



Projects Committee
6th Meeting
9 – 12 September 2013
Belo Horizonte, Brazil

**Report of the
Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS)
on three coffee project proposals**

Background

1. This report contains assessments provided by the Virtual Screening Subcommittee (VSS) on the following three project proposals (one new and two revised) which will be considered by the Projects Committee and Council in September 2013:

Annex I: Best practice management of coffee berry borer (CBB) and coffee leaf rust (CLR) to improve Panama's capacity to export specialty coffees

Annex II: Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement [Formerly: Valorization of Ethiopian coffee origins through the European Protected Geographical Identification label (PGI label)]

Annex III: International research and development services for durable genetic control of the coffee leaf rust disease in Arabica coffee [Formerly: International research and development services for the durable genetic control of two destructive diseases affecting Arabica coffee]

2. The VSS is currently composed of Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Guatemala and Indonesia (exporting Members) and Italy, Spain and the USA (importing Members).

Action

The Projects Committee is requested to consider the report of the VSS and to submit recommendations on the above proposals to the Council.

REPORT OF THE VIRTUAL SCREENING SUBCOMMITTEE (VSS)

Summary of VSS screening by technical area

August 2013

<p>RECOMMENDATION OF THE VSS</p>	<p>Best practice management of coffee berry borer (CBB) and coffee leaf rust (CLR) to improve Panama's capacity to export specialty coffees</p>	<p>Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement [Formerly: Valorization of Ethiopian coffee origins through the European Protected Geographical Identification label (PGI label)]</p>	<p>International research and development services for durable genetic control of the coffee leaf rust disease in Arabica coffee [Formerly: International research and development services for the durable genetic control of two destructive diseases affecting Arabica coffee]</p>
<p>Project eligible</p>	<p>Member 1: YES Member 2: YES</p>	<p>Member 1: NOT YET because of lack of information. It would be helpful if the proponents provide additional information to the Projects Committee in September 2013 in Belo Horizonte, Brazil.</p>	<p>Member 1: YES</p>
<p>Overall recommendation</p>	<p>The VSS considered the proposal for the first time in Aug 2013.</p> <p>August 2013: The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p>	<p>The proposal was considered for the second time by the VSS in Aug 2013.</p> <p>February 2013: The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p> <p>August 2013: The VSS recommended that the proposal should be revised taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p>	<p>The proposal was considered for the first time by the VSS in Aug 2013.</p> <p>The VSS recommended endorsing the proposal taking into consideration technical comments provided.</p>

VSS ASSESSMENT –NEW PROPOSAL

Best practice management of coffee berry borer (CBB) and coffee leaf rust (CLR) to improve Panama's capacity to export specialty coffees – Proposal submitted by submitted by the Government of Panama. See also project outline in document PJ-59/12 and relevant summary in document PJ-52/13 under Project 1.1.

ICO Criteria

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
ICO Criteria¹		Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: The project will benefit mainly small producers who are vulnerable to fluctuations in production, prices, demand, etc., and who in most cases represent the labour force mainly integrated by indigenous people
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: The Development Strategy for coffee specifically includes the action against pests and diseases
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES Member 3: YES	Member 1: The coffee sector has the third place in agricultural exports in Panama and it has a special impact on employment of people with scarce resources. Member 3: Combating Coffee rust is a high priority
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	Member 1: NO Member 2: NO	Member 1: As it is considered the identification mission for a further big national project the participation of national assistance should be essential, not an option (as it is considered in the budget) in order to guarantee the sustainability of the project. Member 3: This proposal is only for funds for consultants to develop a full project proposal.
5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	Member 1: YES Member 2: N/A	Member 1: As it is considered a first step for the preparation of a bigger proposal Member 2: It is meant to prepare a project Member 3: If this 30,000 leads to a well developed programme, sustainability could be possible.

¹ See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: As it is said in the project, the impact will benefit a large number of beneficiaries. Nevertheless I consider that the budget is not detailed enough. For example, how many workshops are going to take place? I miss some explanation of the specific activities to correctly evaluate. Member 3: US\$30,000 for consultants to develop a programme. I'm not sure if it is appropriate for the ICO to request money from itself, but the cost isn't much higher than other consultants I have seen.
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: But some details of the activities would be welcome.
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: Some directorates of the Ministry of Agricultural Development will be involved in the project, although there is no mention about what role will be played by them in the identification mission.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	Member 1: NOT SURE Member 2: NO	Member 1: As it is considered an identification mission, the participation of national assistance should be essential, not an option (as it is considered in the budget).
10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account ² ? If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal: – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	Member 1: NO Member 2: NO	Member 1: As it is a technical mission, gender is not mentioned. Nevertheless it should be highly considered in the final proposal, as participation of women in coffee activities is a fundamental part of this economic sector. Therefore there should be a gender expert in the team responsible for the final proposal.
	Member 1: YES	Member 1: For the preparation of the final proposal there should be a gender perspective included in the document.
11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?	Member 1: NO Member 2: YES	Member 1: There is no counterpart contribution for this Project Preparation Grant (PPG) application, although it is mentioned that there will be a great collaboration of public governmental institutions, research institutes, private producers associations, etc. Member 3: Possible funds from USAID for the programme that is being developed with these funds are noted in the application.

² See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.

VSS ASSESSMENT – REVISED PROPOSAL

Valorization of the Ethiopian coffee origins for marketing improvement [Formerly: Valorization of Ethiopian coffee origins through the European Protected Geographical Identification label (PGI label)]– Proposal submitted by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and Illycaffè. See also project outline in document PJ-46/13 Rev. 1 and relevant summary in document PJ-52/13 under Project 1.2.

ICO Criteria

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
ICO Criteria¹		Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: The beneficiaries of the project will be coffee producers and employees of the coffee sector, that in Ethiopia is about 25% of the total labour force.
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: The Development Strategy for coffee specifically includes the improvement of marketing systems. It also includes the orientation to quality instead of quantity of coffee. In this case we can consider that capacity building processes for farmers and also marketing tools, such as trademarks, can provide a global improvement for the coffee sector
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: Considering the socioeconomic importance of the coffee sector, the project is consistent with country priorities.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: -For the scope of the project the proposed timetable will not be enough. This could be critical in the project, because this is a development process that needs a long time to provide evidences of success. -The description of the components does not provide enough information to evaluate the scope of the project. -Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate if the proposed budget is appropriate although it appears too high. -There is a lack of information about the scope of the project: number of beneficiaries , capacity-building processes, what kind of infrastructures are they thinking about, etc.

¹ See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

		<p>Thus, the budget needs to be more detailed.</p> <p>Member 2: The proposal is for €4 million, out of which €1.15 million is for construction. Details are mostly limited to a logical framework and bullet points. It is not possible to fairly or accurately assess the activity based on the information presented.</p>
5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	Member 1: YES	<p>Member 1: Only if the final beneficiaries (individual farmers, cooperatives) and public supporting institutions are sufficiently involved in the project.</p> <p>Member 2: Unclear – not enough information- It is not evident if increasing the global market awareness of the selected Ethiopian coffee origins and providing additional knowledge to the entire Ethiopian coffee sector will improve the livelihoods of smallholders.</p>
6. Is the scale and scope, including budget, of the project appropriate?	Member 1: NO	<p>Member 1: See answer number 4. This is the critical point of this project.</p> <p>Member 2: Need more information- The majority of funds asked are for infrastructure, administrative and project management costs.</p>
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	Member 1: NO	Member 1: See answer number 4. This is the critical point of this project
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?		Member 2: There is no evident counterpart contribution.
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	Member 1: YES	<p>Member 1: Through capacity building processes which can be considered an essential component of the project.</p> <p>Member 2: This project includes limited training – 10% of budget.</p>

<p>10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account⁴?</p> <p>If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project? 	<p>Member 1: NO</p>	<p>Member 1: There is no mention about gender. Considering the participation of women in this sector, it is important to include this perspective in the project.</p> <p>Member 2: This project does not address gender issues although they can be addressed in the trainings.</p>
	<p>Member 1: N/A</p>	<p>Member 1: I consider that a gender perspective should be included in the proposal. There is no information about women's participation in the coffee sector. It would also be useful to have disaggregated data and include activities focused on gender to promote gender equality</p>
<p>11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?</p>	<p>Member 1: YES</p>	<p>Member 1: Government and project cooperatives are involved in the project. At least we can consider that they will provide human resources to the project.</p> <p>Member 2: While partners are mentioned, no additional resources are leveraged.</p>

⁴ See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.

VSS ASSESSMENT –NEW PROPOSAL

International research and development services for durable genetic control of the coffee leaf rust disease in Arabica coffee [Formerly: International research and development services for the durable genetic control of two destructive diseases affecting Arabica coffee] – Proposal submitted by the Coffee Rust Research Centre (CIFC). See also project outline in document PJ-58/13 and relevant summary in document PJ-52/13 under Project 1.3.

ICO Criteria

	Yes/No	To be completed by the VSS
ICO Criteria¹		Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.
1. Country eligibility: Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: The project will directly benefit national and regional coffee research institutes and indirectly a majority of small producers in producing countries
2. Aims and purposes: Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: The Development Strategy for coffee specifically includes the action against pests and diseases
3. Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?	Member 1: INDIRECTLY Member 2: YES	Member 1: As the results of the project will be available for research centres in coffee producing countries it is coherent with countries' priorities. I consider that the service offered by the IITC-CIFC is important and useful enough to receive the requested funds.
4. Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?	Member 1: NOT IMPORTANT ONES Member 2: NO	Member 1: The main problem could be that some of the results of the research could be protected by bilateral contracts. If some of this "protected work" is financed by this grant (about 46% of the total budget, the balance 54% could be supported by the Portuguese Government in order to finance the "protected research".

¹ See 'Development Strategy for coffee' – Document ICC-105-16.

5. Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?	Member 1: YES Member 2: YES	Member 1: For this issue, the most important component is the participation of researchers from producing countries in capacity building processes. Member 2: It will fund essential support services for the national coffee research centres participating in the R & D network to combat the constant threat of CLR for sustainable production of Arabica coffee.
6. Is the scale and scope, including budget , of the project appropriate?	Member 1: MOST OF IT	Member 1: Depending on the volume of work that is needed for the bilateral contracts, the scale and scope could be appropriate, but it is not mentioned in the project. On the other hand, there is an overhead included in the budget that could be a little high (13%), considering that the EU accepts a maximum of 7% for administrative costs. Maybe the applicant could provide some evidence to the evaluators to show the scope of the results obtained in the past, to correctly measure the real products of its work. Or provide evidences of the support from institutes in producing countries
7. Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?	Member 1: YES	
8. Government commitment: Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: 54% of the budget will be supported by the government. In addition, there are several institutes from producing countries committed to the project
9. Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: Through capacity-building processes which can be considered an essential component of the project
10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account ² ? If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal: – Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex? – Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?	Member 1: NO	Member 1: There is no mention about gender. I consider that it is hard to include a gender perspective in this kind of technical and structural project.

² See relevant ICO document at: <http://dev.ico.org/documents/pj-35e-gender.pdf>.

11. Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?	Member 1: YES	Member 1: There is fundamental support from the Portuguese government. Member 2: Of the total budget of €1,898,000 about 54% will be met by the IITC-CIFC and the EU or other donor will be requested to fund the remaining 46%. The training component (9% of total grant) will entirely benefit research personnel from coffee producing countries.
---	----------------------	--