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1. Welcome – Chair
The Chair welcomes all Guiding Group members and observers, especially the new ones (full list of attendees in Annex 2):
- Gemma Verijdt (on behalf of Kim van Seeters), Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN Organizations in Rome
- Jambaltseren Tumur-Uya, the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry, Mongolia
- Jeremy Hill, Fonterra, New Zealand (observer)
- Dalma Dominguez and Augustin Guerrero, Ministry of Livestock, Paraguay (observers)
- Pablo Manzano, International Union for Conservation of Nature (observer)
- Catherine Marguerat, Federal Office for Agriculture, Switzerland (observer)
- Renata Negrelly Nogueira, Alternate Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO, WFP and IFAD, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil (observer)

Henning Steinfeld announces that he is leaving FAO, and consequently the Global Agenda, next year.

Berhe Tekola welcomes all attendees to FAO. He informs about yesterday’s COAG (Committee of Agriculture) session, where AGA (the Animal Health and Production Division) presented an update on the establishment of a subcommittee on livestock. COAG decided to delay this establishment until next session in 2020, but there were many positive comments towards GASL. The discussion was also about how to best fund GASL, which is an opportunity for GASL to push donors.

2. Approval of the Agenda and 15 June 2018 GG Meeting Minutes – Chair
The agenda (as distributed in the second round) and the minutes of the last GG meeting on 15 June in Mongolia are approved by the GG.

3. Global Agenda Progress Report, including Finances – Chair, Eduardo

**Traffic light evaluation of 15 June 2018, Mongolia**
The following Traffic Light Agenda reflects the items of the last GG meeting including corresponding actions. The colours indicate if actions have been fulfilled (green), are in progress (yellow) or have not yet been undertaken (red) as of 1 October 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome, welcoming new members</td>
<td>1. Attendees list, GG members and Observers</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mr Jambaltseren Tumur-Uya, Director General of the State Administration and Management Department of MoFALI is approved as new member of the GG, Public Sector Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.1. Meeting agenda 2.2. GG meeting minutes, 07 March 2018</td>
<td>2.1 Meeting Agenda 2.2 GG Meeting Minutes, 07 March 2018 incl. annexes</td>
<td>I, A</td>
<td>Minutes March 18 approved</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>Agenda approved, minutes of GG meeting of 7 March 2018 approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.1. Global Agenda Progress Report, including finances</td>
<td>3.1 Traffic light evaluation</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Develop fundraising portfolio for new AP</td>
<td>Chair, AST, Fundr. Task Force</td>
<td>Work for fund raising portfolio in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Financial Statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.1 Mongolia, 8th MSP: Review and Feedback 4.2 Conclusions for the Action Plan 2019-2021</td>
<td>4.1 MSP Agenda and Summary 4.2 MSP Conclusions</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Implement conclusions in AP</td>
<td>AP Task Force</td>
<td>Work in progress, process is according to defined timeline. Final report on MSP 2018 available and distributed to GG. Report is background document for Action Plan 2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.1 Preliminary Results of the FAO-GASL evaluation</td>
<td>5.1 Preliminary Evaluation Report 5.2 Draft management response FAO</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Implement suggestions in AP</td>
<td>AP Task Force</td>
<td>Preliminary report has been circulated with GG. Comments received and integrated in report. Conclusions and recommendations are partially integrated in draft of Action Plan 2019-2021. Final report 24.09.2018 released. Management Response to be discussed in this meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 MSP 2020 Switzerland</td>
<td>7.2 Preliminary themes for MSP 2020</td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>Organize committee MSP 2020</td>
<td>Switzerland and GG members</td>
<td>Three venues are systematically evaluated. Swiss Organizing Committee has been formed. Venue not decided yet (24 Sep 2018). Proposed major themes under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.1 Future communication activities</td>
<td>8.1 Communication plan</td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>Clarify communication perspective of GASL in FAO, start developing tools, create list of events</td>
<td>AST, Lead Anna</td>
<td>Draft strategy for AP 2019-2021 developed and integrated to draft of AP 2019-2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Next Guiding Group meeting</td>
<td>Back to Back with COAG, 2-3 October 2018, Rome</td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Back to Back with COAG, 2-3 October 2018, Rome. Main issue will be the discussion and further development of the AP 2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Any other business</td>
<td>10.1 Draft TOR for Editorial Board</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Identify more members for Editorial Board (up to 3). The intention is</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Rogerio Mauricio (Chair), UFSJ Brazil, Academia &amp; Research Cluster (Chair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members of the board: Ernesto Reyes, Agri Benchmark, Academia & Research Cluster Nancy Bourgeois, HAFL Switzerland, Academia & Research Cluster Additional members are being recruited. Ways to work under discussion.

| 10.2 Review of Tools and Cases | 10.2. Finalizing TOR for consultant recruitment of consultant | I, D | Recruit Pablo Manzano as consultant for this task. | AST | Pablo Manzano has been recruited and hired for 40 days. His report is expected by 31 December 2018. |
| 10.3 Side Event COAG 1 to 5 October 2018 | 10.3 Concept Note by K. Seeters | I | Wednesday 3 October at 18.00 “AMR in Livestock: Innovation and the Role of GASL”. Governments of the Netherlands, Switzerland and South Africa together with GASL. | Kim Seeters in the lead | AMR in Livestock: Innovation and the Role of GASL |
| 10.4 Side Event CFS | 10.3 | | The report on “Nutrition during the first 1000 days of children” of ILRI will be presented there. | Shirley, Fritz | Side event will take place, no active role for GASL |
| 10.5 AN Closing the Efficiency Gap | 10.3 | | Due to lack of resources, the AN Closing the Efficiency Gap needs a new solution. | Ernesto Reyes, AST | Work in progress |
| 10.6 AN Animal Welfare | | | Lesley Mitchel is not leading AN Animal Welfare anymore. Somebody else has to be found as the ‘motor’. | Chair and AST | Dr. Rebecca Doyle is a senior lecturer with the Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences, and researcher at the Animal Welfare Science Centre, the University of Melbourne. She is supported by the university to lead the AN Animal Welfare. |
| 10.7 AN LEAP | | | Lionel proposes to work closer with Camillo. LEAP will be promoted 17-19 October in Bangkok, in an event with more than 400 people. | AST | Informal consultations are in progress: So far, no formal processes for a closer collaboration. However, work in progress. |
| 10.7 List of Important Events | | | | AST | List exists and is being updated regularly (see Annex 3) |

Financial Situation 8th MSP Meeting Mongolia 2018 & GASL Finances 2018
The following tables are presented to the GG in order to follow up the financial statements presented in June 2018. More details can be found in Annex 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Used for</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian Government</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>111,250</td>
<td>Cultural dinner, mini-Naadam, infrastructure, transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland SDC</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Lunch, sponsoring participants, interpretation, infrastructure</td>
<td>Address of SDC rep. Thursday lunchtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Dairy Platform</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>General MSP support</td>
<td>No conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Dinner and general MSP support</td>
<td>Address Tuesday afternoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Accounts 8th MSP Meeting Mongolia 2018, Total Cost (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Service</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>Real Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Infrastructure and equipment</td>
<td>25,891</td>
<td>18,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transportation</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meals</td>
<td>91,250</td>
<td>91,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpretation</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>28,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Printing</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>6,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Meeting package</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other, medical unit on site</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MSP Support Consultancies</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>39,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sponsorship Participants</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>41,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Agenda Support Team Travel (4)</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Unforeseen expenses</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>261,644</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Accounts 8th MSP Meeting Mongolia 2018, Balance (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>261,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sponsoring</td>
<td>241,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost for GASL</td>
<td>19,894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 and 2017 Detailed Expenses and 2018 Adjusted Minimum Budget (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Minimum Budget 2018 Adjusted 31 August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARIAT</td>
<td>150,955</td>
<td>271,751</td>
<td>278,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP PROCESS</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>388,095</td>
<td>306,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>253,897</td>
<td>161,968</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION NETWORKS</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>131,960</td>
<td>119,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICE AND POLICY CHANGE (PPC )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO FEE 7 %</td>
<td>43,775</td>
<td>69,214</td>
<td>56,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>669,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,057,988</strong></td>
<td><strong>860,617</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial situation as on 31 August 2018 (USD)

| Estimated Expenses 2018          | 860,617       |
| Confirmed Contributions 2018     | 883,508       |
| Balance                           | **22,891**    |

4. 8th MSP Report – Anna
The report of the 8th MSP Meeting in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia was written by Tumur Erdenechuluun, lecturer at the Mongolian University of Life Sciences, with the help and under supervision of the AST. It is accessible online under [http://www.livestockdialogue.org/events/events/multi-stakeholder-meetings/ulaanbataar11-15june2018](http://www.livestockdialogue.org/events/events/multi-stakeholder-meetings/ulaanbataar11-15june2018).

One of the last chapters of the report is about participant’s reflections. The GG thinks that the remarks of the different cluster meetings in Mongolia should also be included in these general remarks of GASL. The private sector cluster therefore will share the notes of its meeting with the AST. In general, there is a wish for more exchange and cooperation between the clusters and ANs – sharing their discussion
notes (a few lines of the conclusions) could be a useful step. The GG expresses its wish for more time for individual cluster and AN meetings during MSP and GG meetings.

A GG member suggests using the tables of each of the four priority areas in this report for the new AP. The parallel workshops on these four main topics are perceived well by the GG, but according to some opinions not sufficiently included in the report, neither the presentations of the outputs. The AST will make these presentations available online as well as the report of Peter Ballantyne (the facilitator of the two technical days on Tuesday/Wednesday) which is included in the main report in an abbreviated version.

The GG highlights again that it was an excellent involvement of the Mongolian government. It displays how governments can support GASL. What also worked very well was the limited way of sponsoring: All sponsored participants had to contribute something such as the flight, the hotel, the transport or a lump sum. This reduced way of financing can be done again. On the negative side, the inclusiveness was suffering because of a lack of funds. GASL would like to be able to support more people to join annual MSP meetings.

5. AN Closing the Efficiency Gap: 2018 report and outlook – Ernesto

During the last GG Meeting in Mongolia, Ernesto Reyes has informed about his resignation to chairing the AN Closing the Efficiency Gap due to a lack of capacity. Nonetheless, this doesn’t mean that the AN has to be closed. His proposed working plan for the next 3 years looks as follows:

- Continue providing evidence
- Create a portfolio of options (by regions, by topics)
- Support and endorse modelling (models, methodologies, tools)
- Project proposals?

Ernesto will continue helping with the process but is not the responsible person of running and coordinating the whole network. He reminds that several institutions will continue working for this AN and providing evidence (scaling up case studies). Additionally, new regions and institutions will participate in the case studies. EMBRAPA, Agribenchmark and the Global Network on Silvopastoral Systems (GNSPS) will implement silvopastoral and sustainable livestock case studies in Brazil, Paraguay and Argentina.

Ernesto presents two options for the further continuation:
- Merging activities with other ANs (GNSPS/LEAP)
- Conforming a temporal task force group (TFG) for coordinating the AN. As a proposal, this task force could be composed of GASL cluster representatives.

He emphasizes the importance for this AN to be merged with other ANs, as it is dealing with sustainable livestock options and the efficiency of natural resource management. The work together with the GNSPS has been a good experience.

He also repeats that the content, evidence and methodology are still there – it just needs temporarily a task force to run the action plan for the next years. This could also be a chance to better interlink ANs and clusters by working together. A task force could assess this issue at a higher level in a similar way as LEAP. There could be a group with the same outcomes, budget and organization.
The GG agrees that this AN is core of GASL. Whatever is decided, it will have an impact on the governance as a whole. Therefore, the GG does not want to rush with a decision. It is decided to first form a nucleus with the mandate to build this task force. Ernesto offers to coordinate this task force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nucleus team in charge of building a task force for the AN Closing the Efficiency Gap:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Reyes (Academia Cluster), Caroline Emond (Private Sector Cluster), Camillo De Camillis (AN LEAP), Julian Chara (AN GNSPS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mauricio Chacon mentions the possibility to build a working group in Costa Rica that can contribute to this task force.

The question comes up if GASL still needs the current format of ANs or if they could be merged. This task force can be taken as an example for describing what ANs are doing and how they are contributing to the AP.

Another question is how results of ANs can be structured and represented on the website, so that people, who are looking for results, can find them. In future, people could go to the GASL website and click on what is happening on sustainable livestock production in different regions and see which standardized models were applied to get the results. Several elements are already there, for example the GLEAM model. It is a matter of finance and resources to develop a proper structure.

6. GASL external evaluation

Final report, presentation – Mikal

On behalf of the evaluation team, Mikal Khan presents the results of the evaluation, which was conducted during 2017 and 2018 by the independent evaluation office in FAO. They concentrated four main questions (explained below). The methodology consisted of a combination of interviews with different stakeholders and two online surveys, one for all members and another for ANs (more details such as sub questions, data sources or methodology can be found in the report).

Mikal starts with a look on the development of GASL since its beginning.

Evolution of GASL membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Action Networks</th>
<th>Main Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Brasilia Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phuket Roadmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Programme revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSP Meetings:
He then explains the outcomes of each of the four main questions and their recommendations:

1. To what extent were the project design, approach and implementation arrangements relevant?
   - GASL has demonstrated to be relevant to the objectives of its members and FAO, evolving over time to incorporate new trends (e.g. focus on new areas, SDGs).
   - Its uniqueness as a livestock-focused global MSP makes it an important contributor to partnership and consensus building.

2. To what extent did FAO successfully perform its facilitator, convener, technical agency and programmatic services in establishing and maintaining GASL?
   - Despite a number of structural and operational challenges of hosting GASL in FAO, the benefits provided overall outweigh the costs. The challenges should be addressed by FAO to better manage MSPs (see recom 1).

3. To what extent did GASL function effectively in an inclusive manner?
   - Representation is quite broad and has been growing. Members join for various reasons and have either benefited or expect to benefit in the future. Having the MSPs in different places is a good solution to encourage participation from all regions of the world.
   - The AST has been appreciated for its support, but has limited resources for some important functions such as collecting lessons and achievements and communication (see recom 2).

4. To what extent have stakeholders adopted or are likely to adopt new practices or policies as a result of their participation in GASL?
   - Establishment of membership, partnerships (networks) and process
   - Contributions to adoption of good practices and evidence based policies, in the form of evidence based (e.g. CODEGALAC, Mongolia Agenda for Sustainable Livestock, Regional Livestock MSP in Eastern Europe and Central Asia) – but GASL would benefit from a more clear theory of action, and evidence collection to explain how change should happen (see recom 3)
   - Gender considerations were not sufficiently mainstreamed in GASL’s work (see recom 4).

Recommendation 1
To FAO: FAO’s Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) and the Management and Partnership Division should draw lessons from GASL and other multistakeholder partnerships and provide guidance on their functioning to enable them to achieve concrete results.

Recommendation 2
To GASL and FAO: GASL should prioritize the establishment of monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to collect lessons and results from members and facilitate reporting to current and potential donors.

⇒ GASL has to show the positive experience. This is already happening, for example in Ethiopia 2017, the GG devoted time to the presentations of good cases from the ANs. There should be more of these lessons and they have to be communicated. The evaluation recognizes that such efforts require resources, which are currently limited, however the implementation of this
recommendation will also improve resource mobilization efforts, and it should be seen as an investment.

**Recommendation 3**  
To GASL and FAO: In its Action Plan 2019-2021, GASL would benefit from developing a shared and explicit theory of change of how it intends to contribute to policy and practice change. This should also include further development of the links to regional and country levels.

- GASL has evolved over time, the initial theory of change can now be defined in more detail, and defining more clear links between activities and expected results. The theory of change should serve the purpose of identifying the most effective channels to be prioritized by GASL and its members to promote policy and practice change. The regional MSP in Eastern Europe is a good example and it would be good to expand on this.

**Recommendation 4**  
To GASL and FAO: GASL should strengthen its efforts to incorporate a gender perspective given its crucial importance in sustainable livestock production. This can be done for instance by actively promoting a gender analysis in the policies and practices discussed in GASL or by disseminating FAO technical training material on gender in the livestock sector.

- Gender does not only mean equal representation or participation of men and women, it means understanding the social dynamics in order to achieve better development results. There are a number of concrete suggestions in the report, such as applying a gender analysis to the tools and methods or including a commitment to gender-sensitive livestock production as a cross cutting issue in GASL’s principles.

**Recommendation 5**  
To GASL: Broadening the donor base will be critical for GASL’s future, and additional communication and outreach efforts should be pursued to ensure its activities continue. Leveraging funds from its members has been effective and should be further expanded. Furthermore, GASL should consider organizing donors’ presence in a different form, by possibly eliminating the donor cluster and distributing the donor organizations among the other clusters.

- There is also a lot of contribution, which is not in financial terms, by allocating staff time for members to contribute to GASL through meetings and activities by the ANs. Securing funds is important: by increasing the learning and communication aspects, this could help broadening the donor base.

- Dismantling the donor cluster means: The donor cluster is different from the other cluster. Donors can be present in all clusters. It would make sense to have them everywhere and just have potentially a donor group, separate from the governance structure. This would make it more effective.

The GG generally agrees with these outcomes and recommendations. An additional point is that in many cases, improvements in sustainability of the livestock sector have already taken place, irrespective of GASL activities. People in businesses have been doing improvements. This is something GASL also needs to acknowledge and encourage. Consequently, there would be more participation.
In order to bring more people on board, it is also advisable to focus on a regional level and on local issues, so it is more concrete about lessons learnt and of implementing them.

Another point are the values and impacts that GASL has had on FAO: Certain initiatives that started as FAO initiatives have come to GASL, like LAMP and LEAP. They have had benefits from participation, consultations and partnerships of FAO. But there is potential to do more of FAO’s contribution – and still not too much interaction to keep the independency of GASL.

In order to provide political change and practice change, the GG agrees that GASL has to be better organized and look at what is done in the ANs. The results have to be shared with the public and private sectors and others.

To the question on how quantitative the monitoring of an evaluation should be, Mikal answers that it would have to be qualitative monitoring.

Recommendation 5 causes a little confusion, since in the report there are actually two different things summarized in one single recommendation: the Donor Cluster and regional stakeholder representativeness. These should be two different recommendations, as the second one concerns GASL overall, not only the donor cluster.

Regarding the inclusiveness of GASL’s members and sectors, the GG is concerned about the non-existence of a consumer’s representation. Mikal points out, that this was mentioned by several interviewees. The GG agrees that it would be good to include for example movements that try to reduce the consumption of animal sources. But it’s an open question who to include and how to approach these groups. Some GG feel the need to address the hostility against the livestock sector and think about influencing activities. Others remind that the change comes from the roots, these movements push the sector to become more sustainable and they are instrumental in change. Therefore, it’s not advisable trying to change them. A third opinion is that a new consumer movement first has to be created including all the people who think (more or less) neutral, but are not proactive like the vegan movements. The Chair summarizes that this topic is more difficult than in other areas, but GASL cannot shy away having these discussions.

The evaluation requires a management response of FAO including the following parties:

- AGA
- Management and Partnership Division
- Optionally also a response of GASL: The Chair and AST are going to prepare a management response by working on the FAO draft and adding GASL elements. This will be done by consultation.

Management response of AGA – Henning

The evaluation is timely and comprehensive. AGA accepts all recommendations with the provision that they are subject to budget availability. For example for gender and monitoring aspects, the means were missing. Nevertheless, it will be taken as an encouragement to improve.

Recommendation 1: AGA wants to have a workshop to systematically analyze problems and issues of multistakeholder initiatives, but also engage with DPS to look at a comparative analysis at FAO. GASL is
not the only MSP in FAO, but it is the one that meets the most multistakeholder aspects. Others are multistakeholder, but not that complete.

**Recommendation 2:** There is a need of having a more systematic monitoring of results achieved, and there will be a development proposal on that.

**Recommendation 3:** The development of the theory of change has found a new form in the global AP, it will be easier to devise such a system. There will also be looked at different partnership hosted at AGA and compare them to each other. A theory of change was already developed and published in 2014, but it was not articulated enough, it needs to be reactivated and brought up to date with a set of indicators or ideas on how a monitoring framework could be developed and with an improved priority setting.

**Recommendation 4:** The gender perspective did not get forgotten. It has to be brought in with available resources in FAO to beef this up. GASL should issue a call. In FAO, projects are committed to always having a gender component, this has to be enhanced.

**Recommendation 5:** AGA does not necessarily has a point of view with regard to whether the donor cluster should exist or not. It is not a cluster like the others, a different form could be envisaged. The donors were not the ones driving the agenda. Everybody is quite comfortable with the current situation.

Henning adds that this report points to a number of systematic issues in terms of how multistakeholder initiatives are regarded in an intergovernmental organization. It is becoming a power struggle, the governments are afraid that a multistakeholder initiative takes too much influence or power and drives an agenda that they want to be driving. The reason to start GASL was that there was not enough attention to livestock policy issues, now there seems to be more attention.

Luisa Belli, Project Evaluation Coordinator in OED, points out that the evaluation is a unique opportunity for GASL to be seen by another perspective. There is no formal commitment and request of OED to do anything, but she encourages the GG to take the evaluation as an input to evolve the initiative and to act together. She sees enormous opportunities in GASL.

The Chair highlights the good collaboration with Mikal and the evaluation team. There was always transparent information. GASL has already made use of the evaluation outcomes to create the AP. Nevertheless, GASL had to spend 55,000 USD on the evaluation despite financial struggles. The evaluation costs are definitely one of the challenges of FAO to host an MSP. But the GG agrees that the benefits of this evaluation outweigh the costs. The same counts for being hosted at FAO in general, although there are still issues regarding the copyright of publications, the logo, the identity, communication issues and others. It will be addressed with OSP.

The Chair once again thanks Mikal for the evaluation.

### 7. New Coordinator of AN Animal Welfare – Rebecca

Dr. Rebecca Doyle is a senior lecturer with the Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences and researcher at the Animal Welfare Science Centre at the University of Melbourne. Since one month, she is the new leader of the AN Animal Welfare. She mainly was catching up with the work that has been done by the previous leader Lesley Mitchel and organized meetings with members of this AN such as the Donkey Sanctuary, International Horse Welfare, International Meat Secreta...
Farming and Dairy Sustainability Framework. There will be more meetings with Bristol University, ILRI, Human Society International, and World Animal Protection to find out about the plans of the members.

Rebecca’s plan is to start small and build momentum around Animal Welfare. In the beginning, it is important to establish communication amongst the group and have everyone together and to start the discussions. One of the first activities will be to write a paper on Animal Welfare and its relationship with the SDGs. She points out that Animal Health is just one component under the umbrella of Animal Welfare, although GASL puts a focus on how Animal Welfare links with Animal Health. There will also be other Animal Welfare issues discussed in this paper. The start is to look at the options for Animal Welfare AN in GASL.

Another plan is identifying activities that will be suitable to students and interns. This allows to start building capacity and support in this space internationally and to get activities on ground where it is relevant. Then there should be a satellite meeting around a GASL meeting in 2019 or 2020 with a focus on Animal Welfare.

The GG welcomes Rebecca. The International Dairy Federation is interested in working together and supporting the AN with its group on Animal Welfare and Farm Management. Also the International Meat Secretary highlights the importance of the topic and is looking forward to working together.

8. MSP Meetings: Decision 2019, update 2020, proposal 2021 – Chair

In previous meetings in 2018, the GG decided to keep the format of having a MSP Meeting every year.

MSP Meeting 2019\(^1\)

**Venue:** Kansas State University, Manhattan/University of California, Davis/University of Florida

**Major theme:** Sustainable Livestock Intensification and Innovation (SLII)

**Proposed dates:** 9 to 13 September 2019

In the last GG Meeting, the GG endorsed to have the next MSP meeting in the USA. GASL has now advanced offers from three universities and needs to make a decision rather quickly based on a set of questions. Donald Moore is supporting a lot and has already secured 150’000 USD sponsoring from several institutions and donors that are not linked to any of the universities. There will be an interactive science-policy debate (using evidence in policy making in a multi-stakeholder context). The starting point for program discussions:

*Day 1:* “Science day” with plenary presentations and working groups. The focus will be on the evidence of livestock intensification with regard to the priority themes of sustainable development. These themes have been identified by the Global Forum for Food and Agriculture and include: food security and nutrition, livelihoods and economic growth, animal health and welfare, natural resources and climate change. Groups from different research outfits (US and international) will develop evidence-based statements and questions for each of the themes. This will feed into day 2.

---

\(^1\) On 29 Oct 2018, the Chair confirmed by email to the GG that the MSP Meeting would take place at the Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas on 8-13 Sept 2019. An ad hoc task force is visiting the university and FAO Washington on 26-30 Nov 2018.
Day 2: Official opening of the MSP and centered on the high level science-policy debate with two policy panels, one dealing with the US perspective and an international one. The panels will have a multi-stakeholder mix (aiming at executive level). The panels will debate policy responses for sustainable livestock intensification, based on evidence.

Day 3: GASL action plan and possible guidelines for SLII (reflecting on the science-policy debate of day 2), GG meeting in the afternoon

Day 4: field visit

On Day 5, there could be AN and cluster meetings.

The International Dairy Federation starts its summit on 23 September 2019 with pre-meetings the week before. This could be too close. The US universities actually would like to have it one week earlier, but since it would start on US Labor Day (Monday, 2 September 2019), this is not advisable.

Many countries have visa restrictions for the US. USDA has given GASL a “no objection” for the meeting, there can be cooperation. The goal is to maximize the representation of members.

Some GG members express worries about focusing only on livestock intensification. GASL should engage with this matter of intensification and innovation with a broad perspective, i.e. also including agro-environmental systems, etc. It should not be about sheer intensification, high-input agriculture. The organizers and GASL are aware of that and the Chair confirms that it still has to be sustainable. The panels could talk about intensification vs. extensive systems. There will be still diversity and all views should be included. Other GG members add that it is also a good opportunity to show different systems around the world on different points on the pathway of intensification. To explore the opportunity for the movement on this trajectory, it is very positive also to achieve the SDGs.

Nevertheless, there is also the issue raised that, looking at the four Priority Themes and supply and demand (rapidly growth of meat, milk, eggs), and considering the restrictions of climate change, there is only one way to address this: sustainably intensify. Otherwise, the livestock sector does not fit into the world’s resources. The debate will be about what type of intensification has to happen. There should be an analytical exercise looking at the trajectory of intensification and its impact on the environment. GASL wants to stay independent, but should look for an anchor with these universities to have a good footing to move. Another topic for discussion proposed is “precision agriculture”, although maybe controversial. The Chair doesn’t exclude this and informs that the programme is not detailed yet. The group of the respective university will also have to give some inputs and ideas how the programme will look like.

There will be a task force composed of cluster representatives. The creation and the work of the task force will be by correspondence.

**MSP Meeting 2020**

**Venue:** Delémont, Canton of Jura/Bulle, Canton of Freiburg (decision until 31 Dec 2018)

**Tentative working title:** Potentials and challenges for livestock oriented value chains in marginal areas

**Proposed dates:** 21 to 27 June 2020
As Delémont is close to the French border, and the Jura region includes Switzerland and France, this has higher chances to be chosen. It would allow a good cooperation with France. It could even connect border-crossing farmers/researchers, etc. It would be an excellent case to have a regional policy forum.

There is already some sponsoring secured.

**MSP Meeting 2021**

There are different expressions of interest and options:

**China:** The Chinese Academy of Agriculture Science has expressed interest to host an MSP Meeting. There is already a formal request submitted to GASL. But everything needs an approval from the government.

Additionally, the China Meat Association (very closely linked with all big meat processors) has expressed an interest to sign into GASL, but first they need the approval from the government. Therefore, it would be good to have the academic side, but also the governmental agriculture side. This will double the chances to have an MSP Meeting in China.

**Australia:** Preliminary interest from contacts of WWF in Australia.

**Rome:** If there will be a subcommittee on livestock, it could be interesting to have the MSP Meeting in Rome to have it back-to-back with a meeting of the subcommittee on livestock.

9. **Communication Strategy (Annex 6 of the AP) – Anna**

The communication strategy is part of the new Action Plan and aims at a general improvement in communication for the upcoming period. The objective is to increase visibility in order to have impact.

**External communication objectives**

- Raise the profile of livestock dimensions in the global discourse on agriculture and development
- Articulate key messages on the roles of a sustainable livestock sector and the opportunities to enhance such roles
- Provide balanced and empirical information on the livestock sector
- Attract participation by new members across all the diverse clusters of GASL
- Inform and connect GASL with other related initiatives

**Internal communication objectives**

- Ensure that all members are kept up to date with activities of the agenda itself, and of its diverse membership
- Provide a forum where ideas and issues can be raised and discussed across members
- Ensure the different parts of the Global Agenda are able to communicate and access resources within and between themselves
- Provide access to resources that members can use to inform and present the Global Agenda to their constituencies

**Target audiences**

Different communication tools aim at reaching different target audiences, such as GG members, GASL partners, stakeholders of the livestock sector, FAO public, media and general all interested parties.
The GG adds that also national governments and staff of international organizations like WHO, FAO etc. should be addressed, since they are the ones who make big decisions. They need access to information. The same counts for donors, they also need some specific communication.

The costs for communication are estimated 80,000-82,000 USD a year (consultancy work, communication materials).

An open question is, up to now, how the feedback that is coming from external audiences will be included and responded. The AST will try to find solutions for this. People normally go to the website to get information, for example on the question what sustainable livestock is, so there could be an interactive platform (with moderation).

It is also mentioned that GASL should have a place where people can get information in order to be an advocate for sustainable livestock, it needs a repository. The gathered information of GASL needs to be accessible.

A critical discussion point is the key messages. In some opinions, there are common key messages (livestock alleviates poverty, livestock is worth investing in, etc.), and this communication strategy could become kind of a campaign by focusing on common messages and communicating them, as other movements are doing it too. Therefore, GASL could also be linked to national meat and milk organizations, as they are generally doing a lot of promotion and communication work. But not everybody agrees on this. The message about livestock’s impact cannot only be shown positively, since this would decrease GASL’s credibility. The discussion about “livestock is good or bad” gets controversial views. Today, the general opinions about livestock are polarizing. In some opinions, GASL could also mediate between people against livestock and supporters of livestock.

In general, the GG agrees that GASL should not focus on the question if livestock is good or bad, but show what sustainable livestock is and give examples on how it works. An important goal of communication is to get new members and partners.

10. Update on Action Networks
All presentations are accessible online under http://www.livestockdialogue.org/index.php?id=93468

A task force met in July in Switzerland for two days to discuss the content of the new AP. Afterwards, the AP was sent to the GG in order to provide feedback.

Discussion
The following list is a summary of comments made by the GG:

- The title “Health and Animal Welfare” should be changed back into the GFFA original title “Animal Health and Animal Welfare”. Accordingly, page 14 has to be adapted.
- The key messages in box 1 should include more terms such as nutrients, food safety or economic aspects.
- Regional MSP Meetings should be strengthened, but with careful look on the GASL budget. For the moment, it is not planned to have more than one per year.
- The key messages should have more content.
• The Consensus Document could be included in the new AP.
• Achievements of GASL have to be better pointed out.
• Vision/mission/goal: It is not necessary to have a “goal”. This can be removed and its content can be added to “mission”.
• ANs and clusters have to be better explained in the text as well as their connection to each other. Additionally a more detailed work plan of each should be in the annex.
• Priority Work Area 4 (page 14) should include more than climate change.
• The “objectives” need to be reviewed, no real objective is formulated on page 12.
• A focus on sustainable feed should be included.
• The budget in annex 4 has to be aligned with page 19.

Additionally, a general comment is made that GASL could register as a partner of the UN partnership under SDG17 in order to get more visibility. Another opportunity is the ten-year framework of sustainable consumption and production, run by the UN Ecosoc. Under the framework on sustainable food systems, you can register as a partner, program, project, etc. This might be a chance for GASL to interlink with other initiatives of the same direction.

Regarding the sponsoring of ANs and MSP participants, it is asked if there are any criteria for this. Eduardo explains that there are no written rules. But in general it works as follows:

- **Sponsorship to a MSP Meeting:** The person has to have a relevant role and participation during the meeting and does not have the means to pay. Also important is the representation of the different clusters. There must be a balance.
- **ANs:** Capital is available to every AN of GASL, but its purpose has to be closely related to the AP and the process has to help achieving the different goals in the AP.

**Financial Management and Funding Mechanisms – Emanuel, Lionel, Alwin**

Governments do not support GASL enough; therefore, the idea arose to also ask private companies for funds. FAO cannot accept this money, a foundation could be the solution. A task force has been built at the last GG meeting in Mongolia to look at the financial management and funding mechanisms of GASL for the next AP period. The goal is not to turn GASL into a foundation, but to have a “GASL fund foundation”. The other benefit of such a foundation could be to collect membership fees, although this would also be possible through FAO.

If GASL wants to create a foundation, it has to be incorporated into a national legislation. The task force is examining Switzerland, as there is already “a lot of GASL”.

The Swiss statues require the following information:

- Name and place of foundation
- Purpose and financial capacity (initial capacity and perspectives)
- Structure of the bodies: board of foundation, board of directors (could be the GG or a subcommittee of the GG?), regulations on decision making
- Auditing competences (an external independent body is required)
- Modifications of statutes, change and dissolution
- Registration in commercial register
Important information/questions:

- To create a foundation in Switzerland, GASL needs a minimum of 50,000 CHF (Swiss Francs). Where to find this initial donor or founder? Are there other possibilities?
- There is an accounting obligation and an oversight of the foundation by an office of the federal administration to check if the money is used for the purpose that is written in the statutes.
- If a director leaves, the board of directors decides who joins in.
- If the foundation ends, funds do not go back to the founder. They have to be used in accordance with the purpose of the foundation.
- Governments would still pay to FAO and not to the foundation.
- Switzerland would not be the founder.
- The foundation could also finance ANs.
- To have transparency and a separation between private interests of companies and general interest of GASL, should there be some rules of transparency between the GG and the bodies of the foundation?
- How to assure that funds will not be used for the interest of the party that spends them? Donors paying in a foundation cannot say how the money will be used. That’s why good statutes have to be drafted. The only influence they could have is by saying that they would like to support a certain AN. Nevertheless, it could reflect the reputation of this foundation and GASL; people will certainly check where the money comes from.
- Due diligence from whom the foundation will accept money is possible and necessary.
- It could be useful to have a concept note drafted by the task force.
- The possibility to be a member of the board of directors depends on the person’s organization and has to be discussed in each case.
- What is the difference between the actual FAO rules to accept some private funds and the rules in a foundation? And what is the interest of the foundation?
- FAO, informally, doesn’t support this mechanism. It has never been done up to now. But it could be developed and change FAO practices. There is a proposal of the FAO legal office to talk about it, when GASL is ready.
- Due diligence from whom the foundation will accept money is possible and necessary.
- It could be useful to have a concept note drafted by the task force.
- The possibility to be a member of the board of directors depends on the person’s organization and has to be discussed in each case.
- What is the difference between the actual FAO rules to accept some private funds and the rules in a foundation? And what is the interest of the foundation?
- FAO, informally, doesn’t support this mechanism. It has never been done up to now. But it could be developed and change FAO practices. There is a proposal of the FAO legal office to talk about it, when GASL is ready.

Based on the many comments and open questions, the Chair announces to not continue with the development of a foundation for time being. But if somebody comes along with 50,000 CHF and is willing to be the founder, then this topic will be taken up again.

Nevertheless, there can still be discussions with the FAO Legal Office to further develop this issue in FAO: Eduardo and Emanuel will arrange a meeting. The next step is to explore, if FAO would accept money of this foundation (it would be necessary to root some money through FAO).

Still, there could be a voluntary contribution (not called “membership fees” since governments should be included) of GASL members. The structure would be based on the financial power of the specific members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary contributions of GASL members 10 %</th>
<th>To increase ownership among the membership of GASL. GASL proposes a voluntary contributions of the members towards the core funds of GASL. The proposal is to source 10 % of the necessary funds from the members at large. GASL’s demand to the members will be based on the financial power of the specific members. The structuring is proposed as follows:</th>
<th>Expected Contribution: exempted (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 % of the members (30) with very limited financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 % of the members (30) with modest financial resources | Contribution: 500 annually
---|---
25 % of the members (30) with good financial resources | Contribution 1,500 annually
25 % of the members, (30) mostly Governments and private sector associations | Contribution 2,500 annually

With this structure, GASL would collect 100,000-120,000 USD a year. The classification could be based on a self-declaration of all members. The goal is not only to get the money, it’s also to answer the question what members contribute financially, that is regularly asked by donors. It would make a good impression on them.

The reaction of the GG members are mixed. An issue is that governments should not be listed in a category, since it is desirable for them to contribute more. Also the private sector associations are mostly non-profit orientated and therefore not fitting in the highest category.

Some GG members would like to have a concept note with more clarification with rational, principles, details on certain terms, who to send the invoice to, etc.

SDG17 calls for partnerships, but also for innovative ways of financing. Experience of GG members show that membership contributions can work, for example with a precise analysis of the organization’s annual budget (if it is below a certain amount, the organization does not pay). The effect is also that people feel themselves part of something – not just ideologically, but also as participants of the budget.

Attention is also drawn on that fact, that if people pay a fee, they should also get something out of it: communication products, publications of ANs, etc. It has to be something useful that is shared.

As another source of money suggested, GASL could also play a role on project proposals of ANs to channel money. GASL has to be presented as a platform disseminating these results – and it should also benefit due to this. This is an option to pursue in future.

The Chair announces to quantify the non-financial contributions of GG to the AP. This will show GASL’s recognition for all the contributions such as money spent for travelling, hotels, etc.

The AST and Chair will present a proposal for member contributions at the next GG meeting and maybe circulate it earlier. Studying existing structures of member contributions is a good idea for the beginning. In the meanwhile, to source funding with governments and foundations will continue. Confirmed financing is about 100,000 USD per year and very probable 1 Mio USD for 3 years. In the first half of 2019, GASL needs to find 3 Mio USD.

Another option is that partners could collect money for GASL. But there will be transaction costs.

**Governance**

The proposal to change the governance structure in the Zero Draft AP was not appreciated very much by the GG. Therefore, the governance and rules & regulations will stay the same for the next three years.
Formal Decision of the GG for an extension of GASL

FAO will start the process to extend the GASL project, if the GG intends to continue (and later, if the donors also endorse this extension). The GG members express their will to continue GASL without any vote against it.

Time line, next steps

FAO needs some time to activate the new project. The AP will be sent to the GG until 18 October. Feedback of the GG is possible until the End of October.

12. Next GG Meeting, any other business

GG Meetings in 2019:
   1. February, back to back with LEAP
   2. June (maybe)
   3. September, during MSP Meeting, USA

Tools & Cases: Pablo Manzano has signed a contract as a consultant at FAO last week to do this work. It will be done in consultation with the academic cluster. The tools and cases will be characterized and checked on economic, social and environmental contents, geographical scope and applicability.

The Chair announces the launch of the World Livestock report of FAO on 17 October 2018. The reason why GASL was not involved in this report is because there would have been disagreements in certain topics and it is a unique FAO report. As one of the GASL stakeholders, FAO has its own views on livestock and the SDGs. This report could still be used by GASL to strengthen its work. However, better internal communication on what each stakeholder is working on would be appreciated.

Henning Steinfeld is leaving GASL next year. Therefore, the Chair expresses the thanks and gratitude of the Global Agenda, the Guiding Group, and personally to Henning Steinfeld for his work on livestock. He presents him an engraved “GASL plaque”.

### ANNEX 1: Detailed Meeting Agenda and next steps, 2/3 Oct 2018, FAO, Rome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Point</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Presenter, resp.</th>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
<th>I,D, A</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome (quorum, welcome to new members)</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of the agenda 15 June 2018 GG meeting minutes</td>
<td>Chair, Eduardo</td>
<td>Doc. 1.: Agenda GG meeting 2,3 Oct.2018 Doc. 2.: GG meeting minutes 15 June 2018</td>
<td>I, A</td>
<td>Agenda and minutes June 18 approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Global Agenda Progress Report including finances</td>
<td>Chair, Eduardo</td>
<td>Doc. 3: Traffic Light Evaluation Doc. 4: Financial Tables as per 31.08.18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Work for fund raising portfolio of AP 2019-2021 is in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8th MSP Report</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Doc. 5: 8th MSP Report</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Make workshop presentations and the report of Peter Ballantyne online accessible; include MSP report in the GASL Progress Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>GASL external evaluation, Final report, presentation Elements of a management response Discussion and Conclusions for the GASL AP 2019-21</td>
<td>Mikal, Henning, all</td>
<td>Doc. 6: External Evaluation, final report</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>Management response of FAO (AGA &amp; DPS) and including GASL elements (done by consultation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Proposal to merge AN Closing the Efficiency GAP with AN Silvopastoral Network</td>
<td>Ernesto</td>
<td>Doc. 7: Written proposal from Ernesto</td>
<td>I, D, A</td>
<td>Nucleus team in charge of building a task force for the AN Closing the efficiency gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What:**
- Make workshop presentations and the report of Peter Ballantyne online accessible; include MSP report in the GASL Progress Report 2018
- Management response of FAO (AGA & DPS) and including GASL elements (done by consultation)
- Nucleus team in charge of building a task force for the AN Closing the efficiency gap

**Who:**
- Chair, AST
- Henning Steinfeld, Chair, AST
- Ernesto Reyes, Caroline Emond, Camillo De Camillis, Julian Chara

**By:**
- Nov 2018
- 5 Dec 2018
- Until next GG meeting
7. Rebecca Doyle, New Coordinator of AN Animal Welfare
   - Rebecca via Skype
   - I
   - Establish communication amongst the group; write a paper on Animal Welfare and its relationship with the SDGs; identifying activities for students and interns; satellite meeting around a GASL meeting in 2019 or 2020 with focus on Animal Welfare.

   - 1. Introduction
   - 2. Presentation (Logical Framework)
   - 3. Discussion
   - Chair, Eduardo, all
   - Doc. 8: Advanced Draft AP GASL 2019-2021
   - Doc 9: Power Point (available for GG meeting only)
   - I, D
   - The AST is going to update the AP by including the recommendations of the GG; the GG has time for feedback until 5 Nov 2018. An editor will be hired.

   - Chair
   - Doc. 10: Proposal for 9th MSP in the USA (available for GG meeting only)
   - I, D, A
   - Decide on venue, visit university, build a task force

    - AST
    - Doc. 8: Advanced Draft AP GASL 2019-2021
    - I, D
    - Update strategy for the AP and develop plan of implementation

11. Update on Action networks (6 x 7 minutes)
    - AN Coordinators
    - I
    - Upload presentations on website

12. Next GG Meeting, any other business
    - all
    - I
    - Define dates for GG Meetings in 2019:
      1. February, back to back with LEAP
      2. June (maybe)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September, during MSP Meeting, USA</td>
<td>Tools &amp; Cases: Pablo Manzano has signed a contract as a consultant at FAO and can start his work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of Meeting COAG side Event “AMR in Livestock: Innovation and the role of GASL”**

Kim van Seeters, AST

I = Information; D = Discussion; A = Approval, Decision

done
ANNEX 2: List of participants

Chair
Fritz Schneider, Fritz.schneider@bfh.ch

Public Sector
Claudia González, clau_gm1809@hotmail.com, Head, Livestock and Climate Change Office, Viceministerio de Ganadería, Paraguay
Jambaltseren Tumur-Uya, jambaltseren.t@gmail.com, jambaltseren@mofa.gov.mn; Director General of State Administration and Management Department, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry MoFALI; Jambaldorj Tserendorj; rome@mfa.gov.mn, Mongolian Ambassador at FAO in Rome, Mongolia
Mauricio Chacón, mchacon@mag.go.cr; Gerente de Ganadería, Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG), Costa Rica
Robin Mbae, robinmbae@yahoo.com; Deputy Director Livestock Production (Climate Change), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Kenya

Private Sector
Alexandra De Athayde, alexandra.athayde@ifif.org; Executive Director, International Feed Industry Federation
Caroline Emond, DG@fil-idf.org, CEmond@fil-idf.org; Director General, International Dairy Federation (IDF)
Hsin Huang, Hsin.huang@meat-ims.org; Secretary General, International Meat Secretariat (Cluster Coordinator)
Marília Rangel, marilia.rangel@ubabef.com.br; Secretary General, International Poultry Council (connected by Skype)

Academia / Research
Alexandre Ickowicz, alexandre.ickowicz@cirad.fr; Director Research Unit, CIRAD
Ernesto Reyes, ernesto.reyes@agribenchmark.net; Livestock Manager International Institutions, Agribenchmark
Nancy Bourgeois nancy.bourgeois@bfh.ch; Lecturer & researcher, Bern University of Applied Science (Cluster Coordinator)
Ulf Magnusson, ulf.magnusson@slu.se; Professor, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Donors
Alwin Kopse, alwin.kopse@blw.admin.ch; Head of unit, Switzerland (Cluster Coordinator)
Edwina Love, edwina.love@agriculture.gov.ie; Principal Officer, Ireland (present on 3 Oct)
Emmanuel Coste, e.coste@interbev.fr; Délégué CNE, France
Gemma Verijdt, gemma.verijdt@minbuza.nl, Junior Professional Officer, Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN Organizations in Rome (on behalf of Kim van Seeters)
Lionel Launois, lionel.launois@agriculture.gouv.fr; Policy Officer, Ministry of Agriculture of France
NGOs
Ilse KÖHLER-ROLLEFSON, ilse.koehlerroll@googlemail.com; Coordinator, League for Pastoral Peoples and Endogenous Livestock Development, Coordinator
Margherita Gomarasca, coordinator@vsf-international.org; Coordinator, Veterinaries Sans Frontiers
Nitya Ghotge, nitya.ghotge@gmail.com; Director, Anthra

Social Movements
Pablo Frere, pablofrere@gmail.com; Focal Point, Redes Chaco, WAMIP, Argentina (Cluster Coordinator)

Intergovernmental and Multilateral
Berhe Tekola, Berhe.Tekola@fao.org; Director, Animal Production and Health Division, FAO (Cluster Coordinator)
Jean Jacques Soula, jj.soula@oie.int; Representative, World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)
Shirley Tarawali, s.tarawali@cgiar.org; Assistant Director General, ILRI

Agenda Support Team (AST)
Henning Steinfeld, Henning.Steinfeld@fao.org; Coordinator AGAL, FAO
Pierre Gerber, pgerber@worldbank.org; Senior Livestock Specialist, World Bank (connected by Skype)
Eduardo Arce Díaz, Eduardo.ArceDiaz@fao.org, Manager GASL, FAO
Anna Grun, Anna.Grun@fao.org, Communication Coordinator GASL, FAO

Observers
Anne Mottet (AGAS), Anne.Mottet@fao.org; Livestock Development Officer, FAO (present on 2 Oct)
Augustin Guerrero, Departamento de Ganadería Sostenibilie y Climático, Paraguay
Camillo DeCamillis (AGAL), Camillo.DeCamillis@fao.org; Manager, LEAP, FAO
Carolyn Opio (AGAL), Carolyn.Opio@fao.org; Livestock Policy Officer, LEAP, FAO (present on 2 Oct)
Dalma Dominguez, Departamento de Ganadería Sostenibilie y Climático, Paraguay
Fabiana Villa Alves, fabiana.alves@embrapa.br; Researcher, EMBRAPA, Brazil
Jeremy Hill, jeremy.hill@fonterra.com; Chief Officer, Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd
Julian Chara, julian@fun.cipav.org.co; Research Coordinator, CIPAV
Luisa Belli, Project Evaluation Coordinator in OED, FAO (present on 2 October)
María Sánchez Mainar, MSanchezMainar@fil-idf.org; Technical communication manager, IDF (connected by Skype)
Mikal Khan, Mikal.Khan@fao.org, GASL Evaluation Coordinator, OED, FAO, (present on 2 October)
Pablo Manzano, pablo.manzano.baena@gmail.com; International Union for Conservation of Nature
Rebecca Doyle, rebecca.doyle@unimelb.edu.au; Animal welfare scientist, University of Melbourne
Renata Negrelli Nogueira, renata.negrelli@itamaraty.gov.br, Alternate Permanent Representative of Brazil to FAO, WFP and IFAD, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil

Tim Robinson (AGAL), Timothy.Robinson@fao.org; Livestock Policy Officer, FAO
### ANNEX 3: List of important events

#### 2018 GLOBAL EVENTS OF INTEREST TO THE GLOBAL AGENDA (as of 13/12/2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 January</td>
<td>Global Forum for Food and Agriculture 2018 (GFFA). Berlin, Germany; preliminary theme is ‘Shaping the future of livestock’.</td>
<td>Fritz, Henning Eduardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 26 January</td>
<td>2nd face-to-face meeting of the LEAP Technical Advisory Group on Biodiversity and Ecosystem services, ILRI, Nairobi, Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 January – 3 February</td>
<td>PMAC 2018, Bangkok, Thailand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 23 February</td>
<td>SEBI annual meeting, Naivasha, Kenya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 28 February 2018</td>
<td>1st face-to-face meeting of the LEAP Technical Advisory Group on Feed Additives, Rome, Italy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 7 March</td>
<td>GASL Guiding Group Meeting, Rome, Italy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>20th meeting of the LEAP Steering Committee, Rome, Italy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 March</td>
<td>FAO 35th LARC-Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-14 April</td>
<td>GASL MSP Meeting follow-up Mission to Mongolia</td>
<td>Eduardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 26 April</td>
<td>GASL Regional Meeting Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Kiev, Ukraine.</td>
<td>Fritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 23 May</td>
<td>LPL inter-sectoral regional meeting, Panama City, Panama.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (dates TBC)</td>
<td>2nd face-to-face meeting of the LEAP Technical Advisory Group on Feed Additives, Rome, Italy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 June</td>
<td>GASL Multi Stakeholder Partnership Meeting and Guiding Group Meeting, Red Rock Conference Center, Gorkhi-Terelj National Park, Mongolia.</td>
<td>Fritz, Eduardo, Anna, Henning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June</td>
<td>Meeting of the LEAP Phase 3 task force, Red Rock Conference Center, Gorkhi-Terelj National Park, Mongolia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 -20 September</td>
<td>Dairy Sustainability Framework Advisory Council, London</td>
<td>Eduardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 October</td>
<td>Committee on Agriculture (COAG), FAO Rome, Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 October</td>
<td>Committee on Agriculture (COAG), Side Event of the Netherlands, Switzerland, South Africa and GASL, FAO Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 October 14:00-18:00, 3 October 9:00-17:30</td>
<td>GASL Guiding Group Meeting, FAO Rome, Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October 9:00-13:00</td>
<td>21th meeting of the LEAP Steering Committee, FAO Rome, Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 October</td>
<td>Global Conference on Sustainable Beef: Sustainability in Action: Impact on the Ground, Lyrath Estate, Kilkenny, Ireland. GRSB, ERBS, Irish Food Board</td>
<td>Fritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 October</td>
<td>7th All Africa Conference on Animal Agriculture, Accra, Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 November</td>
<td>Sustainable Livestock and the Forests, UN REDD, Asuncion, Paraguay</td>
<td>Eduardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 November</td>
<td>COP14 Convention on Biological Diversity, Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 4: Finances

#### GASL Finances 2018: Expenses and Budget Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Spent until 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Committed for the rest of 2018</th>
<th>Total Expected Expenses in 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GASL Draft Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 31 August 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DETAILED BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIAT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Project Staff</td>
<td>116,000 USD</td>
<td>57,040 USD</td>
<td>173,040 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Manager</td>
<td>116,000 USD</td>
<td>57,040 USD</td>
<td>173,040 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>58,550 USD</td>
<td>23,450 USD</td>
<td>82,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>30,550 USD</td>
<td>19,450 USD</td>
<td>50,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector analyst (Swiss APO)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic designer</td>
<td>16,000 USD</td>
<td>4,000 USD</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations clerk</td>
<td>12,000 USD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Consultants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td>174,550 USD</td>
<td>80,490 USD</td>
<td>255,040 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Icrue Fee</td>
<td>13,964 USD</td>
<td>6,439 USD</td>
<td>20,403 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel + ICRUE</strong></td>
<td>188,514 USD</td>
<td>86,929 USD</td>
<td>275,443 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>1,250 USD</td>
<td>1,500 USD</td>
<td>2,750 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm and comm. mat.</td>
<td>1,250 USD</td>
<td>1,000 USD</td>
<td>2,250 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lap tops/Screens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500 USD</td>
<td>500 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL SECRETARIAT</strong></td>
<td>189,764 USD</td>
<td>88,429 USD</td>
<td>278,193 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Spent until 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Committed for the rest of 2018</th>
<th>Total Expected Expenses in 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSP PROCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>247,644 USD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247,644 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events &amp; FAO conf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support AN meets.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,266 USD</td>
<td>16,266 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To core budget</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>1,146,220</td>
<td>750,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>743,822</td>
<td>160,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss. Devt. Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Dairy Platform</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE (Conf. Nat. Elevage)</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contr. Gob. Mong. MSP 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Spons. MSP 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Action Networks</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>63,841</td>
<td>133,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>39,817</td>
<td>63,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18,524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Ag. University (SLU)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds available:** Donor contributions 2016 and 2017, and confirmed contributions 2018 (USD) (as per 31.08.2018)
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Dairy Platform</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,210,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>883,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>