

April 2007



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

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

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

E

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Ninety-seventh Session

Rome, 21 – 25 May 2007

Follow-up on the Evaluation of Livestock Production, Policy and Information: Implementation of the Recommendations

A. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION AND OF ITS FOLLOW-UP

1. The Evaluation of Livestock Production, Policy and Information (LPPI) was submitted to the Ninety-fifth Session of the Programme Committee (PC) in May 2005, prior to initiation of the first phase of the Director-General's reform with the associated modification of the Livestock Programme in general and of the LPPI component of this Programme in particular. These modifications naturally had an impact on the extent to which the recommendations of the evaluation could be followed-up over the past two years (Table in Annex). This document first provides a summary of the main findings and recommendations of the review with which Management has concurred in its response as presented to the PC in May 2005 (paras 2-4); it then describes the application of the principles of the reform relating to the new programme structure and of programme-specific guidance received on the Livestock Programme (para 5); it subsequently summarises the concerns expressed by the PC at its May 2006 Session with these changes (paras 6-9); and finally proposes awaiting the guidance of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) on this Programme before any further modifications are undertaken (para 10).

B. SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION AND OF THE ORIGINAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

2. Management welcomed the evaluation's general endorsement of the conceptual and strategic orientation chosen by AGA in developing its portfolio on LPPI. In particular, it welcomed the endorsement of the global public goods approach adopted by AGA and the recognition of some high-profile initiatives led by AGA, which were commended for their strategic innovativeness [Conservation and Management of Animal Genetic Resources, Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) and the Livestock, Environment and Development Initiative (LEAD)]. In addition, Management welcomed the endorsement of the shift from a 'technology transfer' to a 'policy advice' orientation of the Programme. It also welcomed the nature of the

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

evaluation which was more a strategic programme and management review rather than an operations evaluation. This wider approach was appreciated as it provided conceptual guidance on the further development of the Livestock Programme in serving the dynamically changing and growing global livestock sector in an integrated interdisciplinary manner.

3. The evaluation recognised that AGA had significantly restructured its programme in the 2000-01 biennium, to be organised on the basis of development goals instead of the previous production systems orientation. This new approach focused on the role of livestock development as it affects three key global public goods, i.e. equity (in particular poverty alleviation), sustainability of the environment and natural resources, and veterinary public health. The evaluation endorsed this approach which enabled the Programme to suitably relate its objectives and outcomes to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and also served the further strategic enhancement of the Programme's portfolio. Management supported this evolution and welcomed the evaluation's endorsement of this programme orientation.

4. Management noted that the evaluation found a good coherence of the Programme's priorities with the objectives of FAO's Strategic Framework. The evaluation stated that AGA was "found to have also been a leader" in certain of the Cross-Organizational Strategies (*Enhancing Interdisciplinarity* - programme entities which cut increasingly across groups and services within the Division; *Improving Management Processes* - assigning the responsibility for programme entities to entity managers, making efforts to incorporate results-based approaches in their design and using consultative processes in making changes and improvements; *Leveraging Resources* – especially by attracting multidonor support for normative work). Management appreciated these positive assessments.

C. PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORM RELATING TO THE NEW PROGRAMME STRUCTURE AND PROGRAMME AS APPLIED TO THE LIVESTOCK PROGRAMME

5. The Director-General's reform, through the new programme structure, championed two principles: strengthening interdisciplinarity and reducing programmatic fragmentation. The application of these principles implied the substantial reduction in the overall number of programme entities and the design of several interdisciplinary programme entities. It is noteworthy that AGA had gone through a strategic repositioning process, pre-reform, and thereby had already reduced its set of programme entities from eight to six following the same reasoning. In the reform process additional guidance was given, specific to the Livestock Programme: 1) to establish a separate programme (2C: *Diseases and Pests of Animals and Plants*) to deal with *off-farm* health concerns, and 2) to confine the Programme 2B: *Livestock Production Systems Management* to the '*on-farm*' scope. In combination, these guidance elements led to a further reduction of the number of programme entities in the livestock portfolio from six to five, and spread the work of the Livestock Programme across nine programmes in the reformed programme structure.

D. VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE PC (MAY 2006) WITH THESE CHANGES¹

6. (para. 20 of report): "*While giving its general endorsement to the new programme structure, the Committee underlined that some problems remained in understanding the scope of work or some of the titles used in the new structure. A notable example regarded the treatment of livestock and animal health. The reason for separation of on-farm and off-farm aspects in livestock into different entities was questioned by the Committee which advised that further careful reflection was needed on this issue. The apparent dispersion of livestock activities across several programmes and the grouping together of diseases and pests of animal and plants under*

¹ quoted from CL 131/11

Programme 2C, were questioned. ... The Committee stressed that the IEE was well timed to review these issues and advise the governing bodies accordingly.”

7. (para. 33 of report): *“The Committee observed that livestock activities were now spread over nine different Programmes, which may result in a loss of visibility, programme integrity and possibly affecting resource allocations. In particular, animal health activities were divided between three Programmes: 2B (livestock production systems management – herd health management); 2C (EMPRES – transboundary animal diseases); and 2D (veterinary public health/food safety). The Committee welcomed reassurances that responsibility for FAO’s livestock activities remained with the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) ... ”.*

8. (para. 34 of report): *“The Committee questioned the rationale of separating on-farm and off-farm oriented activities, bearing in mind the contributions of livestock to attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It also recalled that it had recently reviewed and endorsed the conclusions of an independent external evaluation of FAO’s livestock programme, and did not see a direct link with the proposed arrangements.”*

9. (para. 35 of report): *“Concerning Programme 2B, the Committee noted that animal genetic resources were protected from major budgetary cuts, although less than adequate funding was budgeted for this area. Reduced allocations of staff and non-staff resources would affect work on animal production, poverty alleviation, value-adding/product processing, and livestock environment interactions.”*

E. THE WAY FORWARD

10. Follow-up to the recommendations of the 2005 Evaluation of LPPI have been affected by the modifications to FAO’s Livestock portfolio by the reform process. Furthermore, management concurs with the PC observation that the IEE is well timed to review the issues expressed by the PC at its May 2006 session and advise the governing bodies accordingly. The Table in the Annex provides account of the actions undertaken.

ANNEX

Action plan for follow – up² (comments inserted in italics in the table)

Main action to be taken (including additional actions not envisaged in the Evaluation report)	Recommendation (no.)	Timing	Responsible FAO Unit
The current Mission Statement has been prepared in an externally facilitated retreat of all AGA Programme Managers in May 2004 in preparation of the MTP 2006-11. The recommended reconsideration of the Mission Statement is scheduled to be undertaken after the 2005 FAO Conference (when the impact of the approved appropriation on the Programme can be gauged). This will be done involving all AGA (not limited to LPPI).	1	first quarter 2006	AGA

Comment: *not done (awaiting the outcome of the IEE process)*

² as submitted to PC in May 2005 (PC 93/5 Sup. 1)

Main action to be taken (including additional actions not envisaged in the Evaluation report)	Recommendation (no.)	Timing	Responsible FAO Unit
The recommendation to have a permanent livestock agenda item in all COAG sessions is submitted to the Committee.	2	2007	COAG Secretariat
<i>Comment: accepted by May 2006 PC and December 2006 Council (implemented as from COAG 2007)</i>			
Interdisciplinarity is being promoted throughout the Organization by various instruments, predominantly through PAIAs (Priority Areas for Inter-Disciplinary Action) and various cross-organizational Working Groups. The PRODS (Production Systems) PAIA, is of particular importance in implementing the recommendation. There are, however, a considerable number of further PAIAs and WGs with active AGA participation. An internal assessment will be made of staff participation in such groups and regular reporting at the Management Team meeting introduced. The option of a divisional fund to support (on a competitive basis) inter-disciplinary action will be investigated. This will be done involving all AGA (not limited to LPPI).	3	first quarter 2006	AGA
<i>Comment: in addition to involvement of AGA in PAIAs and in IDWGs, considerable 'outsourcing' of core portfolio parts to a total of nine Programmes was undertaken in response to reform guidance in 2005/6. Divisional fund for enhancing interdisciplinarity not set up.</i>			
A professional staff position is being filled with the recommended animal genetic resources utilisation / breeding profile.	4(b)	May 2005	AGA
<i>Comment: done in 2006</i>			
<p>All programme entity (PE) Managers are requested to prepare a field programme strategy which best complements the normative work programme of the PE. These strategic statements are consolidated at divisional level as a basis for the development of the 'strategic' component of the divisional field programme. Regional AGA officers are involved in this design and consolidation process.</p> <p>This strategic AGA field programme concept will be shared with FAO country offices to guide the country – submitted requests for assistance; it will also help reduce ad-hoc project initiation by officers when interacting with national colleagues. Similarly, this concept will also be used in the intended pilot to assist FAORs to design and negotiate Country Indicative Programme Agreements (CIPAs).</p> <p>AGA officers will increasingly assume facilitating/supervisory roles in the design and implementation of field projects thereby making use of AGA's "corps of external experts"; this will allow a better balance of time used for normative and operational activities.</p>	5	first semester 2006	AGA

Main action to be taken (including additional actions not envisaged in the Evaluation report)	Recommendation (no.)	Timing	Responsible FAO Unit
This will be done involving all AGA (not limited to LPPI).			
<i>Comment: not done (awaiting outcome of the IEE process)</i>			
<p>RAP cluster is in place.</p> <p>RLC cluster suggested to be assembled by moving two OTO/FAOR posts back to RLC.</p> <p>Africa 'cluster': transfer of RNE – post to RAF (to have two RAF-based posts), SAFR post remaining in Harare.</p> <p>[established outposted AGA officer posts are nine; the Paraguay-based OTO/FAOR is a headquarters post; in the eventuality of a lower resource appropriation in November 2005, the balance between HQ and Region-based posts is maintained by abolishing the SEUR-post which is currently vacant].</p>	6	done 2005 2009 2007	AGA
<i>Comment: superseded by decentralization process, including creation of subregional offices in Africa and Central Asia.</i>			
<p>In filling vacant technical officer posts, experience and qualifications in institution-building, programme management and livestock policy aspects are systematically introduced in Vacancy Announcements to broaden programme scope. Officers are advised to play more facilitating functions in field programme design and implementation (s. 5 above).</p>	7	ongoing	AGA
<i>Comment: on-going, particularly in staffing sub-regional livestock officer posts</i>			
<p>Design of guidelines for livestock role in SPFS.</p>	8	ongoing	AGAP/L
<i>Comment: ongoing</i>			