



Guiding Group Meeting – Minutes

Date: **7 March 2018, 9:00-17:00**

Location: **German Room (C-229), FAO HQ, Rome, Italy**

Present: **see list of participants (Annex)**

Facilitator: **Fritz Schneider, Chair**

Minutes of Meeting: **Anna Grun, AST**

Contents

Guiding Group Meeting – Minutes	1
1. Welcome and recognition of members/observers – Chair.....	2
2. Progress report 2017	2
2.1. Traffic light evaluation – Chair.....	2
2.3. GG Meeting Minutes 19./20. Sept.2017 - Chair	2
2.4. Annual report 2017 – Mr Arce Diaz	2
3. MSP in Mongolia – Chair	3
4. HLPE report on multi-stakeholder partnerships – Mr Arce Diaz	5
5. MSP meeting venues for 2019 and 2020 – Chair.....	5
6. Regional GASL meeting in Uman', Ukraine, 24-26 April, 2018 – Mr Arce Diaz.....	8
7. Finances, fundraising, budget 2018, etc. – Chair.....	9
8. FAO evaluation of GASL – Mr Khan, Mr Guerrero, Mr Waelty	12
9. Process to develop GASL Action Plan 2019-2021 – Chair	13
10. Process to select the GASL Chair 2018 – 2020 – Chair, Mr Steinfeld.....	14
11. Discussion on results and plans shared by Clusters and Action Networks (based on 6-March Seminar) and future strategy to consolidate GASL Action Networks – Chair.....	15
12. Any other business and conclusions	16
12.1. Agree on the TORs for the evaluation of GASL tools and cases from Addis Abeba – Ms Burgeois	16
12.2. Agree on the TORs for the Editorial committee – Mr Schelling.....	17
12.3. Other business	18
ANNEX 1: Detailed Meeting Agenda 7 March 2018.....	20
ANNEX 1: List of Participants	23
ANNEX 2: Traffic Light Evaluation	25
ANNEX 3: Guiding Group Members (as of 10 April 2018).....	27
ANNEX 4: Summaries of Action Network and Cluster Presentations	34



1. Welcome and recognition of members/observers – Chair

Mr Schneider, the Chair of GASL, welcomes the attendees for the GG meeting and informs the participants that the Mongolian Embassy has canceled the foreseen fundraising event in the evening with selected Perm Peps because there was not enough participation. After Mr Arce Diaz from the Agenda Support Team (AST) goes through the list of attendees, Mr Schneider presents the traffic light evaluation.

2. Progress report 2017

2.1. Traffic light evaluation – Chair

Feedback on Ethiopia MSP Meeting: Report is approved. French and Spanish translation is available. Proposal for further revision of the tools and cases presented in Addis Ababa: TORs are developed, work is in progress.

Report of exploratory mission to Mongolia: Work is in progress.

Financial situation: see tables

Proposal to reduce MSP sponsorship burden: Only 30 persons will be sponsored by 2,500 USD, the criteria to select are in progress. In addition, there will be some sponsored Mongolian people, but with much less than 2,500 USD per person.

Fundraising strategy: Fundraising work is going on; the task force (Chair, Alwin Kopse, Niek Schelling, Marie-Odile Kuntz) developed a pamphlet as well as an open letter and sent it out. The response was not enthusiastic. However, the present donors gave positive signals to continue their support for core funding. For the MSP in Mongolia, the Swiss development cooperation will sponsor 50,000 USD, Heifer international pledged 10,000 USD and the Mongolian government budgeted 95,000 USD for the MSP.

Agenda Support Team (AST): Anna Grun support the AST since 1 February 2018. France and Germany JPO proposals are work in progress. For the German JPO, GASL received a short list, there are two very qualified persons. Following the wish of Germany, the chosen person will work for one year in Bangkok at the FAO office and after this one year in Rome.

Proposal for an Executive Committee: Proposal was rejected by GG. No action ever since. Proposal for an Editorial Committee: The draft terms are available. See agenda point later.

GASL communication: Anna Grun will support communication of GASL and support the Action Networks.

Animal Welfare: The AN Animal Welfare report is available. Approved.

Investments for Sustainable Livestock Development: Development on track, not an Action Network yet.

Constitution of the Mongolia MSP Task Force: Nancy Burgeois from the Cluster Academia & Research and Donald Moore, who is not a GG member, have agreed to join the MSP task force.

MSP Venues for 2019 and 2020: New Zealand declines for 2019, Switzerland agrees for 2020.

Global Agenda Co-Hosted CFS Side Event, 11 Oct 2017: Report has been distributed.

Event Calendar 2017-2018: is updated

2.3. GG Meeting Minutes 19./20. Sept.2017 - Chair

The minutes have been distributed. Discussion. The feedback is positive, especially concrete dates in the minutes are appreciated.

Marie-Odile Kuntz announces that she will leave GASL. Isabelle Quillon, Chargé de Mission from the French Ministry of Agriculture will replace her. Isabelle will participate in the 8th MSP.

The minutes are approved.

2.4. Annual report 2017 – Mr Arce Diaz

The Chair and AST have decided to include also the report of 2016, so it became a progress report of 2016-17. This delayed the process. The distributed draft is not complete, since in the annex there should be a short report of every Cluster and AN. The feedback of the GG on this report is requested and appreciated.

Mr Arce Diaz, manager of the AST, explains: The idea was to see what the main activities and achievements have been. GASL has to improve communication to show GASL's contribution to the SDGs. He also mentions the Action Plan (AP) 2019-21, to which all GG members are invited to contribute.

Summary of the progress report:

1. Consolidation of a Multi-Stakeholders Partnership aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals.



2. Formalization of an organizational structure to support and guide the Global Agenda with approved Rules and Procedures. Rules and procedures from FAO are used as a basis of other partnerships. GASL is a good example for what an independent partnership should be.
3. 2016 FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) Support. COAG Sep. 2016: 115 countries gathered and decided to validate and support GASL. The success of GASL renewed the attention of donors and governments.
4. There were two MSP meetings in Panama and Ethiopia: Stakeholder showed how they can contribute to GASL with important tools that helped to foster Sustainable Livestock sector development.
5. Further development of existent Action Networks
6. Establishment of three additional Action Networks: LAMP, Livestock for Social Development and Animal Welfare. These are important for GASL. Funding is an issue.
7. Advocacy on sustainable livestock sector in the process of developing the UN Agenda 2030 and at policy level
8. Expansion of the donor base: There are eight active donors and real interests from Germany and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.
9. Strengthening of the Agenda Support Team
10. FAO's Support to GASL. This support is key, including feedback, critics etc. that makes GASL stronger.
11. Challenges ahead. GASL has to better focus its activities. Communication has to improve. Fundraising is a major challenge.

Discussion:

- What is the procedure? Is it going to be finalized and approved?
A complete first draft will be sent to the GG by end of April. The aim is to have it ready for Mongolia. The print version will be very limited, but there will be an online version.
- What is the difference between a member and an observer? In principle, it is the GG, but if specific observers want to contribute, they can let the Chair and AST know. The difference between a member and an observer is, that in case of a vote the observers cannot vote, only 5 members of each clusters. This is part of the "rules and procedure" of GASL
- It is a good report. 26 pages is long, could be reduced. The thing is it may not point out the future. Yesterday we had a good meeting in terms of sharing and looking deep into GASL. How are we going to take advantage of this report? How do we take into account the evaluation report?
- This is a progress report, which ends at the end of 2017. The evaluation is in 2018. The Chairs' proposal is to finalize this report and not waiting for the evaluation report. The seminar of 6 March feeds into the process of the new Action Plan. The evaluation results will also feed into the new Action Plan. The evaluation is an FAO process. It will be helpful for GASL. The progress report 2016 and 2017 will be finalized without the evaluation inputs.
- Compliment to the Chair and the AST for this report. The main text should be short, details in the annex.
- Suggestion to only have it as electronic version and put it on the website
- Suggestion to have it in different languages, at least the summary. The Chair informs that this will be related to the budget, but the summary will be translated in Spanish and French.
- Specific question in relation to the monitoring of the SDGs and the relation to livestock: as mentioned, this is going to be challenging. The Chair explains that GASL is participating in the High Level Political Forum, which is a monitoring instrument for the SDGs. But the direct contribution as participants in this forum is limited. GASL has been more active in side events, in special events. The activities that were described as part of this output were organizing workshops and seminars about the role of livestock in the UN Agenda 2030 as well as technical papers.

The Chair concludes to continue finalizing the report and to distribute it. The discussion about printing it or not is still open. The pending issues will be taken forward for this year's program but with special reference to the next AP. He thanks Mr Enkhbat for his work on this report.

3. MSP in Mongolia – Chair

The Chair welcomes Mr Enkhbat, State Secretary from the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industries (MoFALI) and the project manager Ms Enkh-Amgalan of a rangeland management program (earlier called



“Green Gold Project”) supported by the Mongolian Government and the Swiss Development Cooperation. The Chair presents the general planning and the outcomes of this first meeting.

Title: “Towards Sustainability – Livestock on the move”. This is referring to both the global and the national and regional parts of the 8th MSP.

Programme: In principle the programme ideas of the AST and the MSP were supported by the GG. Please refer to the advanced draft of the meeting under: <http://www.livestockdialogue.org/events/events/en/>

Budget: See table below. Still a draft.

Cost item	Total (US\$)	Source: GASL Funds	Source: MOFALI	Source: Sponsors	Comments
Event logistics • Conference infrastructure • Hosted dinners and lunches • Cultural programme • Meet the herders • Local transport	200'000.00	30'000.00	95'000.00	75'000.00	Sponsoring expected for: • Dinners and lunches (50'000.00) • Interpretation (10'000) • Conf. infrastructure (15'000.00)
Marchmont communication	45'000.00	45'000.00	0.00	0.00	
Facilitation	30'000.00	30'000.00	0.00	0.00	
Sponsored participation • 30 Persons x 2'500.00	75'000.00	25'000.00	0.00	50'000.00	Sponsoring expected • 20 Persons x 2'500.00
Total	350'000.00	130'000.00	95'000.00	125'000.00	

Open issues: The open issues listed in the GG have been dissolved by 15 April. Still open are the key note speakers.

Accommodation: There is a very small number of hotel rooms, but there are sufficient Gers in the surroundings of the event venue (Red Rock), some of them with attached bathrooms and in some cases, people will have to walk over a field to a sanitary block. The Gers will not be right at the site of the meeting, but not further than five kilometers. Mr. Enkhbat agrees to the Chair's summary and the Chair gives the floor to the audience.

Discussion:

- Regarding the communication in general and between Clusters, ANs, etc. it would be good to help and organize interaction between these different groups. Yesterday it was identified that for the private sector, the added value of GASL is still a question. There should be an organized exchange for discussion about what are the expectations of the Clusters and what are they from the ANs to help their work? During the plenary session or the group session, there could be some questions, on which the different groups could work on and present the results during the plenary. The Chair endorses this idea. He reminds that the global part has to come out with some concrete ideas what GASL can deliver to the global debate. The outcome of the Mongolian meeting will be used for the AP 2019-21.
- It is important to think about the tasks of the different pieces and about how they add together. What have we learned and how do we use this for the next three years AP? Then it is also important to think of the role of GASL related to the SDGs, particularly the eight that were identified. How are we going to contribute to the wider international community and to the countries? There is already some focus around those SDGs, how to get ANs and Clusters working together and use this as a way of organizing the next three years. The Chair agrees that there is no doubt, the reference frame are the SDGs and GASL has to show progress towards achieving them.
- It is very important for GASL to focus on ANs. Another point is COP23 and GFFA – maybe 30 minutes on these two topics is not enough. It is so important to allocate more space to these topics.
- What kind of person is requested as keynote speaker? This question is still pending, as the Chair confirms. If someone has a champion, he or she can let them know. The Mongolian keynote speaker



will talk about rangeland management and sustainable herding. The speaker will be a person from the ministry. That means that the Global Agenda needs a person from the global side, who is well versed with the agenda of COP23 and GFFA and the global issues.

- Can the time located for the ANs also be used for internal meetings of the ANs? There is a slot “cluster meetings” on Friday morning. There should not be any AN-meetings during open space, because there the participants want to interact and listen to the ones who are presenting.
- There must be multi-stakeholder discussions and not only clusters talking (NGOs talk to the NGOs, Private Sector to the Private Sector etc.) It is necessary to organize a real multi-stakeholder dialogue.
- This meeting is used for the next AP: There should not only be focus on the opinions from GG member, but from all GASL members. The Chair agrees and hopes to have at least a concept note or frame for the new AP until the MSP meeting. In principle, the GG has to agree to the new AP in the September/October meeting.
- It is very important to link GASL and the SDGs. A lot of farmer organizations make reflections. We need some examples what to do, a more practical approach, like from the Private Sector. The Chair confirms that there is room for this in the open space.
- Proposal for the program to take the GFFA resolution and fit different SDGs in, so it would be also possible to talk about different systems including pastoralism. Although this could be a good idea, the Chair is not keen to go back on program details in the GG. He points out that now the work with the Mongolian partners has to be done.
- The GG should confirm what the outputs look like. The Chair agrees on that and promises the GG to get the chance to respond.

At the end of the discussion, Mr Enkhbat adds (translated by Ms Enkh-Amgalan) that it is important to select the event management very soon. The Chair thanks and concludes that the GG is looking forward to Mongolia.

4. HLPE report on multi-stakeholder partnerships – Mr Arce Diaz

The report of HLPE on multi-stakeholder partnerships has the intention to find ways to support food security through partnerships. The Global Agenda was invited to provide feedback and therefore every cluster was asked to submit comments. GASL provided inputs as follows:

1. Suggestions to improve the text in Box 9, page 35, regarding the Global Agenda’s description
2. Suggested text to include a box on the Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef, one of GASL partners that is implementing an important MSP initiative in the beef sector.
3. Two representative sets of responses by our partners to the main questions to be addressed, identified by the HLPE can be translated into economic consideration applied to the livestock value chain: To have output we

The Private Sector and Academia Sector contributed to this (Mr Huang and Ms Wedderburn). Mr Arce Diaz and Mr Schneider also submitted some adjustments to the description of the Global Agenda in “box 9”. The Roundtable for Sustainable Beef also requested a box to describe their initiative, it involves a very important MSP initiative in the beef sector. Mr Arce Diaz thanks the contributors for their inputs.

5. MSP meeting venues for 2019 and 2020 – Chair

After the last GG meeting the Chair and AST were requested to look for venues for the MSP meeting 2019 and 2020. Mr Schneider and Mr Arce Diaz decided to ask New Zealand for 2019 and Switzerland for 2020. Switzerland (Alwin Kopse) sent an invitation letter (28 February 2018). For 2019, New Zealand regrets not to be able to host the MSP in 2019 (30 January 2018). Instead of New Zealand, the GG could consider to explore South Africa, Australia or Uruguay.

Discussion:

A possibility could be to link it with a private sector event. Concrete suggestions are:

- World summit of IDF, Istanbul, Turkey, in October 2019
- Event of World Poultry Africa, Rwanda, in October 2019
- World Pork conference, China, 2019
- Feed and Food congress, Bangkok, Thailand, 11-13 March 2019



There is dissent to this proposal: One of the disadvantages to organize a MSP meeting back to back is that it will be driven by other meetings. At a poultry event, for example, you will always have a large part of participation coming from that other meeting. And GASL spends a lot of money bringing people in who have nothing to do with this. In the end, you are not making any big savings because your part is to balance these differences or disparities in terms of the participation. The Global Agenda has to assure that there is participation from all the different parts. Unless of course, if there is another multi-stakeholder meeting.

The GG should ask Uruguay, as there is a real good possibility that they would not only accept, but they would do an excellent job. Look at Uruguay, but also at any others that are similarly motivated.

It should be somewhere, where there are not a lot of members of GASL, to advertise GASL. In South America, there were already a lot of MSPs and GASL has a lot of members there. It would be better to have it in Asia, Turkey, Rwanda, China, Bangkok, maybe also West Africa in order to extend the membership of GASL. Other members of the GG confirm the factor of geographical sensitivity. But Latin America should still not be excluded.

The Chair invites the GG to focus more. Theoretically, it is possible to send a general request to a dozen countries and give them information what it retails – but for 2019, there is not much time. The other option would be to focus and just ask one country again. However, he asks for guidance from the group.

Is the MSP time sensitive? Could it be in the spring? According to the Chair it is not time sensitive. Nevertheless, it has to be taken in account that it is not a good idea for example to have it in January in Switzerland. Mr Arce Diaz adds that one year after the previous meeting is the minimum to recover and preplan. Therefore, there should be at least one year between the meetings. The suggestion for 2019 is that the window between August until September would be appropriate, and the same for 2020.

Is there a set of criteria to choose a country? That would be helpful. Then we could match countries against it. The Chair answers that this is not ready. There are always discussions about the criteria and why to choose a specific place. However, there is no set of agreed criteria for the venue. He offers to develop one and discuss it in the next GG meeting if this is requested. Mr Arce Diaz adds that the problem is not, that there are no criteria. This is the first time the GG discusses the venues in advance. Usually it is just year-by-year. The main points behind the decision are that there should be a strong support from the government and the country has to put a strong message regarding the livestock sector, which could be globally useful. Most important is that the government is on board for the meeting. That is why the Chair and AST have been approaching countries directly like New Zealand or Mongolia: They are livestock countries and their message for the world could be interesting. Mr Arce Diaz concludes that the will of the government is the most important element to have a good meeting.

The Chair/AST could ask at the meeting in Ukraine if a country in Central Asia would be willing to support. The host government has to be willing to spend a fair amount of money in this meeting. For many governments it is very difficult to invest money in this kind of meeting.

Another idea is to change to a biennium rhythm. MSPs are expensive – a meeting every second year could be considered. A controversial discussion follows on this proposal.

PRO:

Every two years. This would reduce the workload and the cost. Why every year? Especially if there is no host country and no willing government. The budget of GASL does not look very optimistic. If you want to have an impact and do it properly, it needs money. The Global Agenda is kind of lacking these resources. There has to be much more representation from governments, from countries. Thus, a first step would be, maybe for the Chair, to send a refresher to every country, FAO members, to the existence of this group. They should be participating financially, but also be committed. That means they have to be at the table. If they are not here, they are not engaged and GASL is kind of missing the point. Let's get more countries engaged, let's get money on the table and let's fulfill the goal.

CONTRA:

It is important to reflect on the usefulness of the MSP. It is a fantastic event for visibility. The Global Agenda is developing a brilliant work in term of what the ANs and Focus Areas are doing. Consequently, the MSP should be the event to bring all this together and extract some key lessons and key messages generally for



the world, for example how to correct the bad image of livestock and how to display the need for sustainable livestock in terms of nutrition, ecology, economy etc.

All MSP meetings are singular and important events and they all have an important shift in thinking of the Agenda and taking important decisions. The nature of the principles and aspirations of the Agenda – transparency, openness, inclusiveness – is best expressed in the MSP. The legitimacy of the GG comes from the MSP. In some way, this is GASL's supreme forum.

The MSP is really, where the multi-stakeholder platform is alive, and the GG is just a group of representatives, but not representative for all the stakeholders in the livestock sector. A regular organization of the MSP platform should be kept. It has to be more regular than 2 years, this is quite a long time.

The GG should focus more on leading impacts or objectives: What does the MSP deliver? And in a wider context about communication: How to fulfill the role as advocates in the livestock sector without a MSP? It is a space of visibility. The GG should look at why having it and what achievements to attempt. This should be the guide. In terms of looking at the wider public debate, now really is not the time to be stepping away from anything that will enable the Global Agenda to be visible and communicate effectively about the livestock sector. This debate is moving forward so fast that we might find us back on the floor if we do not create that level of visible communication for the livestock sector. The MSP is the core of GASL. It is not possible to take a decision now, that's far too early.

The participants of the GG meeting are also trying to find middle courses as a solution. This could be to still first widely ask countries and only if there is no success, choosing this option. The subject is also about having small events alongside, related to dairy or meat or poultry etc. A proposal is to have a "MSP light", which means participating at existing events that are relevant for GASL. In this way, burdens of work could be reduced. Even the point of visibility could be covered with this. An example is the Forum for Food and Agriculture in Berlin, where GASL was very visible and even managed to get an entry into the declaration. In any case, the MSP is a process and this process is applicable for any sort of event.

The Chair appreciates the many ideas, however, asks for guidance and a decision. The answer on his demand is a concrete proposition of distribution of tasks: The Chair should look for a decision to go to one of these three countries. And the Private Sector sits down and thinks about a model for 2019 how to link to a Private Sector event with the proviso that this event must be a multi-stakeholder process. The Chair concludes to plan 2019 a MSP in one of the mentioned countries, or having a 2-3 day meeting in Rome.

The proposition of a small event in the meanwhile for 2019 still gets some more reactions:

The Global Agenda needs to get experience in communication, so the new idea for 2019 is to have this experience around an event or some show. There are some big agriculture events in the world. It is just very important to have an event with communication. There is GFFA in Berlin, but also COP24 in Poland and GASL can organize an event. There are lot of possibilities for communication for next year.

It could be useful to go to regional small events in the meantime, that could be a way to get more local attraction and involvement. Let's not have a MSP meeting in 2019, but let's have a series of regional meetings. The MSP globally has its problems, as noticed before. But regional small events would be good and have more local and regional focus. That could solve some of the problems, there are for example entire regions that are white spots on the map. The participation from Asia is poor, Central Asia has never been much engaged, West Africa is also weak. There are issues of GASL's global representations to start with. Maybe a tour to the regions over a two years cycle will help address some of these problems, if not going for a full MSP in 2019.

The Chair takes this input to maybe have a different structure for the new Action Plan. The Chair and AST will discuss it and make a proposal how to go on by taking everything into account that was discussed, and then come up with a proposal what to do in 2019. This proposal will be tabled in Mongolia in June. The Chair still announces to do some inquiry and preliminary work for the respective meeting, even if there will be no full-fledged MSP meeting next year. The first step will be to discuss the potential of 2-3 back-to-back smaller meetings of the Global Agenda for a day for example. And the discussion will also be about Uruguay. To the question why just exploring Uruguay and not more countries, he answers that the AST has to discuss this. But it is a lot of work. The Chair reminds that referring to the governments he has sent out two mailings in the last three months for fundraising, mainly to governments and the response was very close



to zero. It is possible to explore several countries, but if the decision afterwards is not to have a MSP next year it is not made best use of the resources.

Mr Huang announces that he is willing to explore Uruguay. He urges the other members to also participate and reminds that the AST cannot do all this work. "Either we make a practical decision, all of us, to help, or we won't have a MSP." Mr Schelling proposes to explore South Africa.

The Chair thanks for the engaged discussions and announces to come back on that in June with some ideas. After lunch break, the Chair takes up the venue for 2020 again, which was not decided yet. The GG endorses the offer of Switzerland for the MSP meeting 2020 without any vote against it. An applause follows.

6. Regional GASL meeting in Uman', Ukraine, 24-26 April, 2018 – Mr Arce Diaz

Mr Arce Diaz informs the GG about the regional GASL meeting in Ukraine. GASL has an agreement with the regional FAO office Eastern Europe & Central Asia to organize a regional meeting in Uman. Mr Arce Diaz reminds the audience at this point that the mandate of GASL is not only to organize regional MSP meetings, but also regional and national ones. This is the first one in this region.

The objectives are:

- Raise awareness of the need of strategic planning to ensure sustainable development in target countries
- Participation of the target countries in the planned GASL MSP meeting in Mongolia in June 2018 GEF Points (they can coordinate of actions regarding GEF funds for livestock development)
- Uman' Declaration on Sustainable Development in Livestock in Eastern Europe and Central Asia
- Creation of a Regional Chapter of the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock for EaP and CA on Strategic Planning for Sustainable Livestock Development (a chapter that could relate to any of the Global Agenda Clusters or AN)
- Discussion, amendment and endorsement of an analytical study existing national policies in the region, which are relevant to sustainable development of animal production

Mr Arce Diaz invites the GG to let him know if someone wants to attend this meeting. Since it is a regional meeting, the focus lays on regional stakeholders. It is a collaborative arrangement, GASL doesn't pay for the meeting in full, its donation is 20,000 USD. The rest will be raised in the region, FAO is inputting a similar or greater amount. The Chair adds that this will be a learning exercise of how to do regional meetings. Yuriy Nesterov is very enthusiastic and does a lot of work for this. It is planned that the Chair and Mr Arce Diaz from GASL will participate, maybe also Mr Steinfeld.

Discussion:

It must not be an official GASL meeting with a declaration. An awareness meeting, but not more. What is the link to GASL? Should the GG approve this declaration? Mr Arce Diaz explains that the innovation GASL wants to introduce is "Regional Chapters". They will be almost independent and have the objective to develop the region in terms of livestock sustainability. GASL is supporting this process, not to control, but to see what they do. The Chair adds that whether there is a declaration or not, it will not be tabled for endorsement. It is a learning process to see how GASL can support it and how exactly the document or report will look like. Mr Tekola adds that the ultimate goal of GASL is to empower regions to have their own GASL. The role of GASL is to offer technical support. There is nothing to be approved by GASL.

Maybe it has to be in a formal format if GASL tends to do more of those regional things. There must be guidelines, expectations and key messages on what to expect. If people are using the GASL name, then it respects a certain brand quality. The purpose is to move forward in the same direction and forwarding the same messages. Maybe there is a way to provide a guide to feel comfortable in every region, as it multiplies. Mr Steinfeld clarifies that risk does not exist. The group that gets together wants to do this along the principles of the Global Agenda, otherwise they would not have chosen to do it in that format – which means it is multi-stakeholder, it is integrated, it is SDGs. Any initiative that comes out of this has to respect these minimum requirements and there is no issue here that they will run away and go in some other direction. They will have to translate the generic statements that are made in the Panama Declaration and in other



documents that we have and turn this more into a geographic context of Eastern Europe and Central Asia with specific issues, which are institutional, social, economic and so on. But he also confirms that it would help GASL to refine its narrative. That is very important because, very often there are misunderstandings due to talking in a higher level. Talking about livestock covers so many things and it is difficult to make valid statements. It is much easier to do this at a lower level of resolution.

The Chair reminds the GG that it is also a mandate of the Action Plan to have regional meetings. This learning experience will be reported it in the next GG meeting. Mr Arce Diaz informs that GASL has been completely involved in the planning of the program.

7. Finances, fundraising, budget 2018, etc. – Chair

The Chair gives a brief overview of the current state of finances.

Panama vs. Ethiopia MSP Costs (revised)

Net cost of Panama 6th MSP for GASL (US\$)			Net cost of Ethiopia 7th MSP for GASL (US\$)		
	Budget	Real Expenses		Budget	Real Expenses
Total Cost	221,673	263,582	Total Cost	368,400	416,850
Sponsorships	131,650	131,650	Sponsorships	114,331	114,331
Net Cost for GASL	90,023	131,932	Net Cost for GASL	254,069	302,519

GASL 2016 & 2017 CONTRIBUTIONS IN US\$			GASL 2016 & 2017 REAL EXPENSES IN US\$		
As of 31 December					
	2016	2017			
To Core Budget	680,000	1,146,220	1. GASL Secretariat	150,955	271,751
Balance Previous Year		130,873	2. MSP Process	163,500	388,095
Switzerland (Dec 2016)		591,716	3. Travel	253,897	161,968
Switzerland (Dec 2015 and Dec 2017)	550,000	152,106	4. Action Networks	57,000	131,960
Netherlands	110,000	117,000	5. Practice and policy change support to start national processes	-	-
Swiss Development Corporation		52,051	6. Evaluation	-	35,000
Ireland		47,700	SubTotal	625,352	988,774
Global Dairy Platform (GDP)		20,000	7. FAO Project Cost Fee, 7%	43,775	69,214
Confédération Nationale de l'Élevage (CNE)		17,710	Total Expenses	669,127	1,057,988
France	20,000	17,065	Year End Balance	130,873	152,073
Total Contributions	800,000	1,210,061			



GASL 2018 PLEDGED CONTRIBUTIONS	
As of 01 March 2018	
	US\$
To Core Budget	388,790
Switzerland	160,005
Netherlands	123,000
Swiss Development Corporation	53,335
Ireland	-
Global Dairy Platform (GDP)	34,000
Confédération Nationale de l'Élevage (CNE)	18,450
France	-
To AN Budget	48,510
Global Dairy Platform (GDP)	48,510
Switzerland	-
France	-
Canada	-
Total Contributions	437,300
GASL REDUCED BUDGET 2018	1,252,023
FUNDS TO RAISE FOR 2018	814,723

For 2018 there are 814,723 USD missing, the Chair, AST and a Task Force are still in the process to raise funds. Looking at the expenditures for the last two years, it was also possible with less money. There are some positive signs from potent donors. Mr Schneider highlights, that he really needs support from the GG to get this money.

Discussion:

What will not be done in case the situation doesn't improve? What does it mean in practical terms if we don't find this money? The Chair explains that this is not analyzed yet and will be done later. Mr Arce Diaz concretizes that these tables are in the progress report. If they do not manage to get the money, they have to go over planned activities and eliminate, postpone or cancel them. Important costs are the secretariat costs of 300,000. For the MSP meeting Mr Arce Diaz estimates 250,000 USD, maybe less. There are a few pledges for the meeting, from the Mongolian government 95,000 and SDC around 53,000 USD. Other offers are coming in like Heifer International of 10,000. We have to look at the activities that are less significant for us, but the main costs are the MSP processes. Then there are regional and national processes – this is what was postponed in the previous year when there were not enough funds to organize this. And there is always a chance to reduce in travel: There are less people supported. There are several options to reduce expenses. According to the opinion of Mr Acre Diaz 800,000 looks like a big amount, but on the other hand, it is pocket money for many people and countries. When finding the right people, it may not be that difficult. But he highlights that fundraising is an art and that the AST and the Chair need the GG's help to get to these resources.

Ms Kuntz announces that France will contribute something in 2018, probably more or less the same amount as in 2017.

Concern about the lack: Those are big numbers. The GG needs to make a plan. Someone needs to be in charge. The Chair takes this into account and concretizes that they are working with a small task force and that they are calling on the GG to assist. But in the last two letters to the GG had only one reply. It was an earnest and sincere call to the GG to assist to get that money. There was a very good support from the Netherlands and from Switzerland. And they have tried to get the Perm. Reps. from Rome together tonight, but this was canceled because they didn't follow the invitation. He concludes that if the GG doesn't get the funds, they have to skip certain things. That is the nature of this voluntary organization.

Addition to this Agenda point after the meeting:



AST and the chair have developed a crisis budget for 2018, where they have budgeted the bare minimum required. However, budgeting for the full cost of the 8th MSP in Mongolia. The figures in the tables below show, that GASL for 2018 needs additional funds of at least US\$ 200'000. The AST, Chair and the Fund Raising Task Force are active to source these funds.

DETAILED EXPENSES		GASL Crisis Budget 2018
SECRETARIAT		US\$
FAO Project Staff		173,040
- Project Manager		173,040
- Other		
Consultants		60,000
Chair		40,000
Operations Consultant		-
Communicator		-
Sector analyst (Swiss APO)		-
Visiting researcher, China		-
Graphic designer		20,000
Operations clerk		-
Other Consultants		
Subtotal Personnel		233,040
8% Icrue Fee		18,643
Subtotal Personnel + ICRUE		251,683
Other		13,000
Comm and comm. mat.		10,000
Lap tops/Screens		3,000
Contingency		-
SUBTOTAL SECRETARIAT		264,683
MSP PROCESS		
Global		342,000
Regional		20,000
National		-
Events & FAO conf		-
Support AN meets.		10,000
GG Meetings		30,000
Transl/Interpret		-
SUBTOTAL MSP PROCESS		402,000
TRAVEL		
Intl. AST and GG		30,000
Sponsored part.		15,000
DSA (both)		37,000
SUBTOTAL TRAVEL		82,000
AN		
Workshops		
AN research support		24,500



AN Incubation		15,000
AN Scaling Up		20,000
New AN (Emerging themes)		48,510
SUBTOTAL AN		108,010
PPC		
Support One country		20,000
EVALUATION		
Evaluation		15,000
SUMMARY		
SECRETARIAT		264,683
MSP		402,000
TRAVEL		82,000
AN		108,010
PPC		20,000
EVALUATION		15,000
TOTAL		891,693
Project Cost Fee		62,419
7%		62,419
TOTAL		954,112
		CONTRIBUTIONS 2018
		750,538
		DEFICIT 2018
		- 203,573

8. FAO evaluation of GASL – Mr Khan, Mr Guerrero, Mr Waelty

www.fao.org/evaluation/en/

Mikal Khan: representative of OED

Raul Guerrero: team leader of the evaluation and main author

Samuel Waelty: member of the team

Mr Khan introduces what the team is doing and how they proceed. The Office of Evaluation is a unit of FAO, which provides an independent oversight in the organization. They report directly to the governing bodies of FAO and so they are independent from FAO management. Since GASL is hosted in FAO and classified as a project, it is subject to a mandatory evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Office. The evaluation aims at answering a number of questions. The purpose in general is to provide accountability to the donors, stakeholders etc. and most importantly to provide useful lessons and insights about the activity for the benefit of the overall goals. The evaluation is expected to finish around May – in time for discussion in Mongolia. The evaluation is made by means of documents, report, personal interviews, a survey (will be



send to GASL members) to collect additional information. The goal is to provide useful analysis for everybody. Therefore, questions, suggestions and expectations are welcome and are going to be taken in account. Mr Khan thanks for all participation in the past and future.

Mr Guerrero goes through the evaluation questions:

- To what extent were the project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant?
- To what extent did FAO successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical agency and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining GASL?
- To what extent did GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner?
- To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?

Mr. Guerrero invites the audience to comment and provide any advice, suggestion or indication for the evaluation team to take on board.

Discussion:

What is the timeline? To develop the new AP it would be good to consult the evaluation results. Is there a management response expected? Is this going to be written by GASL or by FAO?

Mr Khan explains that they expect kind of preliminary findings towards End of April, which they will then share with the FAO team first of all. And then they will discuss it more broadly, to the extent possible, within the GG. The final report will be expected in May. And there is always a management response. This is addressed usually to FAO management. In this case they may want to think of broadening it – it is up to the GG how to manage that process. But they could consider preparing that response using a session like this for example. He proposes to discuss that further. Mr Guerrero agrees that it makes sense that there is a consultation within the Agenda.

Mr Steinfeld reemphasizes that from the view point of FAO the Global Agenda is considered as a project. Question 1 and 2 actually evaluate FAO's role in the project. Question 3 and 4 are the outer circles. Of course, question 2 has to be seen not in the context of documents, but in context of resources that were actually provided. Question 3 is really about how this group and the broader Agenda works. And question 4 is about what this creates outside the Global Agenda. These are sort of concentric rings that are evaluated. The management respond is done because this is mandatory for FAO – the management evaluation is addressing management. It's not only AGA, it's also partnership offers, it's the communication people etc. because this is a multi-stakeholder undertaking – creating problems at times, which are also part of the undertaking. So this is not only technical, but also institutional, involving other units of this organizations.

Regarding the bullet point 2, COAG defined the roles FAO plays in GASL. The evaluation team should probably put the language in line with that decision of COAG. This is a really useful process, not just for the member countries of this committee and the government bodies of FAO, but also for the projects. It really has to be seen as an opportunity to have outside experts having a look on how this project runs, in this case on how the multi-stakeholder platform is operating and to take learning from that.

The Chair concludes to look forward to read the report. He will be definitely interested in contributing to the management response and will make use of this report for the further development of the Global Agenda.

[9. Process to develop GASL Action Plan 2019-2021 – Chair](#)

GASL needs a new Action Plan (AP). The process will be as follows:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| • Development of Concept note by AST, Chair | March |
| • Consultation with GG | April |
| • Feedback to AST and Chair | May |
| • Revision of Concept Note | June |
| • Discussion of Concept Note GG Meeting 15 June Mongolia | June |
| • Drafting of Action Plan by consultant | June-July |
| • Consultation with GG | August |
| • Revision of Action Plan | September |



- Approval of Action Plan by GG

October

The new AP will be made based on:

- Action Plan 2016-2018
- Progress report 2016-2017
- Evaluation report
- Input of Seminar 6 March
- Global context (SDGs, COP, GFFA, COAG, CFS, HLPE reports, relevant work of FAO, WB, ILRI, etc)
- others

What will also be taken into account for the new AP are the difficulties to get funds. There will not be a three-year-budget of five millions, as was the case for the first AP, it will be more modest.

The Chair asks the GG for feedback and context issues missing:

Discussion:

This morning it was about if there should be a discussion in Mongolia on the concept note. Now the GG hears that it should be done during the GG meeting. Is it going to be discussed a bit broader among the GASL partners or members? This would also go into the context as input into the plan.

The Chair confirms that there is a possibility to have wider participation to work on this concept note. That would be in day 2 and/or 3. He will take that up for the further development of the program. He asks if the GG agrees to have a champion consultant to support them here? The GG needs somebody who can dedicate a lot of time to develop this AP taking into consideration the mentioned context issues. The participants do not oppose and the Chair concludes to continue this way. The GG will receive a first, very rough concept note, which definitely has to be further developed.

[10. Process to select the GASL Chair 2018 – 2020 – Chair, Mr Steinfeld](#)

The GG has to select a GASL Chair 2018-2020. Mr Schneider has been elected two years ago in Panama. Regarding the rules and procedures, the Chair can be renewed once for two years. Before disappearing, Mr Schneider makes some remarks: He still has a very high job satisfaction in spite of some hick-ups, especially with finances. The workload, which the previous Chair told him, was totally wrong, he uses much more time than these sixty days. He is very happy to work with the Agenda Support Team. The valuable support GASL gets from FAO is kept at a high level, especially for the conceptual support. In case the GG should reelect Mr Schneider, he emphasizes to make better use of champions and champion institutions like FAO, ILRI, World Bank and other institutions in the livestock sector. Maybe the Global Agenda could consider a Co-Chair or a Vice-Chair, because the travel is quite intensive. Last year Mr Schneider had twelve travels for the Global Agenda, six to Rome and six to other countries. This was quite substantial. He also brings up that it would be nice for the AST and the Chair to have a sub-committee to refer to. The GG was not agreeing to an executive committee, but these are some elements, which may be considered in case the GG reelect him. He summarizes that in principle, he is willing to do it another two years, but if the GG decides to have a process to select a Chair and then advertise, he will have to think about running once more or not. He thanks for the confidence the GG had in him for the last two years and leaves the room.

Mr Steinfeld takes over the moderation. He asks the GG if they want Mr Schneider to continue or if they want a competitive process to select a new Chair.

The comments are very positive and everybody agrees on renewing Mr Schneider for another two years. The GG members take Mr Schneider's concerns serious and highlight the importance to think about how to arrange more support for his work. It could for example be extended beyond the number of days or the second option to have a Vice-Chair could be chosen. This should be built into the budget.

Mr Steinfeld informs Mr Schneider that he has been endorsed. Mr Schneider thanks for the confidence and mentions again that he still likes the job very much: "Sometimes it is hard, sometimes it is frustrating, but I



think, we are working for a good cause and I am very happy to work for another two years for the Agenda. Thank you very much." An applause follows.

11. Discussion on results and plans shared by Clusters and Action Networks (based on 6-March Seminar) and future strategy to consolidate GASL Action Networks – Chair

The GG has to formalize how to deal with the output from the meeting on 6 March 2018.

Reporting: The Clusters and ANs presentation will be available on the webpage.

Summary: AST will write a summary of the discussions from yesterday and put it as an Annex to the minutes. See Annex 4.

Input for GASL contribution to COP23 resolution until 31 March: GASL should develop an input to the six mentioned elements of the COP23 resolution. This can be rather brief. Many ANs had some slides in their presentations what contribution the ANs could make. The idea is to develop a table with the elements of the Global Agenda with links to the authors and 1-2 pages note on how we think the process in the COP23 could use this. This work needs many conceptual skills of someone who knows the sector. Maybe there will be some support from FAO to do that. It is urgent. Mr Tekola confirms, as previously discussed, this issue is not limited to GASL, it is also part of the FAO's assignment as well to respond to how agriculture and livestock are responsive to the COP23 recommendations. FAO can contribute to GASL's activities. Mr Tekola promises to sort out who does what and how they can support best. The secretariat cannot do the job, this is clear. He will look at it and assign one or two people to support the secretariat.

The Chair addresses his words to Mr Tekola and the whole GG and mentions, if someone from the GG is assisting that work, he will be very happy to accept that offer. It has to be done in the next two weeks. The Chair also shows that he is much more confident since yesterday's seminar that GASL can contribute and also link this input to the products. There are LEAP results, Efficiency Gap results, Silvopastoral results, Livestock for Social Development results – there is a lot to offer. This should be made available to the COP23 group.

Mr Kopse tells his willingness to participate in the process – not the first draft, but to help think it through and formulate. Mr Coste also offers his participation, but as well not for the first draft.

Mr Tekola acknowledges that this is the participation which is required. To make it more participative, to see it from the feed point of view, beef point of view or a dairy point of view. If everybody contributes something, then it is possible to sit down together, compile it, and give it some scientific touch. That would make it a strong document.

The Chair adds that the COP23 group will then use the input to work on these elements and there will be a reporting to COP26, which will be in 2020. This input is actually to keep GASL's shoe in the door and hope they come back and ask for more information and collaboration to their work. In that sense, it is a good idea to make the offer very explicitly and tell them exactly what GASL can offer.

Mr Chara also shows his willingness to contribute to that. And also Mr Huan is most happy to contribute to review this proposal for COP24 as well as Mr Reyes, who offers his contribution in both ANs, Closing the Efficiency Gap and Livestock for Social Development, with some emphasize in dairy because it is the sector they have started with.

Mr Schneider concludes to further discuss with FAO on how much support to get. The AST and Chair can also feed in some elements how to structure it.



12. Any other business and conclusions

12.1. Agree on the TORs for the evaluation of GASL tools and cases from Addis Abeba – Ms Burgeois

Working group: Liz Wedderburn, Alexandre Ickowicz, Ulf Magnusson, Ernesto Reyes, Nancy Burgeois

The five GG members of the Cluster Academia and Research made a proposal to draft a review of the 14 tools and the 13 cases, which were presented in Addis Abeba. The group came up with a schedule and a budget because this task has to be financed (at least partially) as there has to be someone appointed or recruited to do the main review. This person would be supposed to draft the framework of the review and then to do the publication. The review of the cases would be done by several experts, who are close enough to the cases to understand what it is about, but not involved in the elaboration of these tools and cases. That would be a mix of a voluntary based work by some people. Cluster Academia and Research drafted the TORs and circulated them before the meeting. The objective is to approve the TOR in the GG, including the team, and paid work.

Open questions:

1. Who is going to appoint the person leading this review?
2. How will the selection of the review be done?
3. To whom is this publication addressed? Who will be the main readers of this publication? This will determine the form of the publication.

Timeline: The draft should be ready to be presented in Mongolia.

Ernesto Reyes adds that he strongly suggests the AST to take this into consideration for several reasons: It is a work that can condense by a rigorous process about what the Agenda is doing in all these case studies and tools presented in Addis Abeba – this is important to showcase. Secondly, the process of criteria to select the TORs could be a reference to other processes within the Global Agenda (other pillars, case studies, tools that will be presented). Taking into consideration that, by supporting this, there will be safe resources in the future because there are already processes, how to organize, compile and showcase.

1. Who is going to appoint the person leading this review?

The Chair answers that FAO will appoint it, but not select it. Mr Arce Diaz adds that there are several ways. If it is done in HQ, then they have to open a vacancy announcement and go through the formal process. Another way is that one of the research institutions from the Cluster Academia & Research could sign an agreement with GASL and then the money will be transferred to this institution. So this institution will be in charge of managing the consultancy. For FAO it is really complex to hire a consultant, it can take months. Therefore, Mr Arce Diaz encourages the other option.

Solution: A research institute will receive money through the FAO procedures and hires a consultant. The five members of the Cluster Academia & Research can brainstorm on institutions and give a proposal to Mr Arce Diaz with Mr Schneider in copy.

2. How will the selection of the reviewers be done?

Mr Arce Diaz explains that reviewers will be paid, so the selected institution will suggest the names and costs to the AST and Chair in order to make a Letter of Agreement for the full package. The Chair adds that the names first will be circulated in the GG and comments can be made. But important: All the money flows via one institution.

3. To whom is this publication addressed?

Since the document is not going to be peer reviewed, it will be a Global Agenda document. It is going to be published on the website and made available to a wider public. Mr Arce Diaz thinks that it should be useful for technical and political practitioners because this is supposed to help people to know what kind of tools useful are for practice and policy change.

Discussion:

It would be great to have an eye to the potential of this document to be an example of the kinds of criteria you would be considering in developing new case studies.



Ms Bourgeois confirms that this was also a discussion within the group when drafting the TORs. But they decided as first step to only stick to these tools and cases and ultimately maybe, when they have a second face, to look at additional tools, but first focus on these ones.

The GG endorses the TORs.

12.2. Agree on the TORs for the Editorial committee – Mr Schelling

Working group: Alexandre Ickowicz, Niek Schelling

On the basis of the request and the indications of the GG in September, the working group has made this draft. The editorial can be seen as an instrument to review and support communications and other communication materials that are and will be provided by ANs and Clusters in a way that they will meet general objectives of the Global Agenda. In the setup, the working group made the state that the Editorial Committee reports to the GG. The scope of the committee is to work on assurance of quality and relevance of the provided publications. They also followed the indication of the GG to review minimal requirements for the publications and also to do some work on the definition of the target groups for specific publications. The idea is that the committee runs the process of review and clearance. Further, there are some procedural details. The working group proposes that the Editorial Committee may also invite specific experts from a group of peer reviews to assist the clearance process. The Editorial Committee will be a small committee, maybe 3-6 members, but not more. The Secretariat could provide general support to make this all happen. The membership is a rotational process. The members stay in the group for one year. It is a voluntary group, no salaries are involved, so the time that people can spend is limited. The Editorial Committee does not have a general budget. Most of the communication of the group will be through email and other electronic means of communication.

Discussion:

What is meant by mandated partners? Mr Schelling explains that these are partners who are mandated by the GG or the ANs, but there is not a specific reason to have this, it is also possible to keep it out. The goal was to keep it as broad as possible. The Chair concretizes that the Global Agenda could hire a consultant to write a document and then the editorial board could review it, so this option should be kept open.

The function of the Editorial Committee is to evaluate the quality of submitted products, but it is not clear enough. The important thing is also to evaluate the quality of public products. The final document must be validated too, not only the submitted draft papers, it is a process. That what was not so clear. Mr Schelling takes this into account.

What is the timeline for submission review/redrafting final review? There is an amount of work before the MSP, we have at least three papers to launch, so the timeline is very important to make it manageable. Secondly, regarding the quality and the criteria for quality of different kinds of resources. There will be very technical science led resources, there must be also potential narratives for things that are starting and don't have the evidence behind them. There must be narratives around key systems of production. There is a recognition needed that these are not all going to be technical publications. And the validity of some people who's voices need to be there or stories need to be represented (smallholder etc.), may not ever be in a situation to tell that story. The third point would be the criteria for accepting evaluating – against those different kinds of publications. This is focused on publications that come out under the banner of the Global Agenda rather than simply being housed on the Global Agenda website.

Mr Schelling refers to the TORs, where it will be described more detailed. And he agrees that the achievability is a challenge.

Regarding the first editorial board, Mr Schelling affirms to look what composition would be advisable for the start and to make a proposal. Mr Schelling would coordinate the setting together of the first editorial board for one year. To get it composed, he will circulate an email to see who is interested.



12.3. Other business

Discussion:

Yesterday the GG raised an issue how to link two projects and activities in favor of sustainable livestock development – that was a point made by the Private Sector cluster. What is the plan? How do we address that? In one of the next meetings?

Mr Huang answers this question. First, it is important to have a very clear idea as a GG, as a Global Agenda multi-stakeholder platform, under what conditions an organization can be considered to be a fully participating member, not only of the Global Agenda (this is already available). How can the Global Agenda review and endorse some of the actions of organizations and the process by which this organization can move forward in the future with a plan to show continuous improvement and that they are also following the same lines as the multi-stakeholder platform? We need to be very clear on what kind of relationship we are looking for with these organizations. What will be the rules and procedures? What will be the recognition? They are looking for clear, concrete indications that they are also doing sustainable livestock practices.

The Chair adds that yesterday there were two issues. 1. The Global Agenda should invite such organizations to become member. 2. The Global Agenda should collect and make visible cases of sustainable livestock production by the private sector. Both these elements are possible. When we have cases – we have just now developed a process, which then could be evaluated through the “cases and tools” for instance.

Somebody has to put this on paper if the Global Agenda wants to have such a mechanism. Otherwise we never do something about this. It is not just programs and projects and guidelines for the private sector. It can also be by other organizations that are interested in liaising in one way or the other to GASL. And becoming a member is also a very important step.

This is not only something we want the Private Sector to do, this is something I presume all clusters want to think about. We will discuss amongst ourselves how to move this forward and come with a proposition.

The Chair reminds that in the next MSP there will be this open space, these parallel sessions, where the goal is to showcase best practices. And GASL will invite – as already in Addis Ababa and Panama – through the membership for such cases to be presented, as parallel session presentations or in a poster. And this will happen without an input from the GG, that is part of the MSP preparation. We will send these invitations to the memberships, as we have done earlier. And then they are free to distribute it to potential providers of such cases. And we will give you also a format, as we have done earlier. We can then develop a compendium.

The last remark is dedicated to Ms Kuntz. This is the last time that Ms Kuntz is taking part of our meetings and the AST, Chair and GG thanks her for her contributions and inputs. An applause follows.

The chair, Fritz Schneider, thanks everybody for participation and for a very lively, sometimes heated discussions and contributions. He also thanks the interpreters.

Next GG meeting: 15 June, 2018, 14:00-18:00, Ulaanbataar



Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



ANNEX 1: Detailed Meeting Agenda 7 March 2018

Wednesday 7 March 2018 - 9:00 to 17:00 hours								
Time	Agenda Point	Agenda Topic	Presenter	Supporting Documents	Tasks*	Next Steps		
						What:	Who:	By:
9:00	1.	Welcome and recognition of members/observers – Chair	Chair	1.1 GASL GG Members and Observers List 1.2 GASL Members List	I, A			
9:15	2.	2.1. Traffic light evaluation 2.2. GG meeting minutes of 19/20 Sep. 2.3. Progress report 2017	Chair, AST	2.1 Meeting Program 2.2 GG Meeting minutes 19/20 Sep. 2017 2.3 Traffic light evaluation 2.4 Draft Progress Report	I, A, D	Feedback on Progress Report Finalizing Report	GG AST	7.3.18 30.4.18
9:45	3.	MSP Meeting Mongolia	Chair, Mr Enkhbat	3.1 Draft-conclusions COP 23 3.2 GFFA2018-Communique 3.3 First Draft MSP Mongolia Programme	I, D	Preparation MSP Meeting	Chair, AST, MSP Task Force, MoFALI	10.6.18
10.15	4.	HLPE report on multi-stakeholder partnerships	AST		I	Comments are submitted		
11:00	5.	MSP meeting venues for 2019-2020	Chair		I, D, De	Switzerland is endorsed for 2020, for 2019 venues still must be identified/discussed	Chair, AST	

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



11:15	6.	Regional GASL meeting in Uman', Ukraine, 24-26 April, 2018	AST	6.1 Sample Invitation Georgia FAO-GASL Meeting Uman Ukraine 24-26 April 2018 6.2 Multistakeholder meeting EAP and CA Uman CO EAD FS	I, D	Preparation Uman' meeting	Chair, AST	23.4.18
14:00	7.	Finances, fundraising, budget 2018	Chair, AST		I, D	To be followed up	AST, Chair	Ongoing
14:30	8.	FAO evaluation of GASL	Evaluation Team		I, D	Developing and finalizing report	Evaluation Team	May
15.00	9.	Process to develop GASL Action Plan 2019-2021	Chair	7.1 FINAL GASL AP-16Nov2015	I	Development of Concept note by AST, Chair; Consultation with GG; Feedback to AST and Chair; Revision of Concept Note; Discussion of Concept Note GG Meeting 15 June Mongolia; Drafting of Action Plan by consultant; Consultation with GG; Revision of Action Plan; Approval of Action Plan by GG	AST, Chair, GG, Consultant	October (see process for detailed steps)
15.30	10.	Process to select GASL Chair 2018-2020	Chair, Henning Steinfeld		D, De	Fritz Schneider reelected as Chair	Chair	2018-2020
15.45	11.	Discussion on results and plans shared by Clusters and Actions Networks and future strategy to consolidate GASL Action Networks	Chair		I, D, A, De	Brief input of GASL to the six elements of COP23 resolution	Team FAO, Chair, AST, GG	31.3.18
16.15	12.	Any other business and conclusions 12.1 Agree on the TORs for the evaluation of	Chair, Nancy Burgeois, Niek Schelling	12.1 TORs - Evaluation Ethiopia Tools and Cases-with	I, D, A, De	12.1 Decide on a research institute with consultant and send to Chair, AST Develop a draft of tools and cases Addis	Working group	

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



		GASL tools and cases from Addis Ababa 12.2 Agree on the TORs for Editorial Committee 12.3 Other business		budget and proposed evaluators- final 12.2 Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock editorial ctee draft	I, D, A, De	12.2 Make a proposal for composition of first editorial board by circulating email to find interested members + coordination for 1 year	External consultant Niek Schelling	MSP Meeting Mongolia
16.15	12.	12.3 Proposal how to identify and select select potential members to make their contribution to sustainable livestock development more visible	Private Sector Cluster			Make proposal how to develop this proposal	Private Sector, AST	Next GG

* I = Information, D = Discussion, A = Approval, De = Decision



ANNEX 1: List of Participants

Public Sector

Marcelo Gonzalez, vganaderia@mag.gov.py, paratodomag@gmail.com, Vice-minister of Livestock, Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG), Paraguay (Cluster Coordinator)
Matthew Hooper, matthew.hooper@mfat.govt.nz; Deputy Perm. Rep., Rome FAO Mission, New Zealand
Robin Mbae, robinmbae@yahoo.com; Deputy Director Livestock Production (Climate Change), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Kenya
Inkhbat, otgoo_wv@yahoo.com (Address of Otgontuya Sukhbaatar), Acting State Secretary, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry MoFALI, Mongolia
Mauricio Chacón, mchacon@mag.go.cr, Gerente de Ganadería, Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG), Costa Rica

Private Sector

Hsin Huang, Hsin.huang@meat-ims.org; Secretary General, International Meat Secretariat (Cluster Coordinator)
Alexandra De Athayde, alexandra.athayde@ifif.org; Executive Director, International Feed Industry Federation
Anne Marie Neeteson, aneeteson@aviagen.com, International Poultry Council and International Egg Commission
Caroline Emond, DG@fil-idf.org or CEmond@fil-idf.org, IDF

Academia / Research

Nancy Bourgeois nancy.bourgeois@bfh.ch; Bern University of Applied Science (Cluster Coordinator)
Alexandre Ickowicz, alexandre.ickowicz@cirad.fr; CIRAD
Ernesto Reyes, ernesto.reyes@agribenchmark.net; Agribenchmark
Liz Wedderburn, liz.wedderburn@agresearch.co.nz; Assistant Research Director
Ulf Magnusson, ulf.magnusson@slu.se; Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Donors

Alwin Kopse, alwin.kopse@blw.admin.ch; Switzerland (Cluster Coordinator)
Niek Schelling, N.Schelling@minez.nl; Netherlands (new Focal Point)
Marie-Odile Kuntz, marie-odile.kuntz@diplomatie.gouv.fr; France
Emmanuel Coste; e.coste@interbev.fr; CNE, France (yet not formally accepted as a rep of the GG to the donor cluster)

NGOs

Ilse KÖHLER-ROLLEFSSEN, ilse.koehlerroll@googlemail.com
Margherita Gomarasca, coordinator@vsf-international.org; Veterinaries Sans Frontiers (VSF)
Lesley Mitchell, lesley@goodfoodfutures.com;

Social Movements

Pablo Frere, pablofrere@gmail.com; Redes Chaco, WAMIP, Argentina

Intergovernmental and Multilateral

Jean Jacques Soula, jj.soula@oie.int; OIE
Shirley Tarawali, s.tarawali@cqiar.org; ILRI
Berhe Tekola, Berhe.Tekola@fao.org; FAO

Agenda Support Team (AST)

Henning Steinfeld, Henning.Steinfeld@fao.org
Pierre Gerber, pgerber@worldbank.org (vc)
Eduardo Arce Diaz, Eduardo.ArceDiaz@fao.org



Anna Grun, Anna.Grun@fao.org

Observers

Lionel Launois, lionel.launois@agriculture.gouv.fr; (requested by the Embassy of France)

Julian Chara, julian@fun.cipav.org.co

Pablo Manzano Baena, pablo.manzano.baena@gmail.com; Chair LEAP

Davaadash Sambuu, rome2@mfa.gov.mn; Embassy of Mongolia, Rome

Camillo DeCamillis (AGAL), Camillo.DeCamillis@fao.org; LEAP

Carolyn Opio (AGAL), Carolyn.Opio@fao.org; LEAP

Anne Mottet (AGAS), Anne.Mottet@fao.org; AGAS

Catherine Marguerat, marguerat@hispeed.ch, FOAG consultant

Gunilla Eklund, Gunilla.Eklund@fao.org, AGAH (6 March)

John Maguire, JMaguire@aviagen.com, AVIAGEN (7 March)

María Sánchez Mainar, MSanchezMainar@fil-idf.org, IDF (6 March)

Mikal Khan, Mikal.Khan@fao.org, FAO Evaluation Office (OED)

Enkh-Amgalan Tseelei, Project Manager-Green gold Animal health Project, Swiss Development Corporation Mongolia

Fabiana Villa Alves, fabiana.alves@embrapa.br, Zootecnista, Embrapa Gado de Corte

Raul Guerrero, raul.guerrero.garcia@gmail.com, Evaluation Team (7 March)

Samuel Waelty, samuelwaelty@gmail.com, Evaluation Team (7 March)

Apologies

Neil Fraser, fraserneil33@hotmail.com; former Chair

Franck Cesar Jean Berthe, fberthe1@worldbank.org; World Bank

Marlène PRA, marlene.pra@diplomatie.gouv.fr; (requested by the Embassy of France)

Nitya Ghotge, nitya.ghotge@gmail.com, (10, Lantana Gardens, NDA Road, Bavdhan, Pune, India, 411021); League of Pastoral Peoples and Life Network



ANNEX 2: Traffic Light Evaluation

Traffic Light Evaluation of GG meeting resolutions 19 and 20 September 2017						
Ag Nr.	Agenda Topics	Supporting Document	Task	What	Who, (by)	State of completion 28.02.2018
1.	Welcome, welcoming new members	1.1 GASL GG Members List 1.2 GASL Members List	I, A			
2.	2.1. Meeting agenda 2.2. 12 May GG meeting minutes 2.3 Traffic light evaluation	2.1 Meeting Agenda 2.2 GG Meeting minutes 2.3 Traffic light evaluation	I, A I, A			
3.	Feedback on Ethiopia MSP Meeting	3.1 Addis MSP Report	I, D, A	Report is approved. Report will be translated into French	AST (31.12.17)	French and Spanish translations are available
4.	Proposal for further revision of the tools and cases presented in Addis Ababa	4.1 Draft short proposal	D, A, De	Task Force created, lead with Alexandre Ickowicz and Nancy Bourgeois Task force (next GG)	Al. Ickowicz N. Bourgeois Task force (next GG)	Terms of reference are developed, work in progress
5.	Report exploratory mission to Mongolia	5.1 Presentation on 4-8 September mission	I, D	Proposed dates as of 20.11.2017 11 to 16 June 2018 Confirmed verbally by Rome Mongolian Embassy. Written confirmation as soon as possible.	Task Force (Nov.17)	Work in progress
	GASL Progress Report					
6.1	Financial situation of GASL (Budget outlook, 2017-2018, and cost comparison Addis vs Panama)	6.1 Financial Situation Charts as of 26 August (2017-2018 budget and MSP Cost: Addis vs Panama)	I, D	Fix disbursements and revise tables accordingly	Eduardo (Nov. 17)	Work in progress, see agenda point on GASL finances
6.2	Proposal to reduce MSP sponsorship burden,	6.2 Draft short proposal on reducing MSP sponsorship burden	D, A, DE	To be followed up. Revise sponsorship rules for next MSP	AST, Chair (next GG)	Work in progress, budgeted for max. 30 sponsored persons at max. US\$ 2'500.00 Criteria yet to be developed
6.3	Fundraising strategy, AST strengthening	6.3 Note on fund raising strategy	I, D	Targeted approach of potential donors, governments, development banks, foundations Niek Schelling and Alwin Kopse volunteer to take this file further together with AST and Chair	AST Chair N Schelling A. Kopse C	Work in progress. No definite pledges for core funding, US\$ 70'000.00 for MSP in Mongolia sponsored US\$ 95'000 for MSP budgeted from Mongolian Government

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



6.4	AST strengthening,	6.4 Note on AST strengthening	I, D	Follow up of offers from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Switzerland • Germany • France 	AST (ongoing)	Anna Grun, Switzerland has started 1 Feb. 2018 France and Germany, work in progress
6.5	Proposal for an Executive Committee	6.5 Draft proposal on Executive Committee for GASL	D, A, De	No Ex. Com. will be formed. Chair, AST to revise proposal and propose an efficient way to accelerate decisions with task forces.	Chair AST (next GG)	No progress
6.6	Proposal for Editorial Committee	6.6 Draft short proposal on GASL Editorial Committee	I, D, A, De	Draft TOR to be developed	N. Schelling A. Ickowicz (next GG)	Draft TOR available
6.7	GASL communications		I, D	GASL needs a communication specialist and a support from within the AST. Pascale Corbe stays on hold	AST (ongoing)	Anna Grun as Coordinator GASL Communication and Support for specific Action Networks
7.	Summary of the Day		I			
8.	Report from Clusters and Action Networks (AN)		I, D			
9	Discussion of new action networks		I, D, A			
9.1	Animal Welfare	9.1.1 Animal Welfare Action Network Proposal and summary poster.	I, D, A	AW-AN is approved, provided a revised version of the TOR is prepared making use of OIE standards. AW-AN will be reviewed in one year.	L. Mitchell AST (next GG)	On track
9.2	Investments for Sustainable Livestock Development	9.2 Investor Guide document	I, D, A	Not approved as AN. Discussion with P. Gerber on the next steps with Task Force built by AST and Chair	P. Gerber AST Chair Task Force (ongoing)	On track
10.1	Constitution of Mongolia MSP Task Force		D, De	Task force created. Lead Eduardo. Members: Pablo Frere, Yuri Nesteroi, Marie Odile Kunz, Nythia Gotghe, Lesley Mitchell. Chair will support	Eduardo, Task Force Chair (ongoing)	Task Force completed by Nancy Bourgeois (Academia Research) and Donald Moore (Private Sector)
10.2	MSP Venues for 2019 and 2020		D, De	MSP venues for 2019 and 2010 to be explored	Chair (next GG)	New Zealand 2019 declined Switzerland 2020 agreed



11.	Global Agenda Co-Hosted CFS Side Event, 11 Oct, 18:00-19:00		I	Send report to GG members	AST (ongoing)	Report sent to GG
12.	Event calendar 2017-2018	12.1 Event Calendar 2018-19	I	Insert and send for comments	AST (ongoing)	Updated calendar available

ANNEX 3: Guiding Group Members (as of 10 April 2018)

Public Sector (PuS) – 16

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
Directorate of Livestock Production, Busia County, Kenya	23.06.2016	Bonfacenyongesa Wafula	Director of Livestock Production	bonfacewafula2007@yahoo.com
Government of Argentina, Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (INTA)	09.03.2017	Ing. Agr. Juan Balbin	President of INTA	balbin.juan@inta.gob.ar
Government of Brazil, Embrapa	03.11.2017	Dra. Fabiana Villa Alves	Zootecnista Pesquidora A Grupo de Pesquisas em Sistemas de Produção Embrapa Gado de Corte – Cmapo Grande/MS	fabiana.alves@embrapa.br
Government of Costa Rica, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	23.06.2016	Mauricio Chacón	Gerente de Ganadería	mchacon@mag.go.cr
Government of Cuba, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	21.06.2016	Ing. Aldaín García	Director General de Ganadería	dirganaderia@oc.minag.gob.cu
Government of Dominican Republic, Ministry of Agriculture		Dr. Duarte Contreras	Director General de Ganadería	digeganaderia@gmail.com
Government of El Salvador, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	24.06.2016	Silvia de Larios	Directora de Ecosistemas y Vida Silvestre	slarios@marn.gob.sv
Government of Ethiopia, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries	21.06.2016	Dr. Mesrak Mokonen	State Minister Animal Health	mismek@gmail.com
Government of Kenya, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	23.06.2016	Robin Mbae	Deputy Director Livestock Production (Climate Change)	robinmbae@yahoo.com
Government of New Zealand, Ministry for Primary Industries	19.03.2013	Matthew Hooper	Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO	matthew.Hooper@mfat.govt.nz

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



Government of Mongolia , Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry MOFALI	24.02.2017	Choi-Ish Lkhasuren Davaadash Sambuu	Director General Livestock Embassy of Mongolia, Rome	cho_ish@mofa.gov.mn rome2@mfa.gov.mn
Government of Panama , Ministry of Agricultural and Livestock Development	21.01.2016	Dr. Rolando Tello J.	Director de Ganadería Nacional	rtello@mida.gob.pa
Government of Paraguay , Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	23.06.2016	Marcelo Gonzales	Vice-minister of Livestock	vganaderia@mag.gov.py , paratodomag@gmail.com
Government of Rwanda , Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources		Dr. Theogene Rutagwenda	Director Animal Resources	rutagwendat2006@yahoo.com
Government of Uganda , Uganda Bureau of Statistics	23.06.2016	Patrick Okello	Director, Agriculture and Environment Statistics	pokello@gmail.com
Kamutjonga Inland Fisheries Institute, Namibia	11.05.2017	Renier David Burger	Deputy Director	renier.burger@mfmr.gov.na
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fishery, Uruguay	08.03.2018	Walter Oyhantcabal	Director of the Sustainability and Climate Change Unit	woyhantcabal@mgap.gub.uy , woyhantcabal@gmail.com +59899661524

Private Sector (PrS) – 23

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
Canadian Cattle-men's Association		Fawn Jackson	Environment and Sustainability Manager	jacksonf@cattle.ca
C.B.P.S., Centro Brasileiro de Pecuaria Sustentavel	11.05.2017	Mr. Mauroni Canguçu	Director	mauroniac@hotmail.com
Country Carbon, Australia	06.06.2016	Leanne Wheaton	Office Manager	copier@countrycarbon.com.au
Dairy Sustainability Framework	10.05.2017	Donald Moore	Executive Director	Donald.Moore@globaldairyplatform.com
European Livestock and Meat Trading Union, Brussels, Belgium	09.09.2013	Jean-Luc Mériaux	Secretary General	info@uecbv.eu +32 2 230 46 03
KLPA, Kenya Livestock Producers Association	01.11.2017	Patrick N. Kimani	Chief Executive Officer	klpakenya@yahoo.com , ceo@klpakenya.org
GIZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Germany	17.10.2013	Carola Von Morstein	Program Manager	carola.morstein-von@giz.de
Global Initiatives, Singapore	08.05.2014	Sarah Anderson	Program Director	social@globalinitiatives.com
GRSB, Global Roundtable for Sustainable Beef	05.02.2014	Ruaraidh Petre	Executive Director	Ruaraidh.petre@grsbeef.org

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



International Dairy Federation	08.03.2013	Caroline Emond María Sánchez Mainar	Director General	DG@fil-idf.org , CEmond@fil-idf.org MSanchezMainar@fil-idf.org
International Egg Commission	01.03.2013	Anne Marie Neeteson		aneeteson@aviagen.com
International Feed Industry Federation	11.03.2013	Alexandra De Athayde	Executive Director	alexandra.athayde@ifif.org
International Meat Secretariat		Hsin Huang	Secretary General	Hsin.huang@meat-ims.org
International Poultry Council	20.11.2014	Anne Marie Neeteson		aneeteson@aviagen.com
Kenya Dairy Board	23.06.2016	Margaret Jemutai Rugut	Managing Director	kibogymr@kdb.co.ke
Mercy Corps, Ethiopia	12.05.2017	Michael Jacobs	Program Manager	mjacobs@mercycorps.org
Novus International, United States of America, Novus Europe SA/NV, Brussels, Belgium				info.europe@novusint.com +32 2 778 1441
Ranch 4 International Ltd, Canada	08.03.2013	Ted Haney	President	ted.haney@ranch4.com
Savory Institute, United States of America	03.08.2013	Bobby Gill	Director	bgill@savoryinstitute.org
Swissgenetics	23.08.2017	Alizée Sauron	Project Manager International	asu@swissgenetics.ch
Turkey Farmers of Canada				info@tfc-edc.ca Tel. 905.812.3140
Van Drie Group		Jacques de Groot		jdegrout@vandriegroup.com
VetEffect, Bilt-hoven, The Netherlands				info@veteffect.nl +31-30-2258865

Academia & Research (A&R) – 23

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
Agri Benchmark, Germany	11.03.2013	Ernesto Reyes	Environment and Sustainability Manager	ernesto.reyes@agribenchmark.net
AgResearch, New Zealand	25.03.2013	Liz Wedderburn		liz.wedderburn@agresearch.co.nz
Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Dhaka, Bangladesh	11.05.2017	Nathu Ram Sarker	Principal Scientist	sarkern62@yahoo.com
HAFL, Bern University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland	12.03.2013	Nancy Bourgeois		nancy.bourgeois@bfh.ch
CATIE, Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza, Costa Rica		Muhammad Ibrahim	Director General	mbrahim@catie.ac.cr
CIAT, Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, Colombia	02.08.2017	Michael Peters	Program Leader Tropical Forages	m.peters-ciati@cgiar.org

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



CIPAV, Centro para la Investigación en Sistemas Sostenibles de Producción Agropecuaria	06.05.2016	Julian Chara	Research Coordinator	julian@fun.cipav.org.co
CIRAD, Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement, France	26.02.2013	Alexander Ickowicz	Director Research Unit	alexandre.ickowicz@cirad.fr
CONICET, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina	23.06.2016	Pablo Luis Peri	Head Researcher	peri.pablo@inta.gob.ar
DBARC, Debre Birham Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia	11.05.2017	Ayele Abebe Abiebie	National Sheep Research Coordinator	yemichaeld@gmail.com
ECOSUR, El Colegio de la Frontera Sur, Mexico	05.05.2016	Guillermo Jimenez-Ferrer	Investigador Titular/Ganadería y Cambio Climático	gjimenez@ecosur.mx
Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Livestock Systems, Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences, University of Florida		Adegbola Adesogan	Director	adesogan@ufl.edu
IFCN Dairy Research Network		Torsten Hemme		Torsten.hemme@ifcndairy.org
INRA, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, France	16.04.2013	Jonathan Levine	International Officer	jonathan.levin@inra.fr
Institut de l'Élevage, France	19.03.2013	Jean Baptiste Dolle		jean-baptiste.dolle@idele.fr
Instituto Plan Agropecuario, Uruguay	06.03.2013	Gonzalo Becoña	Extension/Research Officer	gbecona@planagropecuario.org.uy
Kansas State University, College of Veterinary Medicine	27.06.2016	Keith Hamilton	Executive Director, College of Veterinary Medicine	keithhamilton@ksu.edu
ATB, Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy	01.09.2013	Simone Kraatz	Academician/ Researcher	sikraatz@atb-potsdam.de
Leibniz Institute for Farm Animal Biology, Germany	09.04.2014	Prof. Dr. Klaus Wimmers	Director	wimmers@fhn-dummerstorf.de Tel. +49 38208-68 600
National Institute of Animal Sciences, Vietnam	12.03.2013	Huyen Le Thi Thanh	Research Fellow	lehuyen1973@yahoo.com
Royal Veterinary College, University of London	31.10.2014	Steven van Winde	Senior Lecturer	svwinden@rvc.ac.uk
UFSJ, Universidade Federal de	12.03.2013	Rogerio Mauricio	Researcher	rogeriomauricio@ufs.edu.br

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



São João del-Rei, Brazil				
UNPA, Universidad Austral de la Patagonia, Argentina		Pablo Luis Peri	Head Researcher	peri.pablo@inta.gob.ar

Donors (Do) – 10

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
CNE, Confédération Nationale de l'Élevage, France	27.02.2017	Emanuel Coste		e.coste@interbev.fr
GDP, Global Dairy Platform	19.05.2016	Donald Moore	Executive Director	Donald.Moore@globaldairy-platform.com
Government of Canada, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Donation 31.03.2017	Patti Negrave	Deputy Director, Red Meat Section	patti.negrave@agr.gc.ca
Government of France, Ministry of Foreign Affairs		Marie-Odile Kuntz	Senior Officer for Livestock, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Risks, and Veterinary Matters	marie-odile.kuntz@diplomatie.gouv.fr
Government of Ireland, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	19.12.2014	Edwina Love	Climate Change and Bioenergy Policy Division	Edwina.Love@agriculture.gov.ie
Government of Switzerland, Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture FOAG	18.03.2013	Alwin Kopse	Head of the International Sustainable Agriculture Unit	alwin.kopse@blw.admin.ch
Government of The Netherlands, Ministry of Economic Affairs		Niek Schelling	Senior Policy Officer EU Agricultural Policies and Food Security	n.schelling@mnez.nl
SLU, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	14.03.2013	Ulf Magnusson	Professor, Department of Clinical Sciences, Division of Reproduction	ulf.magnusson@slu.se
USAID-Ethiopia	11.05.2017 (has not donated yet)	Elaine Grings		egrings@usaid.gov
The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	29.03.2018	Shannon Mesen-howski		Shannon.mesen-howski@gatesfoundation.org

NGOs (NGO) – 24

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
Animal Task Force, European Union	12.11.2013	Susana De Magalhaes		susana.de.magalhaes@animaltaskforce.eu
ANTHRA, India	10.05.2017	Nitya Ghotge	Director	nitya.ghotge@gmail.com
Compassion in World Farming, United Kingdom	07.03.2013	Wendy Smith	Engagement Manager	wendy@ciwf.org
Fundación CoMunidad, Panama	09.05.2016	Alberto Pascual		apascual@mail.com



Fundación Produce Michoacán, Mexico		Marta Xochitl		dramxfe@fupromich.com
Heifer International		Martha Hirpa		Martha.Hirpa@heifer.org
Humane Society International	12.03.2013	Wendy Higgins		whiggins@hsi.org
Inter Eco Center, Ukraine				InterEcoCentre@gmail.com
KYEEMA Foundation, Australia	17.05.2017	Celia Grenning	CEO	celiag@kyeemafoundation.org
LPP, League for Pastoral Peoples	19.03.2013	Ilse Köhler-Rollefson		ilse.koehlerroll@gmail.com
LIFE, Local Livestock for Empowerment of Rural People, South Asia	19.03.2013	Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan		lpps@sify.com
LIFLOD, Livestock Farming and Local Development Network	07.03.2013	Aboubakar Njoya	Director of Research, Board Chair	nfo@liflod.org
Pacto Caquetá, Cero Deforestación y Reconciliación Ganadera, Colombia	21.09.2016	Rafael Torrijos		rafatorrijos@gmail.com
SAVES, Society of Animal, Veterinary and Environmental Scientists, Pakistan		Abdul Raziq	Expert	raziq2007@gmail.com
Senaapathy Kangayam Cattle Research Foundation	11.05.2017	Karthikeya Sivasenapathy		kartikeyaksm@gmail.com
SOS Sahel Ethiopia	09.05.2017	Feyera Abdi		feyerabdi@yahoo.com
TAFS Forum, Switzerland	14.03.2013	Ulrich Sperling	Exec. Director	ulrich.sperling@tafsforum.org
The Donkey Sanctuary	08.03.2017	Lesley Mitchell Valentina Riva		lesley@goodfutures.com valentina.rive@thedonkeysanctuary.org.uk
The Nature Conservancy		Brian Mcpeek Mark Tercek	Chief Conservation Officer Director General	+1 (703) 841-5300
Vétérinaires Sans Frontières VSF Switzerland	23.06.2016	Dr. Martin Barasa (South Sudan)		martin.barasa@vsf-suisse.org
Vétérinaires Sans Frontières VSF International	10.05.2017	Margherita Gomarasca	Coordinator	coordinator@vsf-international.org
World Animal Protection	25.03.2013	Arjan van Houwelingen	Director	houwelingen@worldanimal-protection.org
World Horse Welfare		Jessica Stark	Director of Communications and Public Affairs	JessicaStark@worldhorse-welfare.org
WWF, World Wildlife Fund	22.06.2016	Ian McConnel		imcconnel@wwf.org.au

Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock



Social Movements (SM) – 4

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
APESS, Association pour la Promotion de l'Elevage au Sahel et en Savane	18.03.2013	Barry Boubakary	General Seretary	barry.boubakary@gmail.com
Pastoralist Knowledge Hub	24.03.2016	Gregorio Velasco Gil	Coordinator	Gregorio.VelascoGil@fao.org
Redes Chaco, WAMIP, Argentina	07.10.2016	Pablo Frere	Coordinator	pablolfrere@gmail.com
WAMIP North Africa	01.08.2016	Fagouri Said	Coordinator	fagouris@gmail.com

Intergovernmental (IntG) – 6

PARTNER	DATE OF JOINING	FOCAL POINT NAME	FOCAL POINT POSITION	FOCAL POINT CONTACT
African Development Bank	23.06.2016	Mr. Bouchaib Boulanouar		bboulanouar@gmail.com
African Union – Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)	22.03.2012	Bruce Mukanda Simplice Noula		bruce.mukanda@au-ibar.org simplice.nouala@au-ibar.org
FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	28.05.2013	Berhe Tekola	Director, Animal Production and Health Division	Berhe.Tekola@fao.org
ILRI, International Livestock Research Institute	15.03.2013	Shirley Tarawali	Assistant Director General	s.tarawali@cgiar.org
The World Bank	16.05.2016	Francois Legall Franck Berthe	Livestock Advisor	flegall1@worldbank.org fberthe1@worldbank.org
World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)	18.10.2016	Jean-Jacques Soula	Coordinator for OIE for the Global Peste Des Petits Ruminants Control and Eradication Programme	jj.soula@oie.int



ANNEX 4: Summaries of Action Network and Cluster Presentations

Cluster	Objectives	Major achievements	Outlook	Potential Contribution to Global Fora (COP, GFFA)
Donors		Intensification of contacts with potential donors among current partners	Attract other significant donors such as Germany and Gates Foundation	
Public Sector	Contribution to the global dialogue on sustainable livestock, providing knowledge about the reality of nations and the potential for articulation of actions, interests and knowledge for the design of inclusive public policies that contribute to the fulfillment of the Sustainable Development Goals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Network of Action in the design of public policies, linked to the Global Agenda: create conditions at the regional and local level, for the promotion of a sustainable livestock - Costa Rica as the venue for the CODEGALAC meeting: manage a work agenda to ensure the discussion of the issue and the participation of senior delegates of the Global Agenda and FAO - Establish a Laboratory for the Analysis and Dialogue of Livestock Policies (LAPP) for Mesoamerica, as an instrument to provide evidence to influence decision-makers, formulate and design policies, in order to achieve the goals of the Agenda 2030 - Strengthen the participation of representatives of the public sector in the different Action Networks created under the guidance of the Global Agenda - Regional approach: move towards a joint agenda, generate references to guide policies, harmonize regulations, homogenize methodologies, promote synergies and exchanges 	



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a Network of Action in Mesoamerica for the design and implementation of public policies (incl. CODEGALAC Mesoamerica Chapter 2018-2020) 	
Private Sector			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcoming existing private sector initiatives - Send positive signal to accelerate sustainable practices - Better position to influence private sector actions - Increase visibility of GASL - Creation of a shared vision rather than “top-down” approach 	
Academia & Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communicate with the GG and seek mandates from cluster members - Collect information on current developments in the livestock sector and to propose relevant research - Promote the agenda and highlight the value of being part of it, while aiming for a balanced participation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewing the 14 cases and 13 tools presented in Addis Ababa and publishing the results of this review are the main activity due to be implemented in the first half of 2018. The progress of these activities will be presented at the MSPM in Mongolia in June - A budget entailing 40 working days (USD 12,600 for senior experts with up to 8 years' experience and USD 18'900 for senior experts with 12 years' experience) has been proposed by GG Cluster members to the GASL Chair and manager to cover the costs of reviewing and writing the publication 	The review of the tools and cases shall support the further dissemination and uptake of tools worldwide to sustainably contribute to social and economic dimensions of livestock keeping (enhance food security and nutrition, enhance livelihood, improve animal health and welfare), while helping to mitigate environmental impacts.
NGOs	Increase the communication between stakeholders, strengthen dialogue and get NGOs to engage			



Civil Society	Reach farmers, families etc., involve governments to commit to GASL, build dialogue with others, take part in organizations (e.g. pastoralism) and connect everything that has to do with nutrition, climate change and so on			
Intergovernmental and Multi-lateral Inst.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 members since 2016 (FAO, WB, ILRI, AU-IBAR, African Dev. Bank, OIE) - Assuring connection and advocacy with International Organizations and governments - Fostering balance, representativeness and inclusiveness in GASL - LGA as representative of members that have not joined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attract other members such as IFAD - Advocacy with governments of under-represented regions - Represent GASL before 2018 COAG Session - Support the establishment of the Livestock sub-committee under COAG - Implement key recommendations of COP23 and - Contribute to the Tripartite initiative based on our engagement on OH-LAMP 	

Action Network	Objectives	Major achievements	Outlook	Potential Contribution to Global Fora (COP, GFFA)
Closing the Efficiency Gap			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Launching a Publication on SPS case studies at the MSP meeting (Mongolia, June 2018) - Modelling (models, methodologies, tools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methods and approaches for assessing adaptation, adaptation co-benefits and resilience - Focus on models and tools for modeling (assessing) sustainable options - Ensuring food Security and Nutrition: Promoting better dissemination



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presenting project proposals to IKI and Gates foundation (joint proposal with the GN of SPS and A.N. Restoring Value to Grasslands) 	<p>and application of technologies and innovations, in particular regarding breeding, feeding and livestock husbandry; conserving natural resources, protecting the environment and addressing climate change; Promoting sustainable and resource-efficient livestock production, including through innovations, integrated systems, agro-ecological methods and organic farming, inter alia by phasing out unsustainable policies and practices; Supporting international research collaboration on reducing the intensity of GHG emissions from livestock production systems, including by pasture restoration and soil carbon sequestration</p>
Restoring Value to Grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving livelihoods particular related to linking grazing systems to value networks and local development - Conserving natural resources and protecting the environment and addressing climate change - Approach to take a systems view and focus on the relationships between social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes and to identify where to place interventions that will strengthen these simultaneously 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Database on the GASL website: share knowledge and lessons (web master) - Synthesis of case studies: lessons and evidence for sustainable grassland management - Participative conceptual model (Ontology) development: Platform built from literature review mid 2016 and Workshop May 2016, and Nov 2017 (20 participants, research, policy, agri- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalise a generic conceptual model Ontology and publish a paper - Develop applications : guidelines; analysis framework; simulation models - Synthesis and communicate on multiple functions and values of grassland - Document and website; Capacity building 	



		<p>business): Participative film 2016-2017, Forum theatre 2016, 10 On farm interviews, Feedback from a workshop at the 10th Int. Range-land Congress (IRC) in Saskatoon, Canada July 2016, Case studies from Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Mongolia, Senegal, France, New Zealand, Vietnam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document and collate activities related to the training of extension personnel in grazing systems 		
LEAP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water use assessment - Nutrients modelling and impact assessment - Soil Carbon Stock Change - Biodiversity and ecosystem services - Feed additives - Road testing - LEAP Chairmanship 2018 - Communication plan - Task force for LEAP3 		



Global Network on Silvopastoral Systems	<p>Promote the strengthening and scaling up of SPS, wherever there are technical, economic, environmental, and cultural options for supporting livelihoods and business activities with sustainable livestock farming, specifically through the generation, exchange and dissemination of knowledge, the documentation of public policies in countries and/or sub-regions, and the facilitation of dialogue to address the challenges associated with Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify the relevant stakeholders and initiatives in silvopastoral systems at global level and the areas where there are demands for knowledge, advice or information about silvopastoral processes. - Serve as a neutral forum to facilitate the exchange between strategic stakeholders in the silvopastoral field including lead producers, private companies, public policy makers, scientists and communicators to stimulate the local practice change in silvopastoral systems. - Serve as a multi-stakeholder platform to find consensus in the methodologies 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate the exchange of information: Book on Silvopastoral Case Studies, 2018; X International Congress, 2019, Paraguay; II World Congress on Silvopastoral Systems, Argentina, 2020. - Provide evidence of sustainability - Enhancing the scope of SPS case studies - Contribution to the NDCs and NAMAs - Implement and effective platform for information exchange among stakeholders (farmers and technicians, scientist, policy makers). - Presenting project proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methods and approaches for assessing adaptation, adaptation co-benefits and resilience. - Improved soil carbon, soil health and soil fertility under grassland - Improved livestock management systems. - Reduce livestock's greenhouse-gas emissions by making livestock production systems more efficient, while also meeting animal health and animal welfare requirements. - Promote and support international research collaboration on reducing the intensity of GHG emissions from livestock production systems, including by pasture restoration and soil carbon sequestration.
---	--	--	---	---



	of evaluation, transfer of information and development of policies to promote the scaling up of silvopastoral systems.			
Dairy Asia		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 national multi-stakeholder meetings to commonly identify key priority working areas in country using the Dairy Asia Sustainability Framework as guide → Building consensus and aligning actions - National progress reports against prioritized working areas. - Technical working groups - Collaboration between member countries - Dairy Asia Sustainability Award - National Focal Point meeting - Open multi-stakeholder platform meeting - Communication and knowledge products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compilations of best practices - Compilation of quality standards from the region - Dairy genetics working group meeting and development of regional guidelines for cattle breeding - Private sector meeting to encourage membership - Dairy Asia Award 	
LAMP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scoping the role for GASL to contribute to the reduction of AMR (AN is jointly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand the network, and form an executive committee (ec) - Collect Good practises (work by the SLU secretariat) 	COP 23: LAMP's area number III animal management and livestock husbandry systems relates directly to paragraph 2 (e) in the resolution



		<p>funded by GASL and SLU)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Endorsement of LAMP as a new action network - Broaden the network - Collecting Good practices among GASL members (Final version posted at the website Feb 2018) - Providing Funds (Some funding from SLU Global, Continuous and positive dialog with other donors) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysing and synthesising the collected practises (work by the secretariat and the ec) - Continuing the fundraising 	<p>(Improved livestock management systems).</p> <p>GFFA resolution on implementation of the Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance led jointly by the WHO, the OIE and the FAO, the FAO's Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance and the OIE Strategy on Antimicrobial Resistance and the Prudent Use of Antimicrobials - LAMP as a whole directly contribute to this resolution.</p>
Livestock for Social Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To provide robust evidence of the impacts of the dairy sector and its development on social and economic conditions - Quantitative and robust information on impacts of dairy development on 'livelihoods' as potential tool to support achievement of SDG1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considerable heterogeneity in study designs, assessed impacts and respective metrics - Remarkable consistency in reported outcomes, which are: always positive, nearly always statistically significant, sizeable (in most cases >20% improvements) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conform a working consultancy group - The selection of a core set of indicators to measure social impact - The development of a model to link input and output indicators - Testing and refining methods / models 	<p>COP 23: Socioeconomic and food security dimensions of climate change in the agricultural sector (achieved by the main working lines of the AN: Evidence and impact methodologies and guidelines)</p> <p>GFFA: This AN will contribute providing guidelines and tools for assessing the potential role of livestock on social development as well as to Policy recommendations of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) at its 43rd session on "Sustainable Agriculture Development for Food Security and Nutrition: What Roles for Livestock?"</p>
Animal Welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand and demonstrate animal welfare's role in delivering the SDGs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to seek further case studies and develop portfolio for presentation in Mongolia 	



<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Increase adoption of good practices and improve animal welfare conditions on farm that support the delivery of the SDGs in line with the Global Agenda's identified priorities- Increase the profile of animal welfare in sustainable livestock- Reflect and enhance the reputation of livestock production by demonstrating its work to achieve good animal welfare in practice		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Finalise AW and SDG briefing – launch in June- Build Year 2 plan and funding proposal – through GASL? Independent? (Governance)- Communications resources at GASL essential for growth of the network <p>Priority has been given to developing two activity streams for presentation at the GASL global meeting in June 2018: Development of an evidence-based briefing on animal welfare and its role in delivery of sustainable livestock in support of the Sustainable Development Goals; Development of case studies of solutions and approaches to inclusion of animal welfare in sustainable livestock.</p>	
--	--	--	--