



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

E

JOINT MEETING

**Hundred and Thirtieth Session of the Programme Committee and
Hundred and Eighty-fifth Session of the Finance Committee**

22 March 2021

FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme

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

Beth Bechdol
Deputy Director General
Tel: +39 06570 51800
Email: DDG-Bechdol@fao.org

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With reference to the Report of the Joint Meeting of the 129th Session of the Programme Committee and the 183rd Session of the Finance Committee (9-13 November 2020), the document recalls the process that defined the distribution and management of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) resources between regions. It recalls further the key steps of project identification guided by the TCP criteria for TCP resource allocation on the ground, and elaborates the process of TCP project identification in alignment with the repositioned UN development system and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Finally, a roadmap to begin a strategic exercise to refine the criteria of resource allocation is proposed.

GUIDANCE SOUGHT FROM THE JOINT MEETING

- The Joint Meeting is invited to provide further guidance on the need to refine and possibly unify the criteria for resource allocation within regions, as deemed appropriate.

Draft Advice

The Joint Meeting:

- **noted the universal character of the TCP criteria and the programmatic alignment of TCP-funded activities with the repositioned UN development system and SDGs;**
- **re-confirmed the decentralization of the authority to manage allocations in full compliance with the TCP criteria and regional specificities;**
- **took note of the information provided regarding the background underpinning the resource distribution between regions and on the criteria for TCP resource allocation on the ground; and**
- **took note of the proposed Roadmap to begin a strategic exercise to refine the criteria of resource allocation and re-imagine the TCP, and looked forward to a progress report at its next session.**

I. Background

1. The Joint Meeting of the 129th Session of the Programme Committee and the 183rd Session of the Finance Committee (9-13 November 2020), discussed the “Update on the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP)” ([JM 2020.2/2](#)). In its Report ([CL165/9](#)), the Joint Meeting:

i. “noted the need to review the percentages of distribution of TCP among regions, according to the 2008 Special Session of the FAO Conference para 35, measure 3.23, and recommended the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees to review the issue at its next session.”

ii. “recalled that the 164th Session of the Council requested that FAO updated information including criteria for project resource allocation on the ground, for review by the Joint Meeting, and noted that this was outstanding; and requested FAO to begin a strategic exercise, in consultation with Members, with the aim to refine, and possibly unify, the criteria of resource allocation, beyond the traditional one of per capita income, and taking into account the specific needs of each region.”

2. This document is, therefore, divided in three sections recalling information on the distribution of TCP resources between regions, the criteria for TCP resource allocation on the ground, and proposing a roadmap to begin a strategic exercise to refine the criteria of resource allocation with guidance from the Joint Meeting.

II. Distribution of TCP resources between regions

A. Historical overview

3. The Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE) completed in 2007, was the basis for the decision taken on the decentralization of the TCP, including on resource distribution. In its Report ([C 2007/7A.1](#), para 340) the IEE noted that “[...] the spread of allocations between regions has, broadly speaking, reflected relative needs, in terms of generally accepted criteria to measure and compare food security, poverty and dependence on agriculture. However, when comparing TCP allocations between individual countries, the rationale for distribution is not clear, taking into account factors such as the absolute number of people suffering from hunger and poverty, as well as the number of persons dependent on the agricultural sector.”

4. Conference Resolution 5/2007 established a Conference Committee (CoC-IEE) to develop the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) in response to the IEE. The CoC-IEE formed three working groups constituted by Members representatives to elaborate proposals for the IPA that were to be approved through the CoC-IEE for consideration by the 35th Session (Special) of the Conference in November 2008. Two working groups were involved in developing proposals for the TCP, comprising 38 Members from all regions.

5. Based on the IEE findings, the working groups under the CoC-IEE explored different resource allocation models¹. All Members agreed that countries’ needs, income status and the extent of rural poverty should feature among the criteria. At first, the working groups considered an allocation model based on a set of articulated criteria ranging from number of countries eligible on grant basis, to number of countries with more than 10 million undernourished population. In a subsequent meeting, a proposal using a weighted set of simplified criteria for regional allocations compared to what was considered earlier was discussed. The criteria considered were: (i) the number of countries eligible on a grant basis in a region; (ii) the number of countries falling under the “special attention” category as defined by the Governing Bodies as Least Developed Countries (LDC), Low Income Food Deficit Countries (LIFDC), Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDC); (iii) the number of undernourished; and (iv) population dependent on agriculture in each region. Consensus was reached around a simple model that foresaw access to a minimum amount of resources for all non-high-income countries, and emphasized the needs of LDCs.

6. It was also decided that Regional Offices would manage the agreed indicative regional allocations, while resources for emergencies and inter-regional projects would be managed by

¹ Chair’s Aide Memoires of Joint Meeting of CoC-IEE WG I & WG III (16 May 2008, 13 June, 1 July, 28 July)

headquarters and allocated according to needs. The proposal was endorsed by the 35th Session (Special) of the Conference in November 2008 ([C 2008/REP](#), para 35).

7. Table 1 shows the regional shares agreed in 2008 in relation to the number of eligible countries and number of LDCs (Annex 1 provides further details), based on the 2008-09 TCP appropriation of USD 86 million (excluding USD 18 million indicatively earmarked for emergency and inter-regional projects managed from headquarters).

Table 1: Indicative TCP allocation by Regional Office coverage as approved in 2008 applied to the 2008-09 TCP appropriation (excluding funding reserved for emergency and inter-regional projects)

Regional Office	Africa	Asia and Pacific	Latin America and Caribbean	Europe	Near East	Totals
Number of eligible countries	47	34	33	19	14	147
Number of LDC countries	32	14	1	0	2	49
Indicative allocation	40%	24%	18%	10%	8%	100%
Indicative Allocation in million USD	34.4	20.6	15.5	8.6	6.9	86

B. Application of percentage shares agreed in 2008 to the 2020-21 TCP appropriation

8. Table 2 shows updated numbers for Table 1 as of 2020 based on the 2020-21 TCP appropriation (USD 112 million, excluding USD 24 million indicatively allocated for emergency and inter-regional TCP projects managed from headquarters). Some countries have graduated out of the LDC category, and others have become high-income countries, or shifted region providing operational coverage (see details in Annex 2).

Table 2: Indicative TCP allocation by Regional Office coverage in 2020 applied to the 2020/21 TCP appropriation (excluding funding for emergency and inter-regional projects)

Regional Office	Africa	Asia and Pacific	Latin America and Caribbean	Europe	Near East	Totals
Number of eligible countries	47	35	30	19	13	144
Number of LDC countries	31	12	1	0	3	47
Indicative allocation	40%	24%	18%	10%	8%	100%
Indicative Allocation in million USD	44.8	26.9	20.2	11.2	9.0	112

III. Criteria for project resource allocation on the ground

C. Distribution of the indicative regional TCP allocation within regions

9. As described in document [JM 2020.2/2](#) presented at the previous session of the Joint Meeting, the responsibility and accountability for the use of the regional indicative TCP allocations is assigned to Regional Representatives, and at country level to FAO Representatives. The Regional Representatives are accountable to the Deputy Director-General (DDG), Ms Beth Bechdol, for the use of TCP. The DDG retains the oversight and the authority to take any remedial measures that may be required if responsibilities assigned to the decentralized levels are not fulfilled, including redistribution of unused resources. This has not been required since decentralization took effect in 2010.

10. The Regional Representatives are advised to manage the TCP regional allocation considering the corporate obligation to:

- i. Commit the entire allocation within the biennium in which it was approved.
- ii. Deliver the entire appropriation by the end of the biennium following the biennium of approval of that appropriation.
- iii. Ensure that, in allocating resources, special attention is given to Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs), Least-Developed Countries (LDCs), Land-Locked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small-Island Developing States (SIDS).
- iv. Ensure the involvement of the FAO Representatives in the prioritization and selection process of regional and subregional TCP projects.

11. Within the above guidance and the responsibility assigned to Regional Representatives, flexibility was ensured to adapt to region-specific challenges and opportunities. Criteria for resource distribution vary between regions considering that, for example, 31 out of 47 countries under the Regional Office for Africa are LDCs, while there are none under the Regional Office for Europe. Other factors such as scarcity of donor funding or the humanitarian situation also varies between regions and is used by Regional Representatives to guide resource allocation decisions (see Annex 3 extracted from [JM 2020.2/2](#) document for full details).

12. This flexibility is also ensured for the share of resources allocated to regional and subregional TCP projects. Needs and opportunities to achieve efficiencies and synergies through cross-border collaboration or on transboundary issues vary from region to region. The different number of subregional offices in each region, and nature of regional organizations partnering with FAO are additional factors benefiting from decentralized decision-making within the regional allocations.

13. According to the recent TCP Evaluation ([PC 129/2](#), Findings 7 and 8), “*all regions have well-defined criteria for TCP fund allocation to countries within their respective regions*” and “*countries are generally satisfied with the post-decentralization allocation process and amounts received*”. It is further recalled that in its Report [[CL 165/9](#), para 10 h], the previous session of the Joint Meeting “*noted the approaches adopted by Regional Offices for TCP resource distribution and reaffirmed the decentralization of the authority to manage allocations in full compliance with the TCP criteria and related corporate obligations.*”

D. The process of TCP project identification in alignment with the repositioned UN development system and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

14. The criteria regulating project resource allocation on the ground are referred to as “TCP Criteria”. The current set of criteria was approved by the Council in 2009 ([CL 136/REP](#), para 37) and were last confirmed by Governing Bodies in 2013, at a time the alignment of TCP with FAO’s Strategic Framework and Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs) was enhanced ([JM 2013.2/2](#), [CL 148/8](#)).

15. All TCP projects are appraised against and need to comply with TCP Criteria. In essence, the criteria aim at ensuring that all TCP-funded interventions are aligned with strategic priorities and lead to sustainable outcomes (see details in Annex 4), and as such are universal. The wording of Criterion 2 “Aims and Purposes” may require minor adjustments to remain aligned with a new strategic framework. Avoiding references to specific FAO results may ensure longer-term applicability of the Criteria.

16. The TCP Criteria require the alignment of TCP-funded activities with the CPF. All new CPFs are being formulated following the CPF guidelines released in October 2019 and are now directly derived from the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCF). Grounded on the United Nations Common Country Analysis, elaborated through a visioning and prioritization exercise resulting in the UNSDCF theory of change and completed through a consultative process by the UN country team and counterparts, the UNSDCF is the vehicle for defining the UN's collective contribution and commitment to support national efforts in achieving SDG targets under the 2030 Agenda. SDG targets and indicators become the default monitoring framework, informed by country-defined and disaggregated baselines. These indicators will be tracked online through UN INFO – the online planning, monitoring and reporting platform at country, regional and global levels.

17. UNSDCF outcomes and outputs relevant to FAO work, as well as related SDG targets and indicators, are copied verbatim into the CPF. The Annualized Resources Matrix of the CPF captures how TCP resources are being allocated in support of achieving CPF outputs and outcomes and, in turn, SDG targets and indicators. The Resident Coordinator reviews and comments on the CPF to confirm alignment and coherence with the UNSDCF, identifying opportunities to strengthen synergies and complementarities and to avoid duplication.

18. Regional and subregional TCP projects are prioritized by the Regional and Subregional Representatives based on requests from or priorities defined by the Regional Conference, regional and subregional organizations or a group of countries. Linkages to the CPFs and emerging priorities of participating countries are also of relevance in the selection of projects.

19. The direct link to the SDG targets and indicators will be further enhanced through the alignment of FAO's next Strategic Framework with the SDGs. Related reporting and monitoring mechanisms are under development.

20. As the demand at country level normally exceeds available resources, the FAO Representative engages in a prioritization process with counterparts. Throughout the prioritization process, the TCP Criteria are considered to avoid the identification of high-priority activities that are not eligible for TCP assistance. Changes to the agreed priorities in the CPF requires a formal request from the competent national authority. Dedicated TCP Officers in each region support quality assurance and compliance with established criteria and policies.

IV. Roadmap proposed to begin a strategic exercise to refine the criteria of resource allocation and re-imagine the TCP

21. The progress of the strategic exercise to refine the criteria and re-imagine the TCP would be presented at the next session of the Joint Meeting, specifically focusing on:

- a) adjusting the TCP criteria to fully align with the new Strategic Framework;
- b) ensuring internal operational guidance is brought up to date, streamlined and made more effective as part of the re-imagining the TCP exercise; and
- c) refining with a view to possibly unifying the criteria for resource allocation within regions. Management would engage with Regional Offices to explore possible improvements in the unification of the criteria within region allocations, without prejudice to regional specificities.

Annex 1: Distribution of Members with access to TCP on a full grant basis based on the operational responsibilities of FAO Regional Offices (2008)

RAF	RAP	RLC	REU	RNE
Angola ^{1,2}	Afghanistan ^{1,2,4}	Antigua and Barbuda ³	Albania ²	Algeria
Benin ^{1,2}	Bangladesh ^{1,2}	Argentina	Armenia ^{2,4}	Bahrain ³
Botswana ⁴	Bhutan ^{1,2,4}	Bahamas ³	Azerbaijan ^{2,4}	Egypt ²
Burkina Faso ^{1,2,4}	Cambodia ^{1,2}	Barbados ³	Belarus ²	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)
Burundi ^{1,2,4}	China ²	Belize ³	Bosnia and Herzegovina ²	Iraq ²
Cameroon ²	Cook Islands ³	Bolivia ⁴	Georgia ²	Jordan
Cabo Verde ^{2,3}	DPR of Korea ²	Brazil	Kazakhstan ⁴	Lebanon
Central African Republic ^{1,2,4}	Fiji ³	Chile	Kyrgyzstan ⁴	Libya
Chad ^{1,2,4}	India ²	Colombia	Montenegro	Mauritania ^{1,2}
Comoros ^{1,2,3}	Indonesia ²	Costa Rica	North Macedonia	Morocco ²
Congo ²	Kiribati ^{1,2,3}	Cuba ³	Rep. of Moldova ^{2,4}	Oman
Côte d'Ivoire ²	Lao People's Dem. Rep. ^{1,4}	Dominica ³	Russian Federation	Syrian Arab Rep. ²
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ^{1,2}	Malaysia	Dominican Republic ³	Serbia ⁴	Tunisia
Djibouti ^{1,2}	Maldives ^{1,3}	Ecuador	Tajikistan ^{2,4}	Yemen ^{1,2}
Equatorial Guinea ^{1,2}	Marshall Islands ³	EI Salvador	Turkey	
Eritrea ^{1,2}	Micronesia (Fed. States of) ³	Grenada ³	Turkmenistan ^{2,4}	
Eswatini ⁴	Mongolia ^{2,4}		Ukraine	
Ethiopia ^{1,2,4}	Myanmar ¹	Guatemala	Uzbekistan ^{2,4}	
Gabon	Nauru ³	Guyana ³		
Gambia ^{1,2}	Nepal ^{1,2,4}	Haiti ^{1,2,3}		
Ghana ²	Niue ³	Honduras ²		
Guinea ^{1,2}	Pakistan ²	Jamaica ³		
Guinea-Bissau ^{1,2,3}	Palau ³	Mexico		
Kenya ²	Papua New Guinea ^{2,3}	Nicaragua ²		
Lesotho ^{1,2,4}	Philippines ²	Panama		
Liberia ^{1,2}	Samoa ^{1,3}	Paraguay ⁴		
Madagascar ^{1,2}	Solomon Islands ^{1,2,3}	Peru		
Malawi ^{1,2,4}	Sri Lanka ²	Saint Kitts and Nevis ³		
Mali ^{1,2,4}	Thailand	Saint Lucia ³		
Mauritius ³	Timor-Leste ^{1,2,3}	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ³		
Mozambique ^{1,2}	Tonga ^{2,3}	Suriname ³		
Namibia	Tuvalu ^{1,2,3}	Trinidad and Tobago ³		
Niger ^{1,4}	Vanuatu ^{1,2,3}	Uruguay		
Nigeria ²	Viet Nam	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		
Rwanda ^{1,4}				
Sao Tomé and Príncipe ^{1,3}				
Senegal ¹				
Seychelles ³				
Sierra Leone ¹				
Somalia ^{1,2}				
South Africa				
Sudan ^{1,2}				
Togo ¹				
United Republic of Tanzania ¹				
Uganda ^{1,4}				
Zambia ^{1,4}				
Zimbabwe ⁴				

¹ Least Developed Country (LDC)

² Low-income Food-deficit Country (LIFDC)

³ Small Island Developing State (SIDS)

⁴ Landlocked Developing Country (LLDC)

Annex 2: Distribution of Members with access to TCP on a full grant basis based on the operational responsibilities of FAO Regional Offices (2020)

RAF	RAP	RLC	REU	RNE
Angola ¹	Afghanistan ^{1,2,4}	Antigua and Barbuda ³	Albania	Algeria
Benin ^{1,2}	Bangladesh ^{1,2}	Argentina	Armenia ⁴	Bahrain ³
Botswana ⁴	Bhutan ^{1,4}	Bahamas ³	Azerbaijan ⁴	Egypt
Burkina Faso ^{1,2,4}	Cambodia ¹	Barbados ³	Belarus	Iraq
Burundi ^{1,2,4}	China	Belize ³	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Jordan
Cameroon ²	Cook Islands ³	Bolivia ⁴	Georgia	Lebanon
Cabo Verde ³	DPR of Korea ²	Brazil	Kazakhstan ⁴	Libya
Central African Republic ^{1,2,4}	Fiji ³	Colombia	Kyrgyzstan ^{2,4}	Mauritania ^{1,2}
Chad ^{1,2,4}	India ²	Costa Rica	Montenegro	Morocco
Comoros ^{1,2,3}	Indonesia	Cuba ³	North Macedonia ⁴	Sudan ^{1,2}
Congo ²	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Dominica ³	Rep. of Moldova ⁴	Syrian Arab Rep. ²
Côte d'Ivoire ²	Kiribati ^{1,3}	Dominican Republic ³	Russian Federation	Tunisia
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ^{1,2}	Lao People's Dem. Rep. ^{1,4}	Ecuador	Serbia	Yemen ^{1,2}
Djibouti ^{1,2}	Malaysia	El Salvador	Tajikistan ^{2,4}	
Equatorial Guinea	Maldives ³	Grenada ³	Turkey	
Eritrea ^{1,2}	Marshall Islands ³	Guatemala	Turkmenistan ⁴	
Eswatini ⁴	Micronesia (Fed. States of) ³	Guyana ³	Ukraine	
Ethiopia ^{1,2,4}	Mongolia ⁴	Haiti ^{1,2,3}	Uzbekistan ^{2,4}	
Gabon	Myanmar ¹	Honduras		
Gambia ^{1,2}	Nauru ³	Jamaica ³		
Ghana ²	Nepal ^{1,2,4}	Mexico		
Guinea ^{1,2}	Niue ³	Nicaragua ²		
Guinea-Bissau ^{1,2,3}	Pakistan	Paraguay ⁴		
Kenya ²	Palau ³	Peru		
Lesotho ^{1,2,4}	Papua New Guinea ³	Saint Kitts and Nevis ³		
Liberia ^{1,2}	Philippines	Saint Lucia ³		
Madagascar ^{1,2}	Samoa ³	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ³		
Malawi ^{1,2,4}	Solomon Islands ^{1,2,3}	Suriname ³		
Mali ^{1,2,4}	Sri Lanka	Trinidad and Tobago ³		
Mauritius ³	Thailand	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		
Mozambique ^{1,2}	Timor-Leste ^{1,3}			
Namibia	Tonga ³			
Niger ^{1,2,4}	Tuvalu ^{1,3}			
Nigeria	Vanuatu ³			
Rwanda ^{1,2,4}	Viet Nam ²			
Sao Tomé and Príncipe ^{1,2,3}				
Senegal ^{1,2}				
Seychelles ³				
Sierra Leone ^{1,2}				
Somalia ^{1,2}				
South Africa				
South Sudan ^{1,2,4}				
Togo ^{1,2}				
Uganda ^{1,2,4}				
United Rep. of Tanzania ^{1,2}				
Zambia ^{1,4}				
Zimbabwe ^{2,4}				

¹ Least Developed Country (LDC)

² Low-income Food-deficit Country (LIFDC)

³ Small Island Developing State (SIDS)

⁴ Landlocked Developing Country (LLDC)

Annex 3: TCP Evaluation: Section on resource distribution by Regional Offices (extract from [JM 2020.2/2](#), pages 10 and 11)

Table 1: Allocation of resources in the Region

Africa (RAF)	Asia and the Pacific (RAP)	Europe and Central Asia (REU)	Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC)	Near East (RNE)
Countries (79%)	Countries (80%)	Countries (80%)	Countries (37%)	Countries (69%)
Subregional (9%)	Subregional* (2%)	Subregional* (5%)	Country catalytic (40%)	Regional and subregional (12%)
Regional (3%)	Regional (12%)	Regional (15%)	Subregional (9%)	Transformative/catalytic (12%)
Emerging issues (5%)	Strategic pool (4%)		Regional (5%)	Contingency (8%)
Seed fund for resource mobilization (3%)	Miscellaneous (1%)		Regional catalytic + reserve (9%)	

Table 2: Allocation criteria to countries

Africa (RAF)	Asia and the Pacific (RAP)	Europe and Central Asia (REU)	Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC)	Near East (RNE)
Historical performance	An equal minimum allocation to all countries (USD 300 000) +	A base amount for TCPFs (USD 150 000 to USD 200 000)	A differentiated base allocation for 5 categories of countries	A same base allocation to all countries (USD 400 000) +
“Special attention” countries	“Special attention” or big country	“Special attention” countries	- low-income	Large country population (> 40 million)
Countries with emergency and humanitarian issues	Under-nourished percentage	- LIFDC	- lower-middle income	Lower-middle-income-country
Resource mobilization special fund use	Under-nourished number	- LLDC – low-middle-income	- upper-middle income SIDS and upper-middle income non-SIDS up to per capita income of USD 8 186	Resource scarcity by donors (<USD 5 million for national projects)
	Additional consideration	- LLDC – upper-middle-income	income of USD 8 186	A fixed amount is reduced for all upper-middle-income countries
	- income level	“Intermediate countries”	- high-income SIDS and all other upper-middle income countries	
	- donor funding availability	- lower-middle income	- high-income non-SIDS are not eligible	
	- humanitarian situation	- upper-middle income		
	- rural population size		The rest is distributed on a first-come first-serve basis	
	- lack of requests			

Allocation per country ranged from USD 400 000 to USD 986 076	Allocation per country ranged from USD 300 000 to USD 1 200 000	Allocation per country ranged from USD 450 000 to USD 800 000	Base allocation per country ranged from USD 100 000 to USD 700 000 (with potential to double)	Allocation per country ranged from USD 400 000 to USD 900 000
Average of USD 748 250	Average of USD 657 576 (the average for Pacific countries was USD 380 000)	Average of USD 585 588	Base average USD 238 710 (potential to double)	Average of USD 553 846

Annex 4: TCP Criteria

Criterion	Development TCP Assistance	Emergency TCP Assistance
1. Country Eligibility	All FAO Members are eligible for access to TCP-supported technical assistance. However, TCP gives special attention to assisting the neediest countries, especially the Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDCs), Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs), and/or Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Access by high-income economies and by members of the European Union to technical assistance through the TCP modality should only be on a full cost-recovery basis.	Fifteen percent of the TCP appropriation is indicatively earmarked for emergency and rehabilitation projects, accessible to all FAO Members.
2. Aims and Purposes	TCP-supported assistance contributes directly to at least one corporate outcome of FAO's Strategic Framework.	TCP-supported emergency and early rehabilitation assistance should contribute to Organizational Outcome 4 of Strategic Objective 5, aiming at ensuring that countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture related interventions.
3. Country or Regional Priorities	TCP-supported assistance should be directed at national or regional priorities linked to the aims and purposes identified in Criterion 2 and, where they are in place, should be consistent with FAO's Country Programming Frameworks and emerge from TCP priority-setting processes at the country level.	Emergency TCP assistance is not subject to any priority setting process.
4. Critical Gap or Problem	TCP-supported assistance should be directed at a clearly defined critical technical gap or problem that has been identified by beneficiaries or stakeholders and which necessitates technical cooperation within the timeframe that can be provided by the Programme, which either cannot or should not be provided through other resources.	Emergency TCP assistance should be designed for very rapid response in support of interventions in thematic areas in which the Organization has a demonstrated comparative advantage.

5. Sustainable Impacts	TCP-supported assistance should result in clearly defined outputs and outcomes leading to impacts. It should have catalytic or multiplier effects such as increased mobilization of investment funds. The outcomes and impacts should be sustainable. TCP requests will not be accepted when they are a consequence of the ineffective follow-up to previous TCPs.	TCP emergency assistance should be directed at the sustainable rehabilitation of productive activities and at technical cooperation to support effective government (or donor) responses. TCP-supported emergency and early rehabilitation assistance should be directed at interventions that increase the likelihood of additional donor and/or government resources being directed to immediate relief and longer-term rehabilitation. Repetitive assistance to address recurrent types of emergencies in the same country should be avoided and be redirected towards more lasting impact assistance for the prevention of and preparedness for these same emergencies.
6. Scale and Duration	No TCP project should require a budget of more than USD 500 000 and it should be completed within 24 months. The duration may be extended to 36 months, when justified, and on a case-by-case basis. The budget ceiling for a TCP Facility project is USD 100 000.	
7. Government Commitment	Requests for TCP assistance should include a formal commitment by government(s) or regional organizations to provide all necessary inputs, staff and institutional arrangements to ensure the timely and effective start-up, implementation and follow-up of the requested TCP-supported assistance.	
8. Capacity Development	Wherever possible, TCP-supported assistance should help develop national or regional capacities to ensure that the critical gaps and problems to which they are directed would either not appear again or that they could be resolved effectively at the national or regional level.	TCP-supported emergency and early rehabilitation assistance should increase the capacity of the government and affected communities and households to either withstand, or respond to, similar shocks in the future, without resorting to external assistance.
9. Gender Equality	TCP-supported assistance must be gender-sensitive in identification, design and implementation, in line with the Organization's Gender Plan of Action.	
10. Partnership and Participation	Wherever possible, TCP-supported assistance should contribute to new or strengthened partnerships and alliances, including through co-financing, and should lead to the increased participation of food-insecure and poor men and women in key decision-making processes.	