



ORGANIZACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DEL CAFÉ
ORGANIZAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL DO CAFÉ
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DU CAFÉ

PJ 9/11

14 March 2011
Original: English

E

Projects Committee
1st Meeting
30 March 2011
London, United Kingdom

**Procedures for submitting, reviewing and
supervising projects – background documents**

Background

This document contains the following Annexes with background information on existing procedures for submitting and reviewing projects:

- Annex I:** Basic information on the submission of applications to the CFC for financial support for activities related to coffee (Document EB-3573/96 Rev.4)
- Annex II:** Monitoring by the Organization of coffee projects financed by the CFC (document WP-Board 838/97 Rev. 1)
- Annex III:** Report of the 3rd Virtual Screening Committee meeting of 16 March 2009 (Document WP-VSC 7/09)
- Annex IV:** Report of the 2nd Virtual Screening Committee meeting of 26 September 2007 (Document WP VSC 5/07)
- Annex V:** Report of the Virtual Screening Committee on the meeting of 30 January 2006 (Document WP-VSC 3/06)
- Annex VI:** Suggested checklist for screening project proposals
- Annex VII:** Form used by the USAID to evaluate programme proposals (Document WP-VSC N. 2/06)

Action

The Projects Committee is requested to note these documents.



Organización Internacional del Café Organization
Organização Internacional do Café
Organisation Internationale du Café

EB 3573/96 Rev. 4

21 May 2003
Original: Spanish

E

Common Fund for Commodities

Executive Board
253rd meeting
17 - 19 September 2003
Cartagena, Colombia

Basic information on the submission of applications to the Common Fund for Commodities for financial support for activities related to coffee

Background

A revised version of the document “Basic information on the submission of applications to the Common Fund for Commodities for financial support for activities related to coffee” is attached.

Action

The Executive Board is requested to approve this document.

BASIC INFORMATION ON THE SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS TO THE COMMON FUND FOR COMMODITIES FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ACTIVITIES RELATED TO COFFEE

Introduction

1. Building on the experience gained since 1995, the International Coffee Organization (ICO) decided to provide Members with a fourth revision of basic information on the preparation of projects submitted for financing by the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC). This document complements the other documents already issued by the Organization on this matter¹.

2. The document should be used together with the Manual for the preparation and management of projects to be financed by the Common Fund for Commodities² to provide guidance for the formulation of projects. It aims to facilitate the analysis of proposals while at the same time reducing the costs and time required for their preparation by ensuring that project proposals are in the format required by the Fund and are submitted in accordance with the optimum processing sequence and timing established by the ICO and the Fund for consideration of project proposals.

3. The document is in three sections:

- I. Nature of the Fund and of International Commodity Bodies involved in development projects;
- II. Criteria established by the ICO and the CFC for access to the resources of the Fund for financing projects; and
- III. Recommendations to be taken into account in order to expedite the process of evaluation and approval of project proposals submitted for financing. Annex II to this document provides information on the establishment of a Virtual Screening Committee for new project proposals.

I. NATURE OF THE FUND AND OF INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY BODIES INVOLVED IN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

I.1 COMMON FUND FOR COMMODITIES (CFC)

4. The Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) is an autonomous intergovernmental financial institution established within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose

¹ Document ED-1837/02, WP-Board No. 838/97, ED-3652/97, EB-3835/02 and EB-3768/01 Rev.2.

² The 5th edition of the Manual for the preparation and management of projects to be financed by the Common Fund for Commodities was published in May 2003. The most recent version of the Manual can be found, in English, on the CFC website: www.common-fund.org, under Publications. Versions in Spanish and French will be available later in the year. In the present document reference will be made to page numbers in the English version of the 2003 Manual in order to avoid unnecessary repetition.

of fostering the economic development of commodity producers and contributing to the development of society as a whole. In line with its market-oriented approach, the Fund concentrates its activities on commodity development projects financed from its resources.

5. The Fund has clearly specified the forms of support it envisages and the shares of financing it provides in accordance with the type of project involved. It also indicates the types of project it can support and those which it will not support in accordance with the areas for action established for each Account, and specifies the loan policy it follows (Sections 6 and 7 of the Manual). The CFC provides finance in the form of loans and grants or in the form of so-called “investment grants”. The CFC may be the sole source of financing for a project but as a general rule prefers to finance not more than 40 to 50 percent of the total cost of the project, inviting the applicant and the International Commodity Body (ICB) to undertake to seek co-financing and counterpart contributions.

6. During the first twelve years of operation the Fund concentrated its activities on grant-financed projects but it is now proposing to gradually increase the proportion of loan-financed projects in order to recycle over time scarce financial resources. Grants are given mainly for commodity projects important to less developed countries (LDCs), to poorer people in other developing countries, and to support loan-financed projects.

7. The Fund gives priority to small to medium sized projects (between one and five million US dollars) and to projects which are particularly well suited to the low absorption capacity of LDCs.

8. The Fund has established mechanisms to permit it to use its resources before the project proposal is approved. The first of these mechanisms is the Project Preparation Facility (PPF), which seeks to assist ICBs, regional organizations and developing countries lacking the resources required for the preparation and formulation of projects in conformity with the requirements of the Fund. The administration of this facility is the responsibility of the Managing Director of the Fund. Annex XIII of the Manual contains more detailed information.

9. A second mechanism is the Fast Track Facility (which was increased from US\$60,000 to US\$120,000 per project in the latest Five-Year Action Plan). This procedure enables Member countries to submit project proposals which, once endorsed by an ICB and the CFC Consultative Committee, may be approved directly by the Managing Director of the Fund, thus avoiding the need for approval by the Executive Board, which is a requirement in the case of regular projects. Most fast track projects are studies, pilot projects or workshops, paving the way for more far-reaching projects once they have been completed. For more detailed information see Section 4.3 of the Manual.

10. By 1 December 2002, the Fund had approved 114 regular projects and 43 fast track projects costing a total of US\$342.9 million. Of this, the Fund financed 48 percent; other donors financed 26% and the institutions involved provided 26% in the form of counterpart

contributions. Of the amount financed by the Fund, US\$140.5 million was provided in the form of grants and US\$26.4 million in the form of loans. The average cost of projects was US\$3 million and the duration was between two to five years. To date, 32 projects have been completed.

I.2 International Commodity Bodies (ICBs)

11. The International Coffee Organization is the designated International Commodity Body (ICB) for coffee and has responsibility for formally submitting projects to the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC). As an ICB, it is also responsible for prioritization, formulation and supervision of projects and for seeking stakeholder, and most particularly target beneficiary participation.

12. The ICO is currently supporting coffee development projects costing a total of more than US\$100 million. The ICO portfolio includes 16 projects costing more than US\$61 million and 11 projects in the process of implementation at a cost of US\$47 million. Additional information can be obtained from the ICO website www.ico.org under the Section on “Activities” related to “Projects”.

II. CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY THE ICO AND CFC FOR ACCESS TO RESOURCES OF THE FUND TO FINANCE PROJECTS

II.1. Criteria established by the ICO

13. All proposals should be submitted to the CFC through the relevant International Commodity Body (ICB) which, in the case of coffee, is the ICO, officially designated for the submission of project proposals to the Managing Director of the Fund. For this purpose, the following conditions have to be fulfilled: (a) official commitment and submission of the proposal by the Government of a sponsoring Member country; and (b) the Government concerned must be a member of the CFC. However, countries which are Members of the Fund but not of the ICB can submit project proposals directly to the Managing Director of the Fund, who will make arrangements for submitting it for approval to the ICB concerned.

14. Proposers can be Government of coffee-producing countries, trade or consumer associations, international organizations or NGOs, scientific authorities or other experts, or any other type of organization with expertise in the field of coffee. It must be emphasized that project proposers need not necessarily be responsible for the execution of the project, whether by their own decision or because they do not fulfil the requirements of the Fund or the ICO. However, the entity chosen must have experience in the implementation of development projects and should be able to assume full responsibility for execution. (See

document EB-3573/96 Rev. 3 Add.2. Such responsibilities include, in particular, technical and financial obligations to the Supervisory Body (SB) and the Fund in accordance with the obligations undertaken on signing the Project Agreement (PA)³.

15. Proposers other than Governments or government bodies should contact the Governments involved in the project proposal in order to arrange for it to be presented to the Executive Director by the official delegations of the countries concerned as confirmation of their support. Whenever the Executive Director receives a proposal not submitted in this way, he will, if he considers the idea reasonable, forward the proposal to the Member countries involved with the request that they consider the possibility of proposing the project to the Executive Board.

16. The ICO, in consultation with the Common Fund Secretariat, will make an assessment of the preliminary proposal, concentrating on determining whether it conforms with the policies of the Common Fund and fits into the priority areas for coffee set out in the ICO strategy document (EB-3768/01 Rev.2). Reference should also be made to Section 5.1 and Annex VIII on pages 6 and 66-67 of the Manual. The project proposal must reach the Executive Director eight weeks before the start of the meetings of the Executive Board in order to allow time for the draft proposal to be prepared for circulation to Members in the four official languages of the ICO, namely English, French, Portuguese and Spanish⁴. (See Annex I.)

17. The ICO, as Supervisory Body (SB), will be responsible for a full scientific, technical, financial, economic and managerial review of project proposals. If deemed necessary, it may use consultancy services from external sources. Support for this purpose may be provided from the resources of the Project Preparation Facility (PPF) as indicated in paragraph 8 above. When consultants are used, their selection will depend on the nature of the project involved, with an appropriate spread of expertise among consultants from both producing and consuming countries. (See document EB-3573/96 Rev. 3 Add. 2.)

18. The possibility of creating a **Virtual Screening Committee** is currently under consideration. Such a Committee would permit the ICO Secretariat to carry out interactive consultations with Committee members to assess the suitability of new proposals. The Committee, which would be composed of delegates with expert knowledge of coffee matters, would help to identify more clearly any points of potential concern, since they would be fully informed on the most pressing problems in their areas or countries of origin. They could thus contribute towards improving preliminary project proposals. (See Annex II.)

³ *The Project Agreement is a legal instrument which establishes the obligations of each of the parties concerned in the financing, execution and supervision of the project in order to clarify the role of each party in developing the approved technical and financial activities to be carried out within a given time period.*

⁴ *In the interests of economy, it is proposed that the project proposal be translated only into the languages of countries directly affected by the project.*

19. Following a positive assessment by the ICO, the sponsoring Member Government, on behalf of the proposing entity, as indicated in paragraph 13, may submit to the Organization a full project proposal presented in accordance with the guidelines in Section 8 (pages 21 – 30) and Annexes II and III (pages 38 – 46) of the Manual.

20. In order to improve the chances of acceptance of the project by the Fund, it is important that the full proposal should include a specific indication of counterpart contributions to be made by the countries and institutions involved in its execution, as well as the proposed source of co-financing. Where co-financing is proposed, it is important to specify conditions established by donors for their contributions in terms of guarantees and other requirements. To date, coffee development projects have received co-financing contributions from the World Bank, the European Union, the European Coffee Industry, the United Kingdom Overseas Development Agency (ODA), and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). However, given the policy of the Fund in relation to co-financing (paragraph 5), the ICO is currently seeking to extend participation in the co-financing of projects to other multilateral, regional and national institutions concerned with development matters.

21. The Executive Board, in considering approval of the project, will also take into account the status with respect to voting rights of the Member country submitting the proposal.

22. Once the proposal is found to be satisfactory, the Executive Board, and in the second instance the International Coffee Council, will authorize the Executive Director to submit it to the CFC in order to initiate the process for it to be considered for financing by the Fund.

23. It should be noted that the procedures to be completed before the full project is presented to the Fund include a process of continual informal consultations between the ICO and the CFC Secretariat, which is the body responsible for the initial selection of proposals. In the case of new project ideas that may not fall within the strategic priorities of the Fund, the ICO will also reserve the right to submit them informally to the CFC Consultative Committee with a view to obtaining preliminary recommendations on whether it is worth proceeding to further consideration.

II.2 Criteria established by the CFC

24. Once the full proposal has been received by the Fund, it is reviewed by the Consultative Committee of the Fund, the body responsible for evaluating the project's technical and economic suitability. The Committee often offers suggestions for the reformulation of the project before recommending its approval as suitable or, if the initial opinion is favourable, recommending that the Managing Director submit it to the CFC

Executive Board for final approval. It should be noted that recommendations for approval by the CFC Consultative Committee in January and July will be submitted by the Managing Director of the Fund to the Executive Board of the CFC in April and October respectively.

25. In order to reduce to a maximum the period which elapses between the initial submission of the proposal and final approval of financial support from the CFC, the process indicated above must be followed in the order established by the CFC (See Figure 1, page 7 of the Manual). A schedule for the presentation of project proposals in 2002/03 is set out in Annex I of this document. The ICO website may be consulted for the updating of this schedule under the Section on “Activities” related to “Projects”.

26. It should be borne in mind that in the initial appraisal the Consultative Committee usually recommends that the proposal be reformulated and only after a second appraisal – when all the suggested amendments have been incorporated in the proposal – does the CC endorse it for approval by the CFC Executive Board.

27. The CFC has recently published its Five-Year Action Plan for 2003/07, reconfirming the particular attention given to less developed countries (LDCs), the poorer strata of the population in other developing countries and countries with economies in transition, thus broadly maintaining the criteria established in the previous Plan. However, it does incorporate a number of new aspects which must be taken into account. Among the main aspects of the new orientation it is worth highlighting the following:

- Strengthening the human resource base of the Secretariat;
- Underlining the importance of the concepts of sustainable development and diversification;
- Encouraging the ICBs to incorporate the chain management concept and poverty reduction as essential elements in the design, execution and supervision of projects;
- Strengthening the dissemination component of projects, emphasizing the development of an exit strategy;
- Greater involvement of the Fund in project design, maintaining close contact with the countries involved. As part of this measure the Fast Track Facility has been increased from US\$60,000 to US\$120,000 per project (See paragraph 9 above);
- Concentration of projects in Member countries, having regard for the fulfilment of their financial obligations and their previous involvement in projects financed by the Common Fund
- Seeking strategic partnerships with other institutions, the private sector and civil society.

28. Details of the financing modalities which the Fund offers for projects, the procedures to be followed for the submission, review and approval of projects and additional criteria for projects considered eligible for loan-financing are given in the Manual. (See Sections 5, 6 and 7.)

29. With regard to the standard format for submission of project proposals, as already mentioned in this document the Manual provides details of the two types of format to be used, namely the project summary and the fully formulated project submission. (See Section 8 and Annexes I to III of the Manual.)

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR FINANCING

30. The selection of the expert responsible for formulating the project should be carried out as strictly as possible, paying particular attention to the cost-quality relationship, in order to avoid delays in the approval of the proposal. In principle, the proposer could be the best candidate for the selection of the Project Executing Agency (PEA) and confirmation could be the responsibility of the Virtual Screening Committee.

31. It is suggested that in submitting a new project, the Government involved should designate a delegate to provide liaison designed to facilitate the exchange of technical and institutional information between the Government and Donor bodies involved in the preparation of the project as well as to provide the ICO with information and clarifications on matters of a national order which could be required for the preparation and formulation of the legal documents necessary for initiating the execution of the project once it has been approved.

32. This Delegate may also use his good offices to seek co-financing, which is a determining aspect for approval by the Fund.

33. The Consultant responsible for formulating the project proposal should present a technical summary to the Executive Board for endorsement by the ICO, to the CFC Consultative Committee for technical approval of financing, and to co-financers as necessary. This will facilitate obtaining the financial support required by the Fund before giving final approval for financing.

34. Finally, it should be noted that at its meeting in January 2003, the Executive Board took note of the suggestion that countries should use the CFC Governing Council to draw the attention of the Fund to the priorities of the ICO so that these could be included among the priority development areas for projects (paragraph 42 of document EB-3840/03).



Organización Internacional del Café
Organização Internacional do Café
Organisation Internationale du Café

WP Board No. 838/97 Rev. 1

26 August 2003
Original: Spanish

E

Projects/Common Fund

Executive Board/
International Coffee Council
17 – 19 September 2003
Cartagena, Colombia

**Monitoring by the Organization of coffee
projects financed by the Common Fund for
Commodities**

Background

A revised version of the document entitled “Monitoring by the Organization of coffee projects financed by the Common Fund for Commodities” (WP-Board No. 838/97) is attached.

Action

The Executive Board is requested to take note of this document.

MONITORING BY THE ORGANIZATION OF COFFEE PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE COMMON FUND FOR COMMODITIES

Introduction

1. On the basis of the Manual of the Common Fund for Commodities¹ and the complementary documents on this matter issued by the Organization², this document summarizes the obligations and functions of the International Coffee Organization as the International Commodity Body (ICB) designated by the Fund to monitor the progress of coffee projects during implementation and to disseminate results. The responsibilities of the ICO as Supervisory Body (SB) for the stage from formulation to approval of projects to be financed by the Fund are detailed in document EB-3573/96 Rev. 4.

2. In particular, this document provides guidelines on the “management” of coffee projects approved for financing by the Fund, highlighting the obligations of the ICO as SB and the evaluation and monitoring functions to be carried out in collaboration with the Fund. The aim is to define and establish the obligations of the Projecting Executing Agency (PEA) at each stage in the implementation of the project and the obligations of the ICO in relation to the dissemination of the project results during and after execution.

3. In order to clarify the supervisory role of the ICO, distinguishing between actions relating to the preparation of the project launch and those involving implementation of the planned activities, this document is divided into two parts. The first covers all activities of an organisational nature to be carried out between final approval of financing by the Fund and the official project launch. The second covers all technical and operational activities relating to the nature of the project and required for its implementation.

¹ The 5th edition of the Manual for the preparation and management of projects to be financed by the Common Fund for Commodities was published in May 2003. The most recent version of the Manual can be found, in English, on the CFC website: www.common-fund.org under Publications. French and Spanish versions will be available later in the year. In the present document reference will be made to page numbers in the English version of the 2003 Manual in order to avoid unnecessary repetition.

² See documents EB-3573/96 Rev. 4: "Basic information on the submission of applications to the Common Fund for Commodities for financial support for activities related to coffee", ED-1837/02 Rev. 1, EB-3652/97, EB-3835/02 Rev. 2 and EB-3768/01 Rev. 2.

I. Supervisory role of the ICO between final approval of financing by the Fund and the official project launch

4. Once the project proposal has been approved by the CFC Executive Board, the Fund will circulate copies of the CFC Final Appraisal Report to all parties involved, together with a list of the legal documents which have to be signed and which define the obligations of the respective parties involved in the financing, implementation and supervision of the project.

5. The following legal documents are part of the prerequisites for initiating implementation of the project:

- a) Project Agreement between the Fund, the ICB and the PEA on the terms and conditions agreed during the preliminary evaluation stage and incorporated in the Project Appraisal Note;
- b) Grant Agreement between the Fund and the ICB; and
- c) Loan Agreement between the Fund and the borrower(s) when financing includes a loan, together with a Guarantee Agreement to be signed with the guarantor(s).

6. In order to reduce to a maximum the period which elapses between the negotiation and signature of the Loan Agreement between the Fund and the competent authorities of the beneficiary country, it is suggested that the Delegate designated by the Government, given his/her knowledge of the institutions involved and their specific functions, should take an active role in the process of technical and legal consultations involved in such negotiation.

7. Once the Agreements have been signed, the next stage involves preparation for the official project launch. It should be noted that in the case of projects including financing in the form of loans, a project launch can be held before completion of the final negotiation and signature of the Loan Agreement. This concession is usually made in order to avoid delays in implementation once the project has been approved.

8. The first transfer of resources will cover, inter alia, the costs of the preparation and official launching of the project, and is subject to the following disbursement conditions:

- a) the Project Account in convertible currency having been opened by the PEA;
- b) the persons authorised to operate the Project Account having been designated;
- c) the Project Implementation Agreement (PIA) having been signed by the PEA and the participating institutions;
- d) endorsement by the Fund and the ICO of the first Annual Work Plan and budget; and
- e) confirmation of co-financing.

9. The project launch marks the official beginning of project implementation activities. A launching meeting is held involving the Fund, the ICO, the PEA and, preferably, the

beneficiaries or their representatives. At the inauguration meeting, which is the first contact in the field between the parties, the project objectives and the procedures for monitoring during implementation will be explained, as well as the responsibilities of each of the parties involved. Requirements in relation to the form and frequency of the PEA reports to the SB will also be specified at this meeting. In addition, the SB will specify its monitoring procedures and all parties will be notified of the obligation to report to the Fund in English³.

10. The project launching meeting provides for discussion of the work plan and budget for the first year with all project beneficiaries; which will be prepared in advance by the PEA and endorsed by the Governments and/or the designated institutions involved in project implementation. The responsibilities of each of the executing agencies in the planning of activities and the use of resources assigned for the implementation of the project within the time period specified will also be defined. It is important to ensure that all the parties involved are familiar with the basic accounting requirements for project implementation in order to maintain a constant flow of the information to be used by the PEA for the preparation of six-monthly reports.

II. Monitoring role of the ICO from the beginning of project implementation to the dissemination of results

11. Once the project has been officially launched, the ICO will carry out monitoring of day-to-day project management by the PEA and, in collaboration with the Fund, will also be responsible for financial monitoring, supervision and evaluation of the progress of implementation. The responsibilities involved are detailed both in the CFC Manual and in the appraisal report and various agreements signed (see paragraph 5 above).

12. The technical and operational activities of the PEA will be monitored by the Fund and the ICO through the progress reports, which will also be analysed, together with annual work plans and budgets, during monitoring visits to the project site to be undertaken annually. Project supervision includes recommendations that may arise from mid-term reviews and impact assessments normally carried out by independent consultants.

13. With regard to obligations and responsibilities relating to the use of financial resources for implementing the project, it should be noted that procedures have been established for making disbursement applications to the Fund, for the procurement of goods and services, and for the submission of financial and auditing reports, as specified in the Agreements and the CFC Financial Procedures Manual. These procedures provide the basis for the establishment and operation of local Implementation Management Committees, which

³ At previous sessions, the Council of the Fund decided that for budgetary reasons English would be the only official working language used.

are responsible for local control of all decisions relating to the use of funds for the implementation of agreed activities within the time period specified in the CFC Appraisal Report.

Progress reports on implementation

14. On the basis of the technical reports received from other institutions involved in implementation of the project, the PEA will be responsible for preparing six-monthly progress and financial reports for subsequent submission to the Fund through the ICO. Reporting requirements are specified in the Project Agreement and the format of such reports is set out in Annex VI of the CFC Manual. The Annex is updated periodically and can be found on the CFC website: www.common-fund.org under “Publications”.

15. The PEA is expected to report on the project's overall achievements through its progress reports and verbal presentations to the Council. The PEA is also required to inform the Fund and the ICO of any constraints that may hamper or alter the normal implementation of the project, and to make available to the Fund, the ICO and/or the auditors any information on developments relating to the implementation of the project and the day-to-day management of funds.

16. Reports should be analytical, providing quantifiable indexes whenever possible. In particular, the first report should provide detailed information on the situation “before the project” in order to permit a comparison to be made with the situation “after the project” when the ICO, in collaboration with the Fund, carries out the completion review of the project and when independent consultants undertake an impact evaluation exercise two years after completion of the project.

17. The ICO, in its capacity as SB, will normally send monitoring reports to the Fund throughout the life of the project, providing its own observations on its progress and the suitability of the agreed activities and costs specified in the Project Agreement. This will enable the ICO to ensure that the day-to-day management activities carried out by the PEA are relevant and that project objectives are being achieved. The progress of the project will subsequently be subject to mid-term and completion reviews by the ICO in collaboration with the Fund in order to determine whether the results obtained are consistent with the specifications in the Project Agreement and to decide whether any adjustments or changes in implementation are required.

18. If the ICO considers that implementation is not satisfactory because any activity undertaken, any cost incurred or any of the results obtained by the PEA have not complied with the requirements specified in the Project Agreement, it will proceed to notify the Fund, while at the same time informing the PEA of any recommendations on possible actions to be taken in order to solve the problems concerned. As a last resort, if the ICO considers that the

project objectives cannot be achieved, or that they have ceased to be valid given the situation of the commodity concerned, it may recommend suspending the project, duly informing the Fund regardless of the stage of implementation.

Monitoring visits

19. Monitoring visits, which are normally annual visits conducted in the field, will be organized and carried out by the ICO in collaboration with the Fund. The nature of such visits may vary widely from a comprehensive assessment of the project and provision of guidance on steps to be taken in order to improve project implementation, to a more selective identification of problems. The budget and work plan for the following year should also be discussed during these visits, providing the ICO with the information required for endorsement to enable the Fund to initiate disbursements.

20. In order to maximize benefits to collaborating institutions and Governments involved in the implementation of the project, the Organization urges that the opportunity provided by professional interaction in the field during implementation of the project be used to exchange know-how, advice and recommendations on local problems affecting the sector. The institutions involved should also use the opportunity to collaborate with the ICO by giving their views on the real conditions and problems of the sector at local level.

Mid-term and impact evaluations

21. Mid-term and impact evaluations are carried out by independent consultants employed by the Fund in order to obtain a second professional opinion on the management undertaken by the PEA and the supervision of the ICO and the Fund. Impact evaluation is undertaken a year or more after the completion of a project and is aimed at assessing the impact of the project and its sustainability over time, indicating whether the observed effects can be attributed to the project or to external factors.

Dissemination of project results

22. The dissemination of project results not only ensures the transfer of know-how generated through the project and offers benefits from the lessons learned but is also an activity that complements the efforts of the ICO and the Fund to avoid project duplication. The results to be disseminated should be reviewed in order to determine:

- i) whether they indicate that the problem has been solved and that the results should be disseminated accordingly;
- ii) whether problems relate to a project already being implemented and could therefore imply an extension of the project concerned; or

- iii) whether a new problem has been identified which should be reconsidered as a new project and, if necessary, as a new field of action within the framework of a coffee development strategy.

CONCLUSION AND COST IMPLICATIONS

23. On the basis of the experience gained in its capacity as a Supervisory Body, the ICO considers that the technical and legal procedures established by the Fund as prerequisites for initiating project implementation could be strengthened by taking the following measures:

- a) selection of a suitable PEA by the ICO (see Section 9.2.1 of the CFC Manual);
- b) inclusion of an obligation for Government – Project continuity in the Project Agreement submitted by beneficiary countries; and
- c) on approval of the project, the Fund should give immediate effect to disbursement of the first transfer of funds to enable the PEA to fulfil the conditions required for disbursement in each beneficiary country and obtain confirmation of co-financing from other institutions in cases where this is envisaged (see paragraph 8 above).

24. In order to optimise the monitoring activities carried out by the ICO in collaboration with the Fund in relation to disbursements, the PEA should give the ICO timely notification of any disbursement requests made and any disbursements received.

25. Since the Fund expects greater participation by ICBs in the supervision and evaluation of projects and the dissemination of results, it is considered that provision should be made for a larger allocation of funds when new project proposals are designed.

26. Finally, experience indicates that proper monitoring provides the basis for the dissemination of results and lessons learned, confirming that through pilot projects, the knowledge gained in one country benefits other Members, albeit indirectly. We have seen that a judicious coffee development strategy can lead to the implementation of projects that reflect the priorities of the sector.

Additional comments

27. On the basis of the experience gained, the ICO considers that its participation is essential for more effective monitoring visits and that a larger allocation of budgetary expenditure is required (under the item Supervision, Monitoring and Evaluation) to carry out a comprehensive assessment in the field of the situation of the project and prepare a report on the value of the project implementation, including the relevance of its objectives and any corrective measures required.

28. At present, the modest budgetary provision for the ICO to carry out monitoring visits limits its effectiveness and its supervisory role. A larger allocation of funds is required to provide for the longer visits needed to carry out the comprehensive assessment envisaged, as well as for subsequent analysis and preparation of a report on the monitoring mission.



ORGANIZACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DEL CAFÉ ORGANIZATION
ORGANIZAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL DO CAFÉ
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DU CAFÉ

WP VSC 7/09

19 March 2009
Original: English

Report

E

**Report of the 3rd Virtual Screening
Committee meeting of 16 March 2009**

1. The 3rd physical meeting of the Virtual Screening Committee (VSC) took place on 16 March 2009. The Executive Director welcomed Ms Mirian Therezinha S. da Eira of Brazil, Mr Mel Eric Gahié of Côte d'Ivoire, Mrs Esther Eskenasy of Guatemala, Ms Yatty Husniaty and Mr Surip Mawardi of Indonesia, Mr Massimiliano Fabian and Mr Alessio Colussi of Italy, Mr Vicente Cano of Spain, and Ms Dawn Thomas and Mr Fernando Vega of the United States, all active Members of the Committee. The meeting was chaired by Mrs Lilian Volcan, Economist of the International Coffee Organization (ICO).

Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda

2. The Committee adopted the draft Agenda contained in document WP-VSC 6/09.

Item 2: Preparations for the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2007

3. The Committee noted that Articles 28 and 31 of the ICA 2007 (relating to the establishment of the Projects Committee and the Consultative Forum on Coffee Sector Finance, respectively), were of particular relevance to future work on project activities. It further noted that the role of the VSC continued to be at the level of screening projects, and made the following recommendations:

- (a) the methodology of the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) should continue to be used for screening as it is standard for most international aid agencies and provides a good starting point if proposals needed to be adapted for other donors;
- (b) the existing tools for screening projects (i.e. checklist, the ICO development strategy for coffee and the CFC Manual for the preparation and management of projects) should continue to be used, and the VSC should provide the

Projects Committee with a VSC report summarizing the outcomes of its technical appraisal;

- (c) since the development of full proposals is costly and time-consuming, ICO Members should be encouraged to submit concept notes for new project ideas (following the format of CFC project profiles) rather than fully developed proposals. This would help to prevent wasting time and resources before a decision is made on whether or not projects are eligible for submission to donors. This would also allow flexibility to adapt proposals in terms of size, timeframe, geographical implications and budget in response to suggestions from donors;
- (d) the ICO document 'Basic information on the submission of applications to the Common Fund for Commodities for financial support for activities related to coffee' (EB-3573/96 Rev. 4) should be updated to provide Members with guidelines on how to further streamline the process of project submission to the ICO;
- (e) since the concept note is considered favourably by the CFC, the ICO should ask the CFC Secretariat to include it on the Agenda of the Consultative Committee (CC) as a separate item in addition to the two fully developed projects (or full proposals) that the ICO is entitled to submit to the CFC in January and July;
- (f) all new proposals (in the form of concept notes) should be screened for similarities with proposals already in the pipeline by the VSC;
- (g) in the case of new proposals which were not eligible for CFC funding, the ICO should assist with the screening and, if appropriate, provide technical endorsement for submission to other donors. A list of potential non-CFC donors should be provided by the project beneficiary countries; and
- (h) the appraisal of projects by the ICO should involve a two step process as follows:
 - Step 1:** selection by the Projects Committee, based on technical advice from the VSC. It was recommended that VSC Members should attend the meetings of the Projects Committee; and
 - Step 2:** final approval by the Council.

Item 3: Priority areas for projects

4. The VSC noted that the number of projects in the pipeline continued to increase and suggested that as some of them were probably outdated, projects currently in the pipeline should be reviewed. This was considered to be a political decision which might imply either a recommendation by the Projects Committee on new donors (in order to secure the US\$70.7 million required for financing projects in the pipeline), or consideration of mechanisms to 'clean' the pipeline. The following recommendations were put forward for the Projects Committee:

- (a) to consider establishing a limit for the length of time that projects should remain in the pipeline;
- (b) to establish the criteria for removing old proposals from the pipeline (i.e. date of approval, relevance to current priorities, etc); and
- (c) to consider, in the light of funding available from donors, the number of proposals that should be accepted per round and/or in the pipeline.

Item 4: Cooperation with other agencies

5. The VSC noted that there was an urgent need for new donors and recommended the following:

- (a) all new proposals should explicitly include a list of potential donors as an alternative to the CFC; and
- (b) the ICO should use its website as a platform to increase visibility of project activities in order to inform a larger number of international aid agencies about the results obtained and funding requirements.

Item 5: Feedback from the VSC on project proposals

6. In order to secure consistency during the appraisal process, VSC Members should provide the Secretariat with a completed checklist for each project proposal screened, together with additional recommendations. Based on inputs received, the Secretariat will produce a draft VSC report, which will subsequently be returned to VSC Members for the purpose of reaching an unambiguous recommendation (i.e. approved, revised or rejected) for the Projects Committee on each project proposal screened.

Item 6: Other business

7. In discussions on the draft terms of reference for the VSC (document WP-Board 955/04 Rev. 1), it was agreed that a new name was needed for this body. The following suggestions were made: Project Proposals Screening Committee; Projects Screening Committee; Proposals Screening Committee; Screening Committee or Screening Group.

8. Given the importance of this appraisal work, it was also suggested that physical meetings should be more regular and that the designated contacts of ICO Members joining the ICA 2007 should be invited to participate in the VSC, in view of the time required for familiarization with procedures. It was also noted that the one-year term for Projects Committee Members, as provided for in the terms of reference, could be too short.

Item 7: Report to the Executive Board

9. The Committee noted that the Chairperson would report on the meeting to the Executive Board.



Organización Internacional del Café Organization
Organização Internacional do Café
Organisation Internationale du Café

WP VSC 5/07

23 October 2007
Original: English

E

Report

**Report of the 2nd Virtual Screening
Committee meeting of 26 September 2007**

1. The 2nd physical meeting of the Virtual Screening Committee (VSC) took place on 26 September 2007. The meeting was chaired by Mrs Lilian Volcan, Economist of the International Coffee Organization (ICO).

2. The Chairperson welcomed Ms Mirian Therezinha S. da Eira and Mr Carlos Eduardo Pachá of Brazil, Mr Gerd Fleischer of Germany, Mr Ernesto Illy of Italy, Ms Dawn Thomas and Ms Kathryn Youel-Page of the United States, all active Members of the Committee. Also present were Mr Caleb Dengu of the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) and Mr Denis Seudieu of the ICO.

Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Committee adopted the draft Agenda contained in document WP-VSC No. 4/07 and took note of two new Articles in the draft International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2007 which were of particular relevance to project activities: Article 28 (Development and funding of projects) and Article 31 (The Consultative Forum on Coffee Sector Finance), see document ICC-98-6.

Item 2: Background information on the Virtual Screening Committee (VSC)

4. The Chairperson informed the Committee about the draft terms of reference for the VSC (document WP-Board 955/04 Rev. 1) and noted that the creation of a Projects Committee responsible for the preparation of projects and fund-raising procedures established under the new ICA could have implications for the current functioning of the VSC.

5. The Committee noted that most of the recommendations agreed during its meeting on 30 January 2006 had been adopted. However, the issue of whether or not the VSC should approve new proposals was still unclear. This issue was further discussed under Item 6.

Item 3: Background information on the preparation of projects

6. The Committee noted that documents EB-3573/96 Rev. 4 and EB-3922/07 Rev. 2 respectively contained background information on the preparation of projects and a summary of the status of projects.

Item 4: Priority areas for projects and methodology

7. The Committee was briefed on the procedures followed by the ICO and on CFC appraisal mechanisms and took note of documents EB-3768/01 Rev. 3 and CFC/ICO 8/06 respectively containing the development strategy for coffee and the report of the CFC/ICO workshop on coffee development priorities held on 27 September 2006.

8. Regarding the CFC criteria for project appraisal, Mr Caleb Dengu outlined each of the priority areas identified for coffee development during the CFC/ICO workshop in September 2006, highlighting the relevance of each one to the CFC Five-Year Action Plan 2008-2012. It was explained by the CFC Representative that basic research and generic promotion projects are on the negative list therefore cannot be supported by the Common Fund.

9. He also explained that the Fund concentrated on two main types of projects, **regular projects** (ranging in total cost from US\$1 to 5 million) and **Fast Track projects** (up to US\$120,000), that could benefit from CFC funding in three different modalities as follows:

- (i) **Regular projects proposals:** these are considered by the Consultative Committee (CC) in January and July each year and subsequently approved – if appropriate – by the CFC Executive Board in April and October. International Commodity Bodies (ICBs) are encouraged to submit no more than two projects per CC meeting. Each proposal is reviewed by the CC only twice before being approved or rejected;
- (ii) **Project Preparation Facility (PPF):** this is intended to assist in formulating sound **project ideas** requiring substantial reformulation and/or to back countries that did not have the resources or technical capabilities to reformulate proposals. As a prerequisite the CC should review and support these proposals before PPF is granted. The use of PPF funds is subject to cost recovery once the **regular project** is approved; and

- (iii) **Fast Track (FT) funding:** This is approved by the Managing Director of the CFC for small project proposals which do not exceed US\$120,000, mainly to implement pilot projects or to carry out consultation workshops and/or feasibility studies. Whereas regular projects need the approval of the CFC Executive Board, FT projects, once reviewed positively by the CC, could be approved by the Managing Director. FT submissions are allowed in addition to the two regular project proposals per CC meeting.

10. In discussions on this item, one representative asked whether it would be viable to coordinate CFC/ICO projects with other donors, especially those involving value-addition and horizontal diversification. Regarding basic research projects, another representative noted that CFC criteria appeared to conflict with its poverty alleviation objective, as a funding gap existed for coffee variety conservation efforts, for example, which not only had a long-term impact on the living standards of coffee producers but were vital for the long-term sustainability of the coffee economy.

Item 5: Feedback from the VSC on project proposals

11. The Committee took note of document EB-3935/07 containing the latest report of the VSC on four new coffee project proposals. It further noted that in the light of the briefing on CFC criteria on projects, which had implications for the ranking of project proposals, it could be timely to consider revising all the projects in the pipeline.

Item 6: Open floor for discussions

12. Based on the Committee discussions, the following considerations emerged:
- (a) Given the limited funding available from the CFC, it was important to ensure that the VSC screening resulted in an unambiguous recommendation on whether or not to approve new project proposals. The category of projects approved should include those eligible for CFC funding, including those still requiring revision.
 - (b) However, sound proposals not eligible for CFC funding could still be approved. The Committee suggested that the checklist should clearly indicate that the new proposal required ‘alternative funding to the CFC’ and relevant donors should be suggested.
 - (c) For projects that were neither sound nor eligible for funding by potential donors, a decision should be taken at an early stage in order to avoid encouraging expectations and to allow the ICO to save time in dealing with other projects.

- (d) The Committee noted that in the draft terms of reference for the VSC (document WP-Board No. 955/04 Rev. 1) there was no indication as to whether the VSC had the mandate to approve new proposals. This matter should be discussed further.
- (e) Taking into consideration the limited number of proposals allowed for submission to the CFC (a maximum of two per CC meeting, or four per year) and that there were far more proposals in the ICO pipeline than the CFC limit allowed, consideration should be given to whether it was time to re-screen, prioritize or rank all the project proposals in the pipeline to better match the opportunities provided by the CFC (see paragraph 9 (i)).

13. The Committee agreed on the following recommendations:

- to revise the checklist taking into consideration the suggestions made at this meeting together with the new screening criteria established by the CFC;
- that the ICO should inform relevant donors about the ‘Coffee Development Strategy’ and in particular about the defined areas of action for projects as a means of fund-raising together with the report of the CFC/ICO workshop on coffee development priorities (document CFC/ICO 8/06); and
- to further discuss whether or not the VSC should recommend the approval of new proposals in order to take account of provisions in the 2007 Agreement.

Item 7: Report to the Executive Board

14. The Committee noted that the Chairperson would report on the meeting to the Executive Board.



Organización Internacional del Café Organization
Organização Internacional do Café
Organisation Internationale du Café

WP VSC No. 3/06

14 February 2006
Original: English

E

Report

**Report of the Virtual Screening Committee
on the meeting of 30 January 2006**

1. The 1st physical meeting of the Virtual Screening Committee (VSC) took place on 30 January 2006. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Pablo Dubois, Head of Operations of the International Coffee Organization (ICO), representing the Executive Director.

2. The Chairman welcomed Mrs. Carol Wilson of the United States, Dr Ernesto Illy of Italy and Mr. Dewa Made Sastrawan and Mrs. Rima Cempaka of Indonesia, all active Members of the Committee.

Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Committee adopted the draft Agenda contained in document WP-VSC No. 1/05 Rev. 2.

Item 2: Background information on the preparation of projects

4. The Chairman informed the Committee about the procedures followed for considering project proposals before and after the establishment of the VSC, highlighting the importance of setting up the VSC to expedite the process of reviewing projects. He referred Members to relevant information contained in documents circulated at the meeting including documents EB-3573/96 Rev. 4, EB-3904/06 and WP-Board No. 955/04 Rev. 1.

5. Regarding the draft Terms of Reference for the VSC (document WP-Board No. 955/04 Rev. 1), the representative of the US asked whether there was an established duration of participation for VSC Members. There was common agreement that Members should participate as long as possible.

Item 3: Evaluation of projects and methodology

6. The Chairman informed the Committee that the “Development strategy for coffee” (document EB-3768/01 Rev. 3) was a reference for prioritizing coffee projects. The US representative noted that the areas of action for projects defined in the document should reflect the objectives of the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) 2001 and asked how often this document was revised by the ICO.

7. The Chairman confirmed that the Development strategy for coffee was related to Article 1 of the ICA, in particular to clauses (1) to promote international cooperation on coffee matters and (8) to analyse and advise on the preparation of projects for the benefit of the world coffee economy, for their subsequent submission to donors or financing organizations, as appropriate. With regard to the timing for revision of the document, he noted that it had been kept flexible to respond to the needs of Members and asked whether there was any particular suggestion for how often it should be revised. The US representative said that the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) revised its strategies every five years, since this was an acceptable length of time to evaluate the performance of each priority area.

8. The US representative also asked about the methodology used by the ICO to evaluate achievements and outlined the methodology used by the USAID. The Chairman explained that the ICO had already undertaken an exercise to establish performance indicators in the different units of the Organization and suggested preparing a specific model for coffee projects that would take into consideration some of the suggestions made.

Item 4: Feedback from the VSC on project proposals

9. The Chairman informed the Committee that the VSC was a “virtual” Committee because its Members communicated by email and highlighted the importance of the VSC’s contribution to the process of screening new projects. This was followed by a discussion on the checklist provided and what the VSC tasks should be. The checklist looked difficult to use and it was suggested that it should be simplified bearing in mind that the analysis by the VSC should be in the light of the objectives of the 2001 Agreement. On the question of the VSC tasks, one Member considered that the VSC should give the green light on whether or not to proceed with new project proposals and the reasons why, whilst another indicated that the screening should specifically focus on the technical and scientific merits of new proposals and their compatibility with the ICA.

Item 5: Open floor for discussions

10. Following discussion, the Committee agreed on the following recommendations:
- (a) the ICO should check that new project proposals conform with the CFC format;
 - (b) the VSC screening will focus on technical and scientific merits of proposals and their compatibility with the ICA/ICO Development strategy for coffee; and
 - (c) the VSC should recommend whether or not to approve new proposals.

Item 6: Report to the Executive Board

11. The Committee noted that the Chairman would report on the meeting to the Executive Board.

CHECKLIST FOR THE SCREENING OF COFFEE PROJECT PROPOSALS (2010/2011)

VSC Member assessing the project proposal <i>(tick as appropriate)</i>	Brazil <input type="checkbox"/>	Côte d'Ivoire <input type="checkbox"/>	Germany <input type="checkbox"/>	Guatemala <input type="checkbox"/>
	Indonesia <input type="checkbox"/>	Italy <input type="checkbox"/>	USa <input type="checkbox"/>	Spain <input type="checkbox"/>
Title of the project proposal				
	Submission to CFC			Submission to other donors:
Should the proposal be recommended for? <i>(tick as appropriate)</i>	Approval <input type="checkbox"/>	Revision <input type="checkbox"/>	Rejection <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Write here your suggestion (if any)</i>
Overall screening of the proposal by Technical Area:	Scoring			
Coffee sector priorities				
Project planning				
Operational capacity of the PEA				
Sustainability				
Budget/cost-effectiveness				

* Score: 0 = missing information, 1= very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = very good

Additional remarks <i>(tick as appropriate)</i>	Yes	No	Suggestion:
Is the proposal focused on basic research?			
Is the proposal focused on Generic Promotion?			
If <u>co-financing</u> is needed, is a co-financing source indicated?			

Screening related dates: <i>(date of the relevant ICO meeting)</i>	Mar-11	Sep-11		
	1 st VSC Screening:	2 nd VSC:		Final VSC:
	Score		Score	Score
Part A: Screening of the proposal against coffee sector priorities	(0 -5)*	Not relevant	(0 - 5)*	(0 - 5)*
How relevant to the 'Development strategy for coffee' outlined in document EB 3768/01 Rev.3 is the proposal?				
How relevant is the proposal to the needs and constraints of the country/countries (as outlined in relevant strategy documents such as national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, rural development strategies or coffee sector development plans)?				
How relevant is the proposal for developing new technology and strengthening capacity to be transferred to other producing countries?				
Overall assessment of the quality of the proposal				
	Score		Score	Score
Part B: Screening of the proposal against proposed project management	(0 -5)*	Not relevant	(0 - 5)*	(0 - 5)*
1. Project planning:				
How relevant are the objectives of the proposal to the CFC priorities?				
How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)?				
How realistic are the expected outcomes?				
Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcomes?				
Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the objectives and expected outcomes?				
Is the action plan clear and feasible?				
Is the level of involvement by the partners in planning and implementation satisfactory?				
How coherent is the overall design of the proposed activity? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation?)				
2. Operational capacity of the Project Executing Agency (PEA):				
Do the applicant and partners have sufficient experience of project management?				
Do the applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise?				
Do the applicant and partners have sufficient management capacity?				
Is the PEA proposed qualified/eligible to carry out technical administration of the project?				

	1 st VSC Screening:		2 nd VSC:	Final VSC:
	Score		Score	Score
Part C: Screening of the proposal against potential impact of the project	(0 -5)*	Not relevant	(0 - 5)*	(0 - 5)*
3. Sustainability:				
Is the project likely to have a tangible impact on its target group and the final beneficiaries?				
Is the project likely to have a multiplier effect? (including scope for replication, extension of outcomes and dissemination of the information)				
Are the expected results of the project sustainable? (financially, institutionally and at policy level)				
Have gender aspects been adequately addressed?				
To what extent do the proposed project activities imply social risks?				
To what extent do the proposed project activities imply environmental risks?				
To what extent are plans or measures to mitigate potential social or environmental risks adequately contemplated?				
4. Budget and cost-effectiveness:				
Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?				
Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the project?				



Organización Internacional del Café Organization
Organização Internacional do Café
Organisation Internationale du Café

WP VSC No. 2/06

27 January 2006
English only

E

Virtual Screening Committee
30 January 2006
London, England

**Form used by the USAID to evaluate
programme proposals**

Background

1. The attached evaluation form has been submitted by the USAID as an example of methods used for programme evaluations.
2. It may be of interest in the context of the procedures used by the Virtual Screening Committee (VSC).

Action

The Committee is requested to consider this evaluation form.

PROPOSAL SCORE SHEET

Proposal Number: - Title:

Reviewer: Target Country:

PRE-MEETING EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL

IS THE PROPOSAL ADEQUATE FOR REVIEW? Yes No

DOES THE PROPOSAL FIT THE PROGRAM GUIDELINES? Yes No

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Not Acceptable
Scientific Merit	A	B	C	D	E
Relevance to Development	A	B	C	D	E
Capacity Strengthening	A	B	C	D	E
Innovation	A	B	C	D	E
Overall Grade	A	B	C	D	E

Are there any administrative concerns associated with the target country? Yes No
(if so, comment below)

Specific Comments on the proposal: (continue on back, if needed)

MEETING RESULTS

IF A PROPOSAL IS ULTIMATELY INVITED, LIST ANY CONDITIONS OF INVITATION:

DELAY DECISION: Yes No
What is the Issue?

Who is Responsible to Resolve the Issue?

ANY COMMENTS FOR THE PROPOSERS? Yes (see back of page) No

FINAL DECISION

OVERALL GRADE FOR PROPOSAL _____

DECISION DATE:

LEAD REVIEWER:

CHECK THOSE "SPECIAL CONCERNS" BELOW THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED

- A. ____ Use of human subjects
- B. ____ Potential safety hazards
- C. ____ Animal or plant pathogens or pests
- D. ____ International shipment of hazardous materials
- E. ____ Recombinant DNA molecules
- F. ____ Radioactive materials
- G. ____ Use of vertebrate animals
- H. ____ Field collection of plants or animals, including
endangered or threatened species
- I. ____ Environmental hazards
- J. ____ Intellectual property rights
- K. ____ Gender issues

Any Specific Comments for the Investigators