



TCP Facility

COMPONENT DESCRIPTION

Title of the component:	Provide assistance to the State Service for Food Safety of the Ministry of Agriculture of Armenia with risk assessment methodology and system in the fields of food safety, veterinary services and phytosanitary.
Project symbol / baby:	TCP/ARM/3603 – baby 2
Recipient Country(ies):	Republic of Armenia
Government/other counterpart(s):	State Service for Food Safety, Ministry of Agriculture
Estimated budget (USD):	USD 46,000
Expected EOD (Starting Date):	15 June 2017
Expected NTE (End Date):	15 December 2017
Lead Technical Officer (LTO):	Mary Kenny, Food Safety and Quality Officer
TCPf contribution to FAO's Strategic Framework (indicate as appropriate) ¹	
Strategic Objective/Organizational Outcome:	SP4/Outcome 401: International agreements, mechanisms and standards that promote more efficient and inclusive trade and markets are formulated and implemented by countries.
Regional Initiative/Priority Area:	RI-2 Agri-food Trade and Market Integration
Country Programming Framework Outcome:	Country Outcome 2.2: Policy framework enhanced to ensure food safety and quality.

¹ For projects operated by country offices, it is necessary to link projects in FPMIS at Organizational Output level. For all other projects, linkage at product/service level is necessary.

Objectives:

Addressing sanitary and phytosanitary issues remains a strategic priority for the Republic of Armenia in the continuing development of the food and agriculture sectors. The State Service for Food Safety (SSFS), Ministry of Agriculture play a leading role in official food control to ensure all foods, whether consumed locally or exported, are safe and free from harmful levels of microbiological or chemical contaminants. Food safety risks may enter the food chain at different points, and may be due to the presence or management of plant pests, and animal health diseases.

SFSS is currently undergoing a re-structuring to improve programme delivery, and has recognized the need to improve its risk assessment capacity, and capacities to develop risk-based official controls and inspection programmes, i.e. focused on the food safety, animal health and plant health risks (including businesses) of most concern. This should improve food safety, support value chain development, and ensure optimal use of public funds which are often limited. Prevention of animal health (including zoonoses) and food safety risks (due to management of plant health) are also a priority.

Building these capacities will require a focus on i) evidence and data on food safety risks; ii) risk assessment to determine priority food safety issues, and iii) development of appropriate controls and risk management options to avoid unsafe food. Through this TCPf, baseline information will be collected to determine current capacities, strengths, and weaknesses in these areas. Discussions will take place with authorities in the SFSS, other relevant government agencies, and the scientific and academia institutions, to determine key players, roles and important data providers.

The country needs to improve risk assessment capabilities on animal health and plant health threats not directly related to food safety will also be assessed and targeted if needed.

A clear understanding of the current status quo, and weaknesses, will inform the scope of support needed to build capacities in risk assessment and risk-based programmes. A draft TCP project will be developed in partnership with the authorities, to be implemented in 2018-2019.

Outputs to be achieved and activities to be implemented:

Output 1: Identification of food safety capacity development interventions needed to improve food safety risk assessment and development of risk-based approaches

Activity 1.1: Inception mission to Armenia, 26 – 30 June 2017 to meet with authorities and discuss request for support and priorities, and gain insights into current knowledge, and available data

Activity 1.2: A one-day multi stakeholder meeting for SFSS, other relevant Ministries, scientific institutions, other data providers (maximum 25 persons)

Activity 1.3: A series of meetings with relevant Ministries, Institutions

Output 2: A report providing additional important data on key institutions, current tasks, available data and evidence, specific needs.

Activity 2.1: Data collection by a national consultant (1 month)

Activity 2.2: Drafting and finalization of report

Activity 2.3: Oversight and guidance by LTO and/or international consultant (5 days)

Output 3: A draft TCP to build capacities on modern approaches to food control, including food safety risk assessment and risk-based programmes

Activity 3.1: Draft document prepared based on information from Output 1 and 2 (5 days international consultant)

Activity 3.2: A follow-up one week mission by AGFF (5 days mission) to discuss and validate the draft project document

Activity 3.3: a 2-day multi-stakeholder workshop to discuss the draft project document (maximum 25 persons).

Consultants (title)	No. of total days	Fee per Day in USD	Total Budget in USD
International Expert on food safety risk assessment	20 (including 10 days of mission)	450	9000
National Expert on food control system and national data collection activities	30	100	3000

Travel	No. of days	DSA per Day	Other travel costs	Total Budget
International Expert on food safety risk assessment	10 days (in 2 missions)	10 days x 162= 1620	Two mission 1380	3000
National Expert on food control system and national data collection activities	5 days within country	5 days x127 = 635	365	1000

Technical Support Services	No. of days	Fee per Day		Total Budget
Honorarium - TSS – LTO	15 days (including 10 days in 2 mission)	571 ²		8565
Honorarium – TSS – Animal Health Officer REUTD	6 days (in one mission)	571 ³		3426
Total TSS				11991
Travel	No. of days	DSA per Day	Other travel costs	Total Budget
Travel – TSS - LTO, AGFF	10 days in 2 mission	10 days x162=1620	1400	3020
Travel – TSS- Animal Health Officer - REUTD	6 days in 1 mission	6 days x162=972	700	1672
Total TSS travel				4692
In-country training and workshops (charge on line 5920)		Total Budget		9000
One two 2-day workshop, and one 1-day workshop for approx. 25 persons				

² Subject to change

³ Subject to change

BUDGET

Parent Account	Parent Account Description	Account	Account Description	Org	Original Budget
5013	Consultants	5542	Consultants - Internationally-recruited	FEARM	9,000
5013	Consultants	5543	Consultants - Locally-recruited	FEARM	3,000
5021	Travel	5684	Travel - Consultants - International	FEARM	3,000
5021	Travel	5685	Travel - Consultants - National	FEARM	1,000
5021	Travel	5692	Travel - Technical Assistance to Field Projects	FEARM	4,692
5023	Training	5920	Training Budget	FEARM	9,000
5027	Technical Support Services	6120	Technical Assistance to Field Projects	FEARM	11,991
5028	General Operating Expenses	6300	General Operating Expenses Budget	FEARM	1,308
5029	Support Costs	6130	Support Costs Budget	FEARM	3,009
Grand Total					46,000

Appraisal against TCP Criteria

1. Country Eligibility

Is the country requesting assistance part of the special attention group? If not, is it part of the intermediate group?
 If the request originates with a regional or subregional organization, is this organization eligible for TCP assistance?
 Are resources remaining in the regional allocation for the country or subregion/region?

Comment on relevance:

Armenia is a special attention country

2. Aims and Purposes

Which Organizational Output(s) does the project contribute to?

Comment on relevance:

SP4 – Building efficient value chains require robust national food control system, which support the safety of food produced, thus protecting consumer health and facilitating market access.

Output 40101 - New and revised international standards for food safety and quality and plant health are formulated and agreed by countries and serve as references for international harmonization.

3. Country or Regional Priorities

Is the problem to be addressed mentioned in any national (or subregional/regional) planning documents?
 How does the project contribute directly to the implementation of the CPF or to the UNDAF?
 If the problem intended to be solved with this project is not included in the NMTPF/CPF/UNDAF what is the explanation for this? Should the project still be considered for funding under the TCP? Why?

Comment on relevance:

The introduction of food safety international standards is the 6th main direction of the national SADS, which highlights the need for effective control and management of plant and animal health⁴.

The TCPf will contribute to CPF, 2016-2020, government priority 2: Animal health, plant protection, and food safety and quality, and more specifically Country Outcome 2.2: Policy framework enhanced to ensure food safety and quality.

4. Critical Gap or Problem

Are the stakeholders and beneficiaries clearly identified?
 Who needs the project and to do what?
 What is it that beneficiaries and stakeholders cannot do without external/international technical assistance through the project?
 Is the identified problem technical (knowledge, capacity, technical, legal or institutional gap) or is it financial (lack of money)? (If lack of money only, we cannot consider TCP funding)
 Are there any other ways/sources of funding to get the expertise to the country?

Comment on relevance:

The project beneficiary is clearly identified – the State Service for Food Safety, Ministry of Agriculture. A clear request is made for technical assistance to build capacities in risk assessment and modern approaches to food control. This will directly support SSFS to fulfill their mandate on food safety. The TCPf will focus on identifying the capacity development needs of the SSFS and other key partners, which will form the basis of a TCP project.

Through the TCPf, (and follow up project), SSFS will be strengthened to fulfill its role in food safety in partnership with the Ministry of Health, private sector, civil society, such as Green Lane NGO, academia, and research institutes such as Armenian National Agrarian University.

The request is for technical assistance and strengthening of national systems of control through improved capacities. It is not financial.

5. Sustainable Impacts

How will the outputs solve the identified problem?

What kind of change will solving the problem lead to?
 How will the stakeholders ensure that the outputs are sustainable?
 Have any donors or financial institutions indicated an interest in supporting the sector or subsector during or after the project?
 How will the TCP and any donor complement each other?
 What other projects in the same sector or subsector in the country (or subregion/region) has the TCP already funded? What was the follow-up to those?

Comment on relevance:	Building capacities in food safety risk assessment and modern approaches to food control will require sustained support through a project. The activities through this TCPf will allow for identification of needs which will be addressed through the planned TCP. Working closely with the government counterpart should ensure that the outputs and follow up project are sustained.
-----------------------	---

6. Scale and Duration
 Can the project realistically be completed within the proposed timeframe and with the proposed budget?

Comment on relevance:	The TCPf will be 6 months duration. It is feasible with the planned budget.
-----------------------	---

7. Government Commitment
 What contributions will the recipient government or institution and the other stakeholders provide to the project?
 How do you know that there is a real interest in solving the identified problem?
 Are you sure that the stakeholders and beneficiaries are ready to participate in the implementation of the project without being paid/compensated for this participation?
 Is it clear that counterpart staff will not receive salary supplements or be recruited to work for the project as national consultants?
 What plans do the counterparts have for how they will use the project's outcome/outputs and follow-up on the project? Where will the financial resources, if required, for the follow-up come from?
 Has the government made a commitment in this regard? How strong is that commitment?

Comment on relevance:	The government specifically requested FAO support and are ready to support missions, and provide information and agree together on capacity building needs. SFSS will be the key partner, and involve other institutions as required Government will provide access to analysis already undertaken and access to relevant facilities. Government counterparts throughout the TCPf will provide time and expertise on their current capacities, institutional framework in place, their specific needs and weaknesses. The counterpart will also play a key role in organizing the two multi-stakeholder workshops, ensuring the correct participation etc, and presenting key information to facilitate discussions.
-----------------------	--

8. Capacity-building
 Will the counterparts and stakeholders acquire the necessary knowledge and skills during the implementation of the project to use its outputs and results effectively in future?
 Will they be able to replicate or scale up the activities?
 Will the project create a critical mass of knowledge and skills that did not exist before the project?

Comment on relevance:	Through the information exchange and discussions in the TCPf, there will be an element of capacity building and knowledge exchange. Validation of the draft TCP project will also allow for ownership and engagement in the planned activities to build capacities in 2018-19.
-----------------------	--

9. Gender-sensitivity
 How have gender considerations been addressed? Note that gender analysis includes issues of sex, age, ethnicity, social class, geographical location and all factors that influence the roles and responsibilities of men and women. Is there a special focus/role/interest/impact for men or women in the project? If so, how has this been reflected in project design and how will it be reflected in project implementation?

How will the equal participation of, and benefit by, women and men be ensured?	
Comment on relevance:	<p>Risk assessment approaches to assess and manage food safety risks take account of differences between men, women, children, infants in terms of vulnerability and exposure to food safety hazards. Discussions and approaches to improved data collection on food safety risks, will promote the need for sex and age disaggregated data as best practice.</p> <p>TCPf activities and the planned follow up TCP will promote the equal opportunity for men and women to contribute to, and participate in project implementation.</p>
<p>10. Partnership and Participation</p> <p>How will the beneficiaries and other stakeholders be involved and participate in the project formulation, implementation and its follow-up?</p> <p>Is the project complementary to related activities financed by the counterpart or by donors?</p> <p>Will any new partnerships be created as a consequence of the project?</p>	
Comment on relevance:	<p>Through this TCPf, two missions are foreseen to allow for direct discussions with the SSFS and other key partners with shared responsibility for food safety. Multi-stakeholder workshops (2) will be convened during the missions to discuss and validate the planned support from FAO.</p> <p>This will include input by the authorities on the project components and activities and results framework, and validation of the draft project during the second mission.</p> <p>Support from a national consultant will also support this collaboration.</p> <p>There will be discussions and information exchange between food safety, animal health and plant health sectors at country level, and within FAO in order to meet the needs of the Government.</p>

Budget