advice, coordinates activities and acts as an information broker to increase knowledge of fisheries and aquaculture in the Asia-Pacific region to underpin decision-making. The APFIC Strategy 2012-2018 has clarified how the Commission will perform the functions laid out in the APFIC Agreement.


4.14 Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission (CACFish)

76 The Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission is a Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (RFMO) established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution. The Agreement empowers the Commission to impose binding management and conservation recommendations. Negotiations for the establishment of a regional inland fisheries and aquaculture management organization began in late 2008, and CACFish came into being in 2010, after Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan ratified the founding agreement.35 The objectives of CACFish are to promote the development, conservation, rational management and utilization of living aquatic resources, as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture in the region.

4.15 General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)

77 The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean is a regional fisheries management organization established under the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution. The GFCM initially started its activities as a Council in 1952, when the Agreement for its establishment came into force, and became a Commission in 1997. The main objective of the GFCM is to ensure the conservation and the sustainable use, at the biological, social, economic and environmental level, of living marine resources as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture in the Mediterranean and in the Black Sea (GFCM area of application).

78 The GFCM is currently composed of 24 members (23 Member Countries and the European Union) who contribute to its autonomous budget to finance its functioning, and three Cooperating non-Contracting Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia and Ukraine).

79 The Commission has the authority to adopt binding recommendations for fisheries conservation and management in its area of application and plays a critical role in fisheries governance in the region. In particular, its measures can relate to the regulation of fishing methods, fishing gear and minimum landing size, the establishment of open and closed fishing seasons and areas, and fishing effort control. In cooperation with other regional fisheries management organizations, the GFCM plays a decisive part in coordinating efforts by governments to effectively manage fisheries at the regional level following the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

4.16 Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in South-West Asia (SWAC)

80 The Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in South-West Asia was established on 15 December 1964. It has four Member Countries (Afghanistan, India, Iran and Pakistan) and meets every two years on a rotational basis in one of the Member Countries. The main activity of the Commission is the annual 30-day joint border survey of the spring breeding areas in southeast Iran and western Pakistan. Other activities concentrate on strengthening national capacities in survey, reporting, early warning, planning, training and control. The Secretary of the Commission is the Senior Locust Forecasting Officer at FAO headquarters.

4.17 Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Western Region (CLCPRO)

The Commission for controlling the Desert Locust in the Western Region was established in 2002 and succeeded the Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in North-West Africa (CLCPANO). CLCPRO aims to promote actions, research and training at national, regional and international level to ensure preventive control and cope with Desert Locust invasions in West and North-West Africa.36

4.18 International Poplar Commission (IPC)

The International Poplar Commission promotes the cultivation, conservation and utilization of poplars and willows. It comprises 38 Member Countries that have accepted the Convention and established a National Poplar Commission. The IPC is one of the oldest statutory bodies within the framework of FAO. It was founded in 1947. FAO runs the Secretariat of the International Poplar Commission under the Forest Resources and Management Team.

IPC supports research and management activities through six international working parties. Despite the focus on selected tree species, IPC is very relevant for SO2. It focuses on sustainable production of poplars, increasing productivity of their management, but it also deals with domestication and conservation of genetic resources, plant health, resilience to threats and climate change, livelihoods, bioenergy and ecosystem services. This demonstrates the cross-sectoral and cross-disciplinary nature of the IPC. Full IPC sessions take place every four years. The last session was organized in Germany in 2016.

4.19 International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT-PGRFA)

The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture was adopted by the 31st Session of the FAO Conference on 3 November 2001.

The Treaty aims at.37 i) recognizing the enormous contribution of farmers to the diversity of crops that feed the world; ii) establishing a global system to provide farmers, plant breeders and scientists with access to plant genetic materials; and iii) ensuring that recipients share benefits deriving from the use of these genetic materials with the countries where they have been originated.

4.20 Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI)

The purpose of the Regional Commission for Fisheries is to promote the development, conservation, rational management and best utilization of living marine resources, as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture within its area of Agreement. Its members include: Bahrain, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates.

The Commission has the following functions and responsibilities: i) keep under review the state of the resources, including their abundance and the level of their exploitation, as well

36 http://www.fao.org/clcpro/fr/
as the state of the fisheries based thereon; ii) formulate and recommend appropriate measures for the conservation and rational management of living marine, applying the precautionary approach and based on the best scientific evidence available, including measures; iii) regulate fishing methods and fishing gear; iv) prescribe the minimum size for individuals of specified species; v) establish open and closed fishing seasons and areas; vi) regulate the amount of total catch and of fishing effort and their allocation among Members; vii) keep under review the economic and social aspects of the fishing industry and recommend any measures aimed at its development; viii) encourage, recommend, coordinate and, as appropriate, undertake training and extension activities in all aspects of fisheries; ix) encourage, recommend, coordinate and, as appropriate, undertake research and development activities, including cooperative projects in the areas of fisheries and the protection of living marine resources; x) assemble, publish or disseminate information regarding exploitable living marine resources and fisheries based on these resources; xi) promote programmes for aquaculture and fisheries enhancement; and xii) carry out such other activities as may be necessary for RECOFI to achieve its purposes as defined above.

4.21 Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF)

The Collaborative Partnership on Forests is an interagency partnership on sustainable management of forests, comprising 14 international organizations, institutions and secretariats with a two-fold objective: to support the work of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and its Member Countries, and to enhance forest cooperation and coordination among the CPF members.

The CPF has been tagged to SO2 but the review of CPF’s mandate and work during the evaluation period indicates that CPF contributes to several Strategic Objectives, not only SO2. When it comes to SO2 and SO6, under the CPF, global forest indicators to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development are being developed; this is something the Forest Resources Assessment is connected to. FAO is the chair of CPF. According to stakeholder interviews, over the years FAO has shown quite consistent leadership of CPF and has provided concrete support and intellectual leadership.

In 2018, CPF and FAO jointly organized a major international conference, thematically at the core of the SO2 and Sustainable Food and Agriculture approach: the International Conference on Working across Sectors to Halt Deforestation and Increase Forest Area - from Aspiration to Action. This was the first major technical conference on forests since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the first-ever United Nations Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030 (UNSPF).

4.22 Rotterdam Convention on PIC procedure for certain hazardous chemicals and pesticides in international trade (Rotterdam/PIC)

With a mandate to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition, eliminate poverty and contribute to sustainable management and utilization of natural resources, FAO is a major player in issues related to pesticides management and different aspects of the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. FAO jointly with UNEP maintains a Secretariat which supports implementation of these conventions and provides support to countries to effectively implement relevant obligations. An International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management is a voluntary instrument but constitutes one of the most important reference frameworks for appropriate use of pesticides. The Code was developed
by FAO, WHO and UNEP, pesticide industry and civil society organizations, and adopted by FAO Member Countries and leading associations in the pesticide industry. The Code provides guidance on the use of pesticides and promotes integrated pest management practices. As such, it serves as a key reference for any initiative aimed at pesticide risk reduction.

92 The FAO Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) considers reducing reliance on pesticides as a principle element of its focus areas on Sustainable Production Intensification and Pesticide Risk Reduction. Integrated pest management (IPM) programmes have demonstrated that pesticide use can often be reduced considerably without affecting yields or farmer profits. The Secretariat and FAO regional and subregional offices cooperate to develop and deliver technical assistance and capacity building activities in country parties to assist with the implementation of the conventions.

93 The 16 FAO regional and subregional offices play a leading role in the delivery of assistance to parties to implement the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. Each regional and subregional office houses a technical officer that is responsible for plant production and protection. Regional staff represent a direct link between the regions and the Secretariat that helps to ensure that the activities are targeted to the needs of the countries. They are also in a unique position to facilitate monitoring of follow-up activities with countries.

94 The work under these Conventions and its implementation is aligned with FAO’s Strategic Objective 2 which promotes agroecology, conservation agriculture, climate-smart agriculture, alternatives to the use of pesticides, integrated pest management programme and Farmers Field Schools (FFS), and addresses adverse effects of pesticides on all kind of non-target aquatic and terrestrial organisms and on ecosystem services (including water, soil formation, nutrient cycling, etc.).

95 For countries outside the European Union, assistance in maintaining inventories and cleaning up obsolete pesticides has been granted through the PHARE programme (for South-East Europe). Additional tools for clean-up could be created in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), but assistance on obsolete pesticides is conditional of their being explicitly included as a priority in the bilateral agreement between the European Union and each partner. There are technical plant protection officers in each of the six FAO regional and subregional offices who provide support to countries in implementing the conventions, reporting on the progress in the implementation of the national action plans and promoting the ratification of conventions when working with non-Parties within their regions and subregions.

4.23 United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD programme)

96 UN-REDD is a partnership between FAO, UNEP and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to support mitigation of climate change in developing countries (64) through the implementation of REDD+ activities under UNFCCC. This by nature is a multi-sectoral programme dealing in an integrated manner with forestry, climate change, energy and forest-related land-use changes including agriculture, as well as with gender and governance. As described elsewhere in this thematic report, UN-REDD is one of the key

38 http://chm.pops.int/Partners/FAO/tabid/293/Default.aspx
forestry programmes FAO has been involved in during the evaluation period, especially through support to national forest monitoring, carbon stock assessment and work on measuring, reporting and verification, and forest reference emission level.

97 UN-REDD is an important global climate change mitigation programme. With increased relevance after the Paris Agreement adopted at COP 21 in 2015, it sent a strong message that REDD+ is a critical, officially recognized element of the new global climate goal to achieve net-zero emissions in the second half of this century. UN-REDD is a long-term partnership programme and an important delivery mechanism for contributing to SO2. In the FAO forestry portfolio, UN-REDD contributions are the most significant, especially if national forest monitoring work, with strong links to REDD+ is included.

4.24 Mountain Partnership Secretariat (MPS)

98 The Mountain Partnership brings countries, groups and organizations together to improve the lives of mountain peoples and protect mountain environments around the world. FAO hosts the Mountain Partnership Secretariat that acts as a networking and information sharing point for members. MPS operates three portals: Mountain Education Database, Resource Mobilization Database and Mountain Partnership Products Database. MPS helps members build and develop joint activities and promote closer collaboration. The Fifth Global Meeting of the Mountain Partnership was staged in Rome, Italy, in 2017 to launch a Framework for Action to implement the 2030 Agenda for Mountains.

4.25 Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW)

99 During the evaluation period, FAO’s Forestry Department (FO) continued to operate the secretariat for Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management and organized four annual CPW meetings, as well as produced five fact sheets of which three were of cross-sectoral nature and also addressed cross-cutting themes of nutrition and gender.

4.26 International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)

100 The International Plant Protection Convention is a 1951 multilateral treaty deposited with FAO that aims to secure coordinated, effective action to prevent and control the introduction and spread of pests of plants and plant products. The Convention extends beyond the protection of cultivated plants to the protection of natural flora and plant products. It also takes into consideration both direct and indirect damage by pests, so it includes weeds.

101 The Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), governing body of the IPPC, agreed on the following Strategic Objectives:39 i) protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread; ii) protect the environment, forests and biodiversity from plant pests; iii) facilitate economic and trade development through the promotion of harmonized scientifically-based phytosanitary measures; and iv) develop phytosanitary capacity for members to accomplish the preceding three objectives.

39 https://www.ippc.int/en/structure/
4.27 **Global Soil Partnership (GSP)**

The Global Soil Partnership was established in December 2012\(^\text{40}\) as a mechanism to develop a strong interactive partnership and enhance collaboration and synergy of efforts between all stakeholders. From land users to policymakers, one of the key objectives of the GSP is to improve governance and promote sustainable management of soils.

Since its creation, the GSP has become an important partnership where global soil issues are discussed and addressed by multiple stakeholders. Key outputs demonstrate that the partnership was needed to fill an existing gap in the promotion of sustainable soil management. Among those outputs there are the: i) establishment of the Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils (ITPS); ii) submission of the proposal for a United Nations World Soil Day (WSD - 5 December) and the International Year of Soils 2015; iii) preparation of the revised World Soil Charter (WSC); iv) production of the Status of the World’s Soil Resources (SWSR) Report; v) establishment of Regional Soil Partnerships (RSPs); vi) development of capacities in developing countries on digital soil mapping; vii) development of Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Soil Management; and viii) establishment of national soil information systems.

4.28 **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)**

FAO’s role as a strategic partner to the UNFCCC is organized and compiled as a CTA. The UNFCCC is a “Rio Convention”, one of three adopted at the “Rio Earth Summit” in 1992. Entered into force on 21 March 1994, today it has near-universal membership with 197 Parties. Its sister Rio Conventions are the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). UNFCCC raises awareness on agriculture and food security concerns for the next global climate change agreements, which would result in integration of climate change challenges into food security as well as food security principles into national sectoral policies and programmes to address climate change.

FAO provides technical advice to its Member Countries to support their involvement in the negotiations and in meeting their UNFCCC commitments, making sure that the linkages between climate change, agriculture and food security are made. Agricultural sectors are key in addressing climate change.

4.29 **Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation (GFAR)**

The Global Forum on Agricultural Research and Innovation is a global forum which provides the open and inclusive space required for fostering dialogue, agreeing priorities and catalysing collective actions by the many stakeholders involved in agri-food research and innovation. GFAR’s focus is to ensure that agricultural innovation systems - encompassing research, extension, education and enterprise - deliver the best development outcomes to resource-poor farmers and rural communities.

Work formulated through consultative processes of GFAR is delivered by its constituent partners. Partners agree to commit and generate resources together, to catalyse actions or advocacy towards shared, demand-driven development aims. These actions are fostered and supported through the GFAR Secretariat.

4.30 Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)

FAO launched the Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System in 2002, during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD, Johannesburg, South Africa). Since then, using various extrabudgetary financial resources, many projects to assist Member Countries in identifying and conserving the GIAHS sites as well as international, regional and national conferences, seminars, training courses to enhance the capacity of Member Countries and to disseminate the concept of GIAHS have been carried out. As a result of these activities, the designated GIAHS sites have increased and the GIAHS programme has gained considerable recognition both at international and national levels.

The overall goal of the GIAHS programme is to identify and safeguard Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems and their associated landscapes, agricultural biodiversity and knowledge systems through catalysing and establishing a long-term programme to support such systems, and enhance global, national and local benefits derived through their dynamic conservation, sustainable management and enhanced viability.

4.31 Forest Resources Assessment (FRA)

FAO’s SO2-related work on forest resources assessment was commonly seen as very relevant responding to global, regional and country needs concerning planning and monitoring of forest and land management and international reporting (FRA, UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD). Reliable reporting on forest cover and land-use change is also needed for SDG monitoring.

FRA provides valuable information globally on forests resources and related trends. FAO’s technical capacity and resources as well as good global reputation contribute to it being well-positioned and leading the global work on FRA, strengthening national forest monitoring systems and capacity, and at the same time supporting UN-REDD and REDD+ work. Interviews of FAO staff and external interlocutors globally, regionally and at country levels identified that FAO has a specific unique comparative advantage in forest resources assessment. FAO’s FRA teams can be regarded as a centre of excellence. The findings concerning the global, regional and country level relevance of FRA are consistent with the findings of the Strategic Evaluation of FAO’s Role and Work in Forestry (FAO 2012).

4.32 Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources (ITWG-FGR)

FAO’s work on genetic resources in general is very relevant, and the same applies to forest genetics work. This work contributes to sustainable management of forest resources, nutrition, etc. The maintenance of healthy productive systems, increasing productivity and resiliency are all linked to the maintenance of genetic resources.

FAO’s Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture provides the only global forum for governments to discuss and negotiate matters specifically relevant to biological diversity and genetic resources for food and agriculture.

Many others are of course doing work on forest genetics, but FAO still has a clear role and comparative advantage, e.g. in planted seedling material. FAO’s work on forest genetic resources is contributing to all SO2 outcomes. In 2014, FAO published the first report on the
State of the World’s Forest Genetic Resources that provides information contributing to the sustainable management of FGR at national, regional and international levels.

The work has also contributed to the formulation of national policies, integration of genetic diversity into National Climate Change Adaptation Planning, and FAO’s genetic information systems have enabled stakeholders to access and share information. The evaluation of FAO’s work on genetic resources concluded that FAO’s work on genetic resources, forest genetic resources included, is very relevant and FAO is a respected authority on GRFA (FAO 2016). Work on forest genetics has also been done in the Asia-Pacific Region through the Asia Pacific Forest Genetic Resources Programme (APFORGEN) where FAO is a partner. In the Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission meeting in 2017, the Asia-Pacific Strategy for Implementing the Global Plan of Action on Forest Genetic Resources was discussed.

4.33 Mountain Partnership

Mountain Partnership has always supported an integrated approach; SO2 has not impacted Mountain partnership in this sense because the work is fully aligned anyhow. SP2 is supportive of the Mountain Partnership Secretariat and provides limited funding from regular budget. This partnership contributes to both SO2 and SO5 as well as SO4, and also to some extent to SO1 and SO3. It is very integrated by nature because it deals with watershed management sustainable mountain landscape development which also includes rural development, and improving people’s livelihoods and reducing hunger. It is difficult to separate the contribution of an inherently integrated approach to different Strategic Objectives; this work on the ground is not done based on Strategic Objectives; they are natural systems and cross the boundaries of SOs.

SDGs have three mountain-related targets. They guide the work of the partnership. Mountain Partnership has its own steering mechanism; it is not FAO that steers but a multi-stakeholder Steering Committee representing some countries by region, international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and NGOs, UNEP and research agencies. This Committee provides programmatic directions in the form of a strategy; the latest one for 2018-2021 was approved at the Fifth Global Meeting of the Mountain Partnership in 2017. Both the coordinators agreed with the overall idea of Strategic Objectives and SO2 but raised the issue of creating new silos and unnecessary administrative burden. Mountain Partnership is based on an integrated approach and is now divided between SO2, SO3 and SO4.

4.34 Fisheries Commissions

The Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission, Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission promote proper utilization of living aquatic resources and its relevance to the work undertaken/reported under SO2 includes: i) review of the state of these resources and of the industries based on them; ii) recommendations on increasing the efficiency and sustainable productivity of fisheries and aquaculture; iii) conservation of resources and protection from pollution; and iv) assembling, publishing and disseminating information regarding the living aquatic resources and fisheries based on these resources.

4.35 Silva Mediterranea

The work of Silva Mediterranea is highly relevant for SO2-related forestry work, as it supports national forestry agencies in the formulation and implementation of national forest policies,
with an emphasis on environmental sustainability. The most recent decision taken by this initiative was to reinforce regional cooperation on forest and landscape restoration and on land degradation neutrality, in particular through better coordination among organizations and the mobilization of the experts of the working group on desertification and restoration of Mediterranean drylands.

4.36 Relevance of SO2 CTAs in the major thematic areas

120 The Corporate Technical Activities assessed in this report represent such a large range of mechanisms and activities with different legal status and ways of working that it is not possible to draw generic conclusions concerning the relevance and effectiveness of these as a delivery mechanism. In fact, many of these CTAs represent global mechanisms guided by governance and administrative systems external to FAO, and hence their effectiveness needs to be assessed in a much broader perspective. However, some observations from an FAO and SO2 perspective can be made. Based on the interviews, CTAs were generally regarded as important and relevant.

121 It is often difficult to link CTA work directly to SO (2) results framework. It comprises a lot of work that is in way core FAO work, such as forest resources assessment and support to international commissions such as the International Poplar Commission and agreements (UNFCCC) and secretariats of partnerships (Mountain Partnership, Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, and Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources), or global partnerships and programmes such as Collaborative Partnerships on Forests and UN-REDD. These exist irrespective of FAO’s strategies but in terms of substance and general objectives, these CTAs are supportive of SO2.

122 These CTAs are aligned with SO2 and in most cases it is quite easy to assess the contribution to SO2. However, the possibilities to influence many of these CTAs are limited because most of them have their own planning and priority setting processes to which FAO can contribute just like any other Member, e.g. in the CPF. For example, the work of the Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Forest Genetic Resources is driven by the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Development of Forest Genetic Resources. UN-REDD is major global programme and partnership with its own governance system. In many cases, FAO’s role is just to host a secretariat.

123 SP2 is supportive of the CTA work, and provides e.g. most of the annual funding to the forests resources assessment through the regular budget. Budgets for many CTAs are though quite limited; and e.g. the Intergovernmental Technical Working Group and Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management are currently struggling with annual budgets of USD 1 535 000 per year, non-staff allocation.

124 CTAs support achievement of results through the framework of Strategic Objectives. However, being autonomous bodies and mechanisms, the CTAs, especially those that have been created as per the Article 14 and 16 (which have their own governing bodies) are less receptive to the potential influence from SP2 guidance and programming, as these have their specific “niches” and mandates driven by priorities of the founder and lead organizations or Member States.
### Table 3: Full List of CTAs related to SO2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SO2 Outputs</th>
<th>RP Budget 2016-2017 biennium (USD)</th>
<th>Host Division</th>
<th>Type of CTA</th>
<th>Regional Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CT09</td>
<td>Forest Resources Assessment (FRA)</td>
<td>20401</td>
<td>1 132 611</td>
<td>FOA</td>
<td>Flagship Publication</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CT30</td>
<td>AFWC/EFC/NEFC Committee on Mediterranean Forestry Questions - Silva Mediterranea</td>
<td>20102</td>
<td>62 691</td>
<td>FOA</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>REU, RNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CT31</td>
<td>Agriculture, Land and Water Use Commission for the Near East (ALAWUC)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>65 000</td>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>RNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CT32</td>
<td>Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA)</td>
<td>20301 20302 20401 20403</td>
<td>2 464 712</td>
<td>DDN</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CT33</td>
<td>CGRFA - ITWG on AnGR</td>
<td>20301 20401</td>
<td>416 230</td>
<td>AGA</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CT34</td>
<td>CGRFA - ITWG on PGRFA</td>
<td>20301 20401 20402 20403</td>
<td>260 000</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CT35</td>
<td>CGRFA - ITWG on FoGR</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>231 430</td>
<td>FOA</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CT39</td>
<td>Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>199 000</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CT40</td>
<td>Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Specifications (JMPS)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>160 000</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CT42</td>
<td>Panel of PAAT Advisory Group Coordinators</td>
<td>20103</td>
<td>100 000</td>
<td>AGA</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CT43</td>
<td>Agreement to promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>91 784</td>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CT44</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC)</td>
<td>20201</td>
<td>257 973</td>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CT45</td>
<td>Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission (CACfish)</td>
<td>20303</td>
<td>111 114</td>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CT46</td>
<td>Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in South West Asia (SWAC)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>134 920</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CT47</td>
<td>Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Western Region (CLCPRO)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>130 000</td>
<td>AGP</td>
<td>Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 16 | CT48 | General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) | 20301 | 125 000 | FIA | Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution | REU, RNE |
| 17 | CT49 | International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) | 20301 | 1 778 485 | AGP | Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution | GLOBAL |
| 18 | CT50 | International Poplar Commission (IPC) | 20301 | 310 170 | FOA | Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution | GLOBAL |
| 19 | CT51 | International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IT-PGRFA) - 2001 - Agreements concluded under Article 15 | 20202 20302 20303 | 1 951 704 | AGD | Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution | GLOBAL |
| 20 | CT54 | Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI) | 20301 | 260 319 | FIA | Bodies established under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution | RNE |
| 21 | CT55 | Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) | 20301 | 182 817 | FOA | UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates | GLOBAL |
| 22 | CT57 | Global Soil Partnership | 20301 20401 | 600 059 | CBL | UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates | GLOBAL |
| 23 | CT59 | Rotterdam Convention on PIC procedure for certain hazardous chemicals and pesticides in international trade (Rotterdam/PIC) | 20103 20301 20303 | 1 491 555 | AGP | UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates | GLOBAL |
| 24 | CT60 | UN Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (UN-REDD programme) | 20302 | 100 000 | FOA | UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates | GLOBAL |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>UN System and other global initiatives where FAO formally participates</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CT62</td>
<td>Mountain Partnership Secretariat (MPS)</td>
<td>20303</td>
<td>226 908</td>
<td>FOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CT63</td>
<td>Collaborative Partnership on sustainable wildlife management (CPW)</td>
<td>20303</td>
<td>116 958</td>
<td>FOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CT64</td>
<td>UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)</td>
<td>20302</td>
<td>50 000</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CT65</td>
<td>Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR)</td>
<td>20103</td>
<td>100 000</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>CT67</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA ITWG-AQ)</td>
<td>20301</td>
<td>115 000</td>
<td>FIA</td>
<td>Bodies established by Conference and Council under Article VI of the FAO Constitution</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CT68</td>
<td>Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)</td>
<td>20101</td>
<td>700 000</td>
<td>DDN</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>