This Operations Manual is not a legal document. The Manual describes the governance structure and the operating principles, guidelines and procedures for the day-to-day operations of the Antimicrobial Resistance Multi-Partner Trust Fund (AMR MPTF). In case of conflict, the terms set out in the Standard Administrative Arrangement and in the MOUs concluded between UNDP and WHO/FAO and between UNDP and the OIE take precedence over this Manual.
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1. Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is arguably the most complex threat to global health security, potentially leading to millions of deaths a year and hundreds of billions of dollars lost in annual economic growth. It threatens to compromise the global community’s progress towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Misuse and overuse of antimicrobial drugs in human medicine, veterinary medicine, and food production has put our future at risk, with few alternative solutions in the pipeline. Without coordinated and accelerated action, the world is heading towards a post-antibiotic era in which common infections could once again kill and routine medical procedures become high risk.

Globalization has led to an unprecedented rise in the movement of people, animals, and food commodities, providing opportunities for the spread of resistance. Stemming the tide of AMR will take bold and determined global action and the commitment of all. To ensure that today’s cures are available for generations to come, a One Health approach is required to systematically address key challenges that include:

- Responsible use and stewardship, whilst ensuring access to existing and new antimicrobials.
- Robust human and animal health systems in countries and between countries to prevent infections from spreading;
- Universally agreed priorities and mechanisms to foster innovation towards quality and inexpensive diagnostic tests that provide care;
- The transformation of animal husbandry (terrestrial and aquatic) to substantially reduce antimicrobial use whilst boosting agricultural productivity and ensuring food security and safety.

In strengthening sustained advocacy, political commitment and accountability, Tripartite dialogue, intersectoral approaches and data and evidence; the Antimicrobial Resistance Multi-Partner Trust Fund (AMR MPTF) has been established as a funding mechanism to support the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and the World Health Organization (WHO) – collectively known as the Tripartite – to secure consistent and coordinated financing to enable the development and implementation of One Health National Action Plans, Tripartite Workplans on AMR and to support the achievement of the relevant SDGs as well as the implementation of some of the recommendations of the ad hoc Interagency Coordination Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (IACG AMR). The AMR MPTF will finance catalytical, coordinated policy advice, technical assistance and capacity-strengthening programmes that Member States have requested from FAO, OIE and WHO to combat AMR.

Established for an initial five-year period (2019-2024) with the option to extend the lifespan, the AMR MPTF aims at influencing and contributing to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. The AMR MPTF will support joint and coordinated actions based on the Tripartite Workplans on AMR at global, regional and country levels to catalyze national level action and garner sustainable results. Specifically, countries will be provided with policy support and technical assistance in the following areas:

- Designing and implementing of One Health National Action Plans (NAPs): (i) provide in-country support to develop, finance and implement One Health NAPs; (ii) build evidence and tools to support implementation and evaluation of One Health NAPs; (iii) undertake assessments of the economic and social benefits of reducing AMR across all sectors; and, (v) develop guidance on the analysis of legal frameworks and regulatory options;
- Raising awareness and catalyzing behaviour change across all sectors: global and regional campaigns, as well as support to countries to identify key audiences, develop awareness raising campaigns to effect behaviour change, enable collective action, achieve national priorities and strengthen monitoring and accountability;
- Strengthen surveillance and monitoring of AMR and antimicrobial sales and use: support the global, regional and country levels to obtain and standardize meaningful data to guide the development of tools, policies, and regulations. This includes integrated surveillance systems to promote data sharing across sectors at local, regional and global levels. Provision of technical support to countries to establish and deliver national AMR surveillance programmes monitoring the sales, distribution, use/consumption of antimicrobials.
• Strengthening stewardship and the optimal use of antimicrobials: at all levels foster research and development, develop and support practical measures to minimize the need for antimicrobials (e.g. improved hygiene, biosecurity, animal welfare, vaccination programs, etc.), reduce the use of antimicrobials (e.g. implementing good practice and identifying alternatives to antimicrobials including vaccines), and prevent the spread of AMR or residues (e.g. good hygiene practices).

• Robust monitoring and evaluation: build capacities and processes at all levels to boost monitoring and evaluation to measure progress towards the delivery of the objectives, and achievements and availability of, and access to, financial resources to support actions at scale that contribute to transformational change in addressing AMR are key factors for successful implementation. The private sector, public sector, and financial institutions will also be encouraged to support implementation through the AMR MPTF.

This Manual covers the operations for the AMR MPTF and should be read together with the associated Terms of Reference.

2. Governance Arrangements

The governance arrangements for the AMR MPTF are based on standard governance arrangements for pass-through MPTFs and UNDG best practices. As depicted in Figure 1, the governance arrangements provide for an efficient and effective decision-making and oversight framework, ensuring streamlined allocation processes and clear lines of accountability. These arrangements are built on and informed by the principles of inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, and consensus-based decisions.

Figure 1. Fund Governance and Financial Architecture

2.1. Steering Committee

2.1.1. Composition

The Steering Committee is composed of a senior-level principal representative, or their nominated alternates, from each of the three organizations (FAO, OIE, WHO), three to five representatives from Resource Partners. The full composition of the Steering Committee includes:

• Deputy Director-General for Climate and Natural Resources, FAO; (alternates: Director, Animal Health Service);

• Deputy Director-General for International Standards and Science, OIE; (alternates: Head, Engagement and Investment Department);

1 Titles and representatives as of April 2020.
• Assistant Director-General for Antimicrobial Resistance, WHO; (Alternates: Director, Global Coordination and Partnerships on Antimicrobial Resistance);
• Programme Manager of the AMR MPTF, ex-officio;
• Executive Coordinator of the United Nations MPTF Office, UNDP, ex-officio;
• Three to five representatives from resource partners to the AMR MPTF. Where more than five partners contribute to the AMR MPTF, the Steering Committee will introduce provisions to ensure that all resource partners may contribute to decision making without the need to increase the size of the Steering Committee membership.

The Steering Committee will be chaired by one of the Tripartite organizations on an annual rotational basis and the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will provide the Secretariat support.

The Steering Committee can call upon ad hoc expertise to provide insight to the AMR MPTF, as necessary, drawing upon existing platforms and networks of expertise on AMR. Expertise could also be sought from relevant governments, civil society, academia, private sector, regional counterparts, resource partners and UN agencies or other entities, as deemed necessary. Engagement with the global south will be particularly welcomed, providing a regional lens to AMR issues, to ensure the AMR MPTF is up to date and flexible in its response to differing trends and contexts. Depending on the request of the Steering Committee, such experts could participate in the Steering Committee meetings as observers.

2.1.2. Responsibilities

As the principal governing and decision-making body, the Steering Committee is responsible for providing oversight of the AMR MPTF and approving the strategic direction and overall workplan.

The main functions of the Steering Committee include:

Programmatic Oversight

• Provide general oversight and exercise overall accountability of the Fund in accordance with the AMR MPTF’s Terms of Reference and Operations Manual;
• Approve the strategic direction of the Fund;
• Approve any revisions to the Terms of Reference;
  o Any revision of the Terms of Reference of a substantive nature shall only be carried out based on a decision by the Steering Committee. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will be responsible for carrying out the revisions, which will then be submitted to the Steering Committee for approval.
• Approve the Fund’s Operations Manual and update it as necessary;
  o The Steering Committee will review and validate the Fund’s Operations Manual. If there is a need to make any substantive change, it will request the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR to advise on the revision of the Operations Manual. When the Steering Committee is called upon to decide on a procedural aspect not already contained in the manual, such a decision will be taken as a precedent and the Operations Manual will be amended accordingly. Non-substantive changes of the Operations Manual will be incorporated by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and the Steering Committee will be informed accordingly.
• Discuss MPTF requirements and priorities concerning (a) programme management, including consistent and common approaches to costing, cost recovery, implementation modalities, results-based reporting and impact assessment, and (b) information management, including appropriate MPTF donor visibility;
• Approve the AMR MPTF risk management strategy and review risk monitoring regularly;
• Agree on the scope and frequency of independent review of the MPTF commissioned by the Steering Committee;
• Convene advisory expertise to provide insight to the Steering Committee on ad hoc basis.

Appraisal and approval of projects
• Review concept notes after being screened by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, ensuring their conformity with the scope and requirements of the Fund, and decide on their inclusion in the AMR MPTF programme pipeline;

• Request the submission of joint programme proposals (based on concept notes included in the Fund programme pipeline);

• Review and approve programme proposals after screening by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR to ensure that they meet Fund’s criteria and requirements, are consistent with the concept notes and are aligned with the strategic objectives and scope of the Fund as described in the Terms of Reference;

• Approve direct costs related to fund operations supported by the Secretariat;

• Decide the allocation of funds and request fund transfers to the Administrative Agent (signed off by UN member of the Steering Committee);

Monitoring and reporting

• Review the MPTF status and oversee the overall progress against the results framework through monitoring, reporting and evaluation;

• Review and approve the periodic progress reports consolidated by the Administrative Agent and the Secretariat based on the progress reports submitted by the Participating Organizations;

• Highlight lessons learned and periodically discuss follow-up by Participating Organizations on recommended actions that have MPTF-wide impact;

• Commission independent evaluations on the overall performance of the MPTF;

• Review the draft and final reports on lessons learned, ensure the implementation of recommendations, identify and address any critical issues linked to the MPTF.

Advocacy, partnership and resource mobilization

• Approve resource mobilization strategies to capitalize the AMR MPTF;

• Guide the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the resource mobilization strategy and advocate for the fund, as appropriate;

• Ensure appropriate consultative processes take place with key stakeholders and resource partners to avoid duplication and overlap between activities funded through the Fund and those supported through other funding mechanisms or investments.

2.1.3. Decisions

The Steering Committee will take decisions by consensus. The quorum of the Steering Committee shall be four members, with at least one member from each Participating Organization and one donor representative. Decisions of the Steering Committee shall be duly recorded through minutes prepared by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR. Prior to presenting their position on a significant issue to the Steering Committee, a Participating Organization must make sure that it is endorsed internally by their organization and is in line with the organization’s regulatory requirements.

In case the Steering Committee cannot physically meet, the decisions will be taken virtually, or through email, and the same norms of consensus and quorum will apply. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will coordinate the communications with the Steering Committee members making all reasonable efforts to share information and obtain feedback.

Should the absence of consensus result in a deadlock where critical decisions cannot be taken, a decision can exceptionally be taken by the Chair upon consultation with the other members of the Steering Committee. In such an event, the disagreement of individual members will be explicitly noted in the minutes of the Steering Committee and the decision-making process will be duly reviewed as part of ongoing evaluations of the Fund.

The role of the chairperson of the Steering Committee is to:
• ensure that the decisions taken by the Steering Committee are in accordance with the regulatory requirements and frameworks of the Participating Organizations and agreements with the donors, and that the approved programmes are within the scope of the Terms of Reference;

• ensure that the decisions taken by the Steering Committee are duly recorded and promptly endorsed. Subsequent to endorsement, the minutes will be communicated to the members of the Steering Committee, including Participating Organizations and donors;

• monitor the implementation of the decisions of the Steering Committee.

Decisions on project proposal submissions will only be taken upon a completion of a review prepared by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, evaluated against the defined criteria outlined in the proposal assessment form (Annex 4).

2.1.4. Meetings of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee will meet at least twice per year, in person or virtually, with the option of scheduling additional meetings as and when needed. The Steering Committee will be chaired by a representation of one of the Tripartite organizations on an annual rotating basis.

The Participating Organization that is serving as Steering Committee chairperson shall also designate an alternate Chairperson. The Steering Committee can also make decisions through written consultations with its members, respecting the consensus and the quorum. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat will issue invitations to the members of the Steering Committee and shall also send the documents 7 working days before the scheduled meeting.

The Steering Committee may invite observers on a case-by-case basis.

2.2. Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR

The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will also serve as the secretariat of the MPTF. This Secretariat will be composed of dedicated staff from each of the Tripartite organizations (FAO, OIE, WHO) and will be tasked with supporting the AMR MPTF Steering Committee and overseeing the overall operations of the AMR MPTF. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will not be co-located and will rely on staff located in each of the three Tripartite organizations (FAO, OIE, WHO).

A Programme Manager², supported by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, will be recruited to support the AMR MPTF. The Programme Manager’s role will be to provide strategic, operational and administrative support for the day to day operations as well as facilitate key decision-making for the AMR MPTF’s Steering Committee and is further described below.

The Steering Committee can review the composition of the staff funded through the AMR MPTF and make revisions to reflect needs and considering budget availability. The budget required to perform the necessary Secretariat functions to the AMR MPTF and governance throughout the AMR MPTF’s lifecycle will be agreed upon by the Steering Committee. These costs will be adjusted to: (i) align with recommended UNDG guidelines and thresholds³ and, (ii) duly reflect the complexity and multi-stakeholder nature of the Tripartite’s approach to tackling AMR.

The functions of the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR related to the AMR MPTF include:

Programme Management, including monitoring and reporting

• Advises the Steering Committee on strategic priorities, programmatic and financial allocations in accordance with the AMR MPTF’s Operations Manual (based on the inputs of inter-agency working groups and the Administrative Agent, if applicable);

---

² Although titled as Coordinator in the Fund’s Terms of Reference, the position’s nomenclature will be Programme Manager to align with WHO staffing title requirements.

³ The costs associated to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR paid by the AMR MPTF cannot exceed 3% over the lifespan of the Fund (costs can exceed 3% in the initial period to enable operationalization).
• Provides planning, logistical and operational support to the Steering Committee;
• Develops operational procedures for the AMR MPTF, including key guiding documents and templates;
• Ensures project monitoring as well as potential operational risks and overall performance of the MPTF;
• Supports the development of quality programming and results management of the Fund;
• Organizes calls for proposals;
• Supports the development of prioritized project proposals, including facilitating linkages between country teams and Tripartite substantive policy experts at regional and global level;
• Reviews project proposals for disbursement of funds, including convening the necessary technical expertise to appraise such proposals;
• Provides monitoring and evaluation guidance;
• Consolidates and ensures quality of annual and final narrative reports provided by the Participating Organizations;
• Collate and share knowledge, including lessons learned and good practices;
• Provide additional policy and programmatic support.

Advocacy, partnership and resource mobilization
• Serve as the AMR MPTF’s central point of contact and liaises with other UN agencies and other related initiatives and stakeholders. This includes providing vital information for external partners, as well as liaising with existing and potential resource partners to mobilize necessary financing for the AMR MPTF;
• Collaborate with the Participating Organizations and the MPTF Office;
• Undertake resource mobilization in accordance with approved strategies and in collaboration with staff from the Participating Organizations;
• Support partnership management by facilitating collaboration and communication between Participating Organizations;
• Promote a One Health approach and joint activities of the Tripartite through communication, advocacy and political engagement as well as spearheading communications with external partners regarding the Fund;
• Liaise with the Administrative Agent on fund administration issues, including issues related to project/fund extensions and project/fund closure.

More specifically, the AMR MPTF Programme Manager, supported by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR - will have the following tasks:

Leadership
• Supports the Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR and the AMR MPTF Steering Committee to develop and implement the vision of the Fund;
• Advises the Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR and the AMR MPTF Steering Committee on strategic priorities, programmatic and financial allocations, benefitting from inputs and substantive support from the Administrative Agent and key partners at the global, regional and national levels.

AMR MPTF Steering Committee
• Advises the Joint Tripartite Secretariat and AMR MPTF Steering Committee on all aspects of the AMR MPTF, including on policy, strategy, monitoring and compliance;
• Coordinates closely with each member of the Tripartite to ensure consistency and complementarity with the overall corporate partnerships and resource partners;
• Acts as liaison between the Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR, the AMR MPTF Steering Committee, Country Teams, the Fund Administrator, and related UN, One Health or other mechanisms as necessary;
• Provides logistical and operational support to the Joint Tripartite Secretariat and AMR MPTF Steering Committee;
Building partnerships

- Supports partnership management of the Fund by coordinating contributions from the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and staff from FAO, OIE and WHO;
- Identifies and supports the Tripartite to develop strategic and innovative partnerships with other entities, initiatives and/or organizations, especially multilateral partners; the private sector, including investors and civil society, necessary to accelerate progress on AMR;
- Contributes to develop broad partnerships that can be leveraged to support the AMR MPTF.

Advocacy, Communication and Resource Mobilization

- Supports AMR MPTF resource mobilization efforts through overseeing the design and implementation of a resource mobilisation strategy and action plan, from traditional and non-traditional donors, foundations, the private sector, International Finance Institutions and host governments;
- Develops briefings to support directors in resource mobilization;
- Ensures that the AMR Fund is represented in various fora and organizes key events as necessary and ensures communication of the Tripartite’s work to the public and other stakeholders.

2.3. Administrative Agent

The AMR MPTF will use the pass-through funding modality, where resource partners and Participating Organizations agree to channel funding through one UN organization, referred to as the Administrative Agent. The Administrative Agent is the appointed interface between the Participating Organizations and the resource partners for administrative matters. The UNDP MPTF Office has been appointed by the AMR MPTF Participating Organizations to act as the Administrative Agent for the Fund.

The UNDP MPTF Office will provide support to the design of the AMR MPTF (Terms of Reference, Operations Manual), development of legal instruments and administration of the Fund.

In administering the Fund, the Administrative Agent is responsible for the following functions:

- Signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Participating Organizations;
- Signing Standard Administrative Agreements (SAA) with resource partners;
- Receiving contributions from donors and administering funds in accordance with regulations, rules, policies and procedures of the United Nation Development Programme, as well as the MOU, TOR and SAA, including provisions relating to closure of the Fund account;
- Investing and reinvesting the Fund’s resources according to investment policies, practices and procedures. Any investment income will be added to the Fund’s resources and will not be credited to the contributions of a particular donor;
- Providing updated information to the Steering Committee regarding the regular resource availability;
- Transferring funds to the Participating Organizations in accordance with Steering Committee decisions;
- Consolidating the annual or final narrative report submitted by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR with the annual or final financial reports submitted by the Participating Organizations and presenting the consolidated report to the Steering Committee as well as to each of the AMR MPTF’s contributors;
- Preparing the Fund’s final financial report including its closure notice;
- Releasing funds as direct costs for the running of the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, based on Steering Committee’s decisions;
- The Administrative Agent will annually notify the Steering Committee about the amounts used to that end;
- Releasing funds for additional expenses that the Steering Committee may decide to allocate;
- Providing tools for fund management to ensure transparency and accountability.
The MPTF Office through its Gateway\(^4\) offers a web-based service portal providing real-time financial data generated directly from its accounting system. This open portal provides all partners and the general public with the ability to track information on contributions, transfers and expenditures.

The Administrative Agent is entitled to allocate an administrative fee of one percent (1%) of the amount contributed by each donor to meet the costs of performing the Administrative Agents' standard functions as described in the Memorandums of Understanding concluded between the Participating Organizations and the Administrative Agent.

2.4. Participating Organizations

The FAO, OIE and WHO are the Participating Organizations of the AMR MPTF and will be responsible for its management. Each of the Participating Organizations can receive funds from the AMR MPTF, through the Administrative Agent. The distribution of funding allocation among the Participating Organizations shall be balanced and equitable over the lifespan of the AMR MPTF and will be monitored through Steering Committee meetings. Each Participating Organization is programmatically and financially responsible for AMR MPTF resources received in accordance with its own regulations, rules, policies and procedures. The indirect costs of the Participating Organizations recovered through programme support costs will be harmonized at seven percent (7%).

---

3. Theory of Change

Given the intersectoral nature of AMR, a One Health perspective informs the Theory of Change for the AMR MPTF and its programmatic logic, as highlighted in the below table:

The Tripartite Results Matrix is provided in Annex 1 (under finalisation). Each individual programme funded through the AMR MPTF will develop a results framework as part of their complete proposal and, during programme implementation will report on the results being achieved by Tripartite for reporting, communication and resource mobilisation purposes.
4. Fund Administration

As outlined in section 2.3, the AMR MPTF will be administered by the United Nations MPTF Office (Administrative Agent) housed within UNDP. As the financial regulations and rules of UNDP only allow the agency to provide services to United Nations organizations and Member States, the three Participating Organizations accept full financial and programmatic accountability for their programmes (developed jointly or individually) in accordance with their own rules and regulations and approved as per the programming cycles described below.

Although the OIE is not a United Nations organization, the Tripartite organizations regard each other as equal partners in delivering the Tripartite Workplans on AMR. The Participating UN Organizations and the OIE, undertake to work diligently and in good faith together, in order to put in place such necessary arrangements (including with respect to privileges and immunities) according to their respective rules and procedures, to enable the OIE to operate with sufficient and appropriate safeguards and carry out activities agreed by the Participating UN Organizations and OIE in connection to the Fund.

Should engagement with other United Nations organizations be deemed pertinent in the context of this AMR MPTF, necessary arrangements will be taken to include these agencies as implementing partners.

4.1. Financial contributions

4.1.1. Arrangement for financial contributions

The AMR MPTF is funded through contributions of development and resource partners, international financial institutions, foundations and other non-state actors. The Fund will also consider innovative financing sources.

Financial contributions to the AMR MPTF may be accepted in fully convertible currency or in any other currency that can be readily utilized. Such contributions are deposited into the bank account designated by the Administrative Agent, as stated in the Standard Administrative Agreement. The value of a contribution payment, if made in other than US dollars, is determined by applying the UN operational rate of exchange in effect on the date of payment.

Resource partners can provide financial contributions to the AMR MPTF which are preferably multi-year and non-earmarked. If non-earmarked contributions are not possible, earmarked contributions can be made to the national programming cycle. Contributions cannot be earmarked to specific organizations of the Tripartite. The earmarking will be reflected in the Standard Administrative Arrangement. Donors can sign a Standard Administrative Arrangement with the MPTF Office and transfer resources to the Fund account. In-kind contributions are also welcome, through separate arrangements with each Organization (e.g. secondments, provision of equipment).

Each Tripartite organization and the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will engage in coordinated resource mobilization efforts with potential financial contributors. When a contributor has been identified with a pledged amount, the contributor will be introduced to the Administrative Agent to finalize the contribution through a Standard Administrative Arrangement.

4.1.2. Financial contributions from the private sector

Acceptance of funds from the private sector will be guided by criteria stipulated in the UN system-wide guidelines on cooperation between the UN and the Business Community. The receipt of financing from private sector companies is subject to UNDP’s risk assessment tool for the assessment and approval of funding from non-state actors (in Annex 3). The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will work with potential private contributors to collect information about each contributor’s organization. This information will be submitted to the Administrative Agent to conduct an independent verification of the firm. The information will be captured in the risk assessment tool and signed off by the Executive Director of the MPTF Office.
Notwithstanding the foregoing, there shall be no engagement with the tobacco or arms industry in connection with the AMR MPTF. Prior to accepting any contribution from a private sector entity, all signatories to the MOUs will be consulted by the Administrative Agent. The due diligence process should be initiated as soon as there is some certainty of interest by the private sector partner to allow for ample time to conduct the due diligence process, which includes agreement by the Participating Organizations. The approval will be given on a non-objection basis within one month of the submission of the request to the Participating Organizations by the Administrative Agent.

Once the Participating Organisations agree to accept the contribution, as recorded by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, the administrative agent will sign a Standard Administrative Arrangement with the contributor.

4.2. Operational modalities

The AMR MPTF has been formally established upon signature of the Memorandum of Understanding between the MPTF Office and the FAO/WHO and a Memorandum of Understanding between the MPTF Office and the OIE, designating the UNDP’s MPTF Office as the Administrative Agent. The AMR MPTF commences its operational activities upon signature of a Standard Administrative Arrangement between at least one donor and the Administrative Agent.

The initial duration of the AMR MPTF is five years, starting on 15 August 2019 until 31 December 2024. Once funding has been received, the Steering Committee will be convened by the Chair for the first time. During the Fund’s operational period, the Participating Organizations will be able to submit concept notes and programme proposals to the Steering Committee. The AMR MPTF Steering Committee will allocate funds to the Participating Organizations based on their proposals, with preference given to joint Tripartite proposals.

4.3. Programme approval cycle

![Figure 3. Programme Approval Cycle](image)
4.3.1. Proposal preparation, assessment and approval process

4.3.1.1. National Programming Cycle

This covers country-specific programmes: These programmes will be developed in consultation and agreement with national government stakeholders and will provide resources to allow the Participating Organisations to collaborate and support countries implement multisectoral National Action Plans. These programmes will deliver against the AMR MPTF results matrix and ensure application of a One Health approach. The Steering Committee will agree on which countries will be invited to develop a concept note based on the following criteria:

- Willingness and interest of the government to address AMR with an existing multisectoral approach. This will be assessed by in line with the AMR/One Health National Action Plans, level of commitment and engagement as assessed by the Tripartite, as well as the feasibility of the government being able to progress beyond a two-year period;
- Need for support to progress the One Health approach or the likelihood that the country would be an exemplar for the region or sub-region;
- Tripartite able to demonstrate significant impact and added value in the short and medium term;
- Least develop countries, other low-income countries and lower middle-income countries of priority from Africa, Asia, the Americas and the European regions;
- No duplication and overlap between the proposal and other funding mechanisms or investments, but synergies drawn where possible. Considering that complementary investments can heighten impact, references to economies of scale and leveraging opportunities will be mentioned in the proposal;
- The proposal is achievable, sustainable and cost-efficient;
- Capacity to engage with the relevant national stakeholders (ie. private sector, civil society and academia) to tackle AMR is highly desirable;
- Considerations and approaches to ensure sustainability of the investment upon completion of the programme, including a government-centric exit strategy.

Priorities and criteria for selection may change slightly between project proposal submission rounds.

Staff from the three Participating Organisations will be expected to collaborate to develop a concept note, in conjunction with the National AMR control committee and other stakeholders.

The concept notes will be submitted to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR using the agreed Concept Note template (Annex 4) and will be reviewed by experts from the Tripartite. Each Tripartite organization will identify its technical reviewers and the internal process for performing such review. Upon completion of this review, the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will provide a consolidated review of the concept notes using a standardized concept note review matrix which will assess the extent to which invitation criteria are met (see concept note assessment form in Annex 4) as well as the below-listed elements:

- The results that are being offered reflect an appropriate level of ambition, are in line with the National AMR control strategy or plan, align with the strategic objectives, principles and standards of the Tripartite and other relevant UN organizations, align with the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, and link with SDG targets;
- The Participating Organisations’ collaborative engagement in concept note development, and in the proposed approach to implementation;
- The likelihood of delivery, whether there has been appropriate consideration of practical aspects of delivery and programme coordination and management.

Should a concept note be approved by the Steering Committee, the concept note will move to the second phase which will entail elaborating the concept note into a full project proposal, using the agreed Programme Proposal template (Annex 4). The National AMR Committee and other relevant stakeholders should be involved in this programme proposal development process. The programme proposal should also be discussed with the UN Resident Coordinator.
The UN Participating Organizations will be able to apply for a pre-financing facility to support the costs of full proposal development. This facility entitles one of the Tripartite organizations to invest up to USD$25,000 in proposal development, that can be claimed as part of the first payment tranche when the programme proposal is approved by the Steering Committee. This facility can be used to pay for human resource, technical assistance, or to pay costs of meetings and consultations.

Each programme proposal should stipulate how much funding will be allocated to each Participating Organization to achieve results in line with standard UN budget headings. A Programme Coordinator from one of the Participating Organizations should be designated to each programme funded through the AMR MPTF; this coordinator will be responsible for managing the delivery of the programme, coordinating its activities at country level and performing monitoring and reporting functions. Implementation of activities and individual programmes will be through the existing systems and structures of the Tripartite Organisations.

Each programme proposal should include a component for monitoring and evaluation and reporting. Programme proposals will be submitted to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, where they will be reviewed by experts from the three Participating Organizations. Each Tripartite organization will identify its technical reviewers and the internal process for performing such review; the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will provide a consolidated review of the programme proposals using a standardized proposal review matrix (see Proposal Assessment Form in Annex 4). Selected project proposals may be submitted to independent external technical experts for further review, if necessary.

The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will submit to the Steering Committee concept notes and programme proposals. The Steering Committee will determine all decisions on whether to:

- approve the concept note or proposal;
- approve the concept note or proposal conditionally, subject to modification and re-submission;
- defer the concept note or proposal, with comments for further consideration, or;
- reject the concept note or proposal.

### 4.3.1.2. Global/regional Programming Cycle

This cycle will include Tripartite programme proposals with a global/regional focus. It will include proposals targeting the development of global public goods and related deliverables as identified in the Tripartite Workplan as well as leadership and coordination functions in line with the IACG AMR recommendations.

Concept notes will be developed by technical teams of the three Participating Organisations working together. Concept notes will be assessed against the following criteria:

- Contribution to the AMR MPTF’s Theory of Change and Results Matrix;
- Importance of the activity to One Health implementation at country level or sustaining the momentum for AMR at a regional and global level;
- Demonstrating Tripartite capacity and comparative advantage;
- Capacity to implement and deliver meaningful results in the next twenty-four months;
- The proposal is achievable, sustainable and cost-efficient;
- Strategic cohesiveness (with other tripartite activities and those of other stakeholders);
- Likelihood that it will catalyze further action and results;

Should a concept note be approved by the Steering Committee, the concept note will move to the second phase which will entail the technical teams elaborating the concept note into a full programme proposal using the agreed, Programme Proposal template (Annex 4).

Each programme proposal should stipulate how much funding will be allocated to each Participating Organization to achieve results in line with standard UN budget headings.

Each programme proposal should include a component for monitoring and evaluation and reporting. Programme proposals will be submitted to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, where they will be reviewed.
by experts from the three Participating Organizations. Each Tripartite organization will identify its technical reviewers and the internal process for performing such review; the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will provide a consolidated review of the programme proposals using a standardized proposal review matrix (see Proposal Assessment Form in Annex 4). Selected programme proposals may be submitted to independent external technical experts for further review, if necessary.

The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will submit to the Steering Committee concept notes and programme proposals. The Steering Committee will determine all decisions on whether to:

- approve the concept note or proposal;
- approve the concept note or proposal conditionally, subject to modification and re-submission;
- defer the concept note or proposal, with comments for further consideration, or;
- reject the concept note or proposal.

Over the lifetime of the AMR MPTF there will balanced and equitable fund allocation among the Participating Organizations. Implementation of the activities included in the global programme are expected to be completed before the operational end date of the MPTF in effect at the time of the decision.

4.3.2. Allocation and fund transfer

The Steering Committee will discuss the concept notes or project proposals based on comments received from the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and make decisions for the allocation of available MPTF resources, which will be provided through a funding framework provided by the Administrative Agent. The funding framework will provide information on donor earmarking.

The Steering Committee must ensure that it makes funding allocations that do not contradict legal agreements with donors related to earmarked funding, and which take into account previous allocation decisions and performance. To enable the Steering Committee to make informed resource allocation decisions, the MPTF Office, as the administrative agent, will issue a funding framework to the Steering Committee through the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR at least five days prior to the Steering Committee meeting. The funding framework forms a necessary input into the fund allocation decision. It sets out the financial position of the AMR MPTF and the balance of funding available for programming. It includes information on earmarking (if any) to enable the Steering Committee to adhere to legally agreed stipulations about the use of funds and to enable prioritization decisions.

The Steering Committee makes allocations up to the programmable amount of the cash balance in the Fund. However, a pipeline of ready to implement proposals could be developed if considered relevant by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee may therefore also approve allocations that would become effective only when sufficient cash is available in the Fund. This situation, with approved but not yet funded proposals, must be stated in the meeting minutes and fund allocation matrix signed by the Steering Committee to evidence its approval.

As per Section 2, paragraph 5.3 of the Memorandum of Understanding, where the balance in the Fund Account on the date of a scheduled disbursement is insufficient to make that disbursement, the Administrative Agent will consult with the Steering Committee and make a disbursement, if any, in accordance with the Steering Committee’s decisions.

Should a Steering Committee exceptionally authorize an allocation in excess of the programmable cash balance of the MPTF, the Steering Committee must indicate which proposals should be prioritized for transfer pending the receipt of the anticipated donor deposit. Furthermore, should a multi-tranche proposal be approved, the full amount of the proposal must be included in the total allocation authorized, and the conditions for second and subsequent tranches to be transferred must be spelled out (such as via an annual request, or dependent on performance criteria). Second and subsequent tranches for transfer should be approved at future Steering Committee meetings once conditions have been met unless a formal written delegation is in place for the technical secretariat to make this decision.
The Steering Committee has the authority to allocate funding to joint programmes or projects that have a reasonable expectation of being operationally completed by the operational closure date of the MPTF, as established in the Terms of Reference and the Memorandums of Understanding which have been signed for the MPTF. Allocations cannot be made for projects where implementation is expected to continue beyond the operational end date of the MPTF in effect at the time of the decision. This forms part of the appraisal review conducted by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR.

The decisions will be recorded in the minutes of Steering Committee meetings.

Steering Committee allocation decisions are documented in the submission form of the proposals and must be signed and dated by the chairperson of the Steering Committee (AMR MPTF Approved Fund Allocation Matrix - Annex 5). Electronic signatures are also acceptable. If the electronic signature protocol is used, the email should be copied to Steering Committee members and have the fund transfer form document attached to the email.

The Administrative Agent will disburse funds based on the Fund Allocation Matrix signed by the chair of the AMR Steering Committee, and the programme document, including the harmonized budget categories, signed by the Participating Organizations receiving funds.

4.3.3. Standard workflow

The financial resources will be held by the Administrative Agent in a dedicated fund account. The funds in the account will be transferred to Participating Organizations at Headquarters level by the Administrative Agent based on instructions from the Steering Committee. The Participating Organizations will have to open ledger accounts to receive these funds.

The Participating Organizations, upon receipt of a confirmation of funds transfer into their ledger accounts, will implement projects/programs within the framework of the validated proposal.

To implement projects within the framework of a validated proposal, the Participating Organizations will transfer the funds to their respective technical departments or country/regional offices in charge of project implementation as detailed in the Guidance note on Programme Operationalization (Annex 6).

Each Participating Organization will use its own procedures to implement the funds.

Indirect costs of Participating Organizations will be 7%. All other costs incurred by each Participating Organization in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs.

The minimum size of individual transfers from the Administrative Agent to the Participating Organizations during the implementation phase should be at least $100,000 per individual transfer to reduce transaction costs. Transfers can be smaller during the last year of the programmatic framework, when the final round of allocations is made. It is recommended to limit the number of transfer rounds per year so that each project funded from the AMR MPTF receives funding at maximum only once per year.

4.3.4. Project revision, extension and closure

Project revision and extension

Revisions to programme work plans and budget will be made subsequent to the decisions of the annual/regular reviews by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR. The new work plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Steering Committee. Any substantive change in the programmatic scope or change in financial allocations (above 25% of the budget category) will require revision of the programme document and signature of all Participating Organizations involved.

If there are unforeseen circumstances, such as prolonged staff absence, that would require extension of their programmes, the Participating Organizations may request an extension through the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR at least, except relevant reasons, three months in advance. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will review the extension request and submit it to the Steering Committee for decision. Upon approval, the
Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will obtain the signature of the Steering Committee chairperson and submit it to the administrative agent for updating the project end date. Only extensions up to the operational end date of the fund will be considered.

**Project closure**

Operational closure refers to the programme operational end date as stipulated in the programme document approved by the Steering Committee. By that date, a programme must have completed all programmatic activities.

Participating Organizations or the lead agency shall submit the final narrative report, which should include an exit strategy, three months after the operational closure date.

It is possible for a Participating Organization to operationally close based on partial completion of the project where, for example, a ParticipatingOrganization is only involved in the early stages of the project. In these cases, the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR can declare a Participating Organization to have operationally closed even if the project continues (termed a “partially closed project”) on receipt of the final project report from the Participating Organization within one month of closure. This is a prerequisite to managing an efficient and cost-effective financial closure process.

The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will monitor operational end dates on a quarterly basis and request Participating Organizations to submit final reports (or advise extension within three months of closure). The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will request the Participating Organizations to submit documentation to the MPTF Office, including, as appropriate, (a) final Participating Organization narrative project report; (b) consolidated final joint programme narrative report; and (c) a list of projects that have been operationally closed by agencies.

Upon receipt, final narrative reports will be uploaded to the MPTF office gateway.

### 4.4. Reporting modalities

#### 4.4.1. Reporting to resource partners

The Administrative Agent will provide the following statements and reports to the donors and the Steering Committee, as described in the memorandum of understanding and the standard administrative arrangement:

- annual consolidated narrative progress reports;
- annual consolidated financial reports;
- annual and final financial statements;
- a final consolidated narrative report with a summary of the results and achievements compared to the goals and objectives of the Global Action Plan on AMR.

These reports will be based on submissions provided to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and the administrative agent by the FAO, OIE and WHO.

#### 4.4.2. Reporting by the FAO, OIE and WHO to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and the Administrative Agent

Each approved programme from the national programming cycle, and workstream of the global programme will provide a brief report to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR every three months using the quarterly reporting template. This will be used for lesson learning and resource mobilisation purposes.

The Participating Organization(s) will collectively provide the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR and the Administrative Agent with annual narrative progress reports (Annex 7) and final reports set against the MPTF results matrix (the final report will replace the annual report requirement for the final year of a project). The Participating Organizations will submit the narrative report to the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR for quality review, and once cleared, the secretariat will upload the reports to the MPTF Office Gateway.
The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will consolidate the project reports into a single narrative progress report for the Fund (Annex 8).

These annual and final reports will be results oriented and evidence based. The reports will give a summary of results and achievements and a comparison with projected results provided in the approved project document.

Both programmatic and financial performance indicators will be monitored at the outcome and output levels (programme and project levels). Every project will monitor its contribution to the key outcome indicators of the AMR MPTF Theory of Change. The output indicators may be specific for each project.

The final report of each project will also contain an analysis of how the outcomes and outputs are likely to contribute to the overall impact.

The prime responsibility for collecting data lies with the Participating Organizations and will be one of the key elements reflected in their annual report. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will be responsible for consolidating the narrative reports into a single fund narrative report, which will be consolidated with the financial report prepared by the MPTF Office.

4.4.3. Financial reports

The Participating Organizations will also provide annual and final financial reports and statements prepared in accordance with their accounting and reporting procedures, as agreed upon in the Memorandum of Understanding signed with the Administrative Agent.

The MPTF Office receives the following reports.

- Narrative programme progress report. A narrative report (Annex 7) is produced for each project. The report should be reviewed by the secretariat before it is uploaded to the MPTF Office Gateway on 31 March of each year.
- Financial progress report. Each participating organisation uploads financial information, as approved by the organisation, automatically into the MPTF Office’s financial system.

By 20 May of each year, the official financial information will be available on the MPTF Office Gateway. Participating organisations will be requested to review the figures and inform the MPTF Office of any explanations for discrepancies between the official information and financial information kept locally.

**Table 1. Report schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report name</th>
<th>Coordinating author or consolidator</th>
<th>Approving authority</th>
<th>Deadline (reporting period: 01/01 – 31/12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated annual progress report (including narrative and financial reports)</td>
<td>MPTF Office</td>
<td>MPTFO Executive Coordinator</td>
<td>31 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Fund narrative and financial report</td>
<td>MPTF Programme Manager</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>20 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated financial portion</td>
<td>MPTF Office</td>
<td>MPTF Office</td>
<td>18 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated narrative portion</td>
<td>MPTF Programme Manager</td>
<td>Tripartite Senior Management</td>
<td>30 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial project progress/final report</td>
<td>Participating Organizations</td>
<td>MPTF Programme Manager, reviewed by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR</td>
<td>30 April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. Monitoring & Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities funded under the AMR MPTF Global Programme shall be undertaken in accordance with the Global Programme Document (to be approved by Steering Committee), and the annual plans under the global component of the MPTF (to be approved by Steering Committee).

The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will be responsible for consolidating the data reported by the FAO, OIE and WHO, together with the reported financial expenditure (Annex 7, Annual narrative progress report). This tool will be used by the Steering Committee to review the overall progress against expected results and assess the achievement of performance targets (see results matrix).

M&E will take place at national project proposal component level with detailed M&E plans forming a core component of the full project proposal. National project M&E frameworks will be aligned to the MPTF Theory of Change and Results Matrix at Output and Outcome indicator level. At national level the M&E framework and any evaluations that take place will be managed at national level. The aggregation of results and the need for external evaluations will be managed at the national level. National programmes will be monitored and evaluated against the respective country programme documents (to be approved by the Steering Committee), workplans and corresponding results-based frameworks. Depending on the size of such programmes, country-level evaluations or programme reviews may be required.

An evaluation of the AMR Global Programme – at Fund level – shall be undertaken within the initial period 2019-2024 in accordance with the guidance from the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG), focused on attributing impact and results as per the Theory of Change. Participating Organizations will share information and progress updates on accomplishments achieved, as well as undertake joint monitoring and evaluation, where appropriate. The evaluation will make specific recommendations to the Steering Committee for the revision of the objectives based on the underlying theory of change.

5. Accountability Framework

5.1. Audit

The Administrative Agent and implementing partners will be audited in accordance with their organizational financial regulations and rules and, in the case of UN Participating Organizations, with the Framework for Joint Internal Audits of UN Joint Activities, which has been agreed to by the Internal Audit Services of Participating UN Organizations and endorsed by the UN Development Group in 2014.

The corresponding external reports will be disclosed publicly unless the relevant policies and procedures of each of the relevant Participating Organization provide otherwise.

5.2. Public Disclosure

The Participating Organizations and the Administrative Agent will ensure that MPTF operations are disseminated on the Administrative Agent’s website. Information posted on the website will include contributions received and their sources, funds transferred, annual expenditures, summaries of proposed and approved projects, the workplan, MPTF progress reports and Steering Committee minutes.

The Tripartite will take appropriate measures to advocate for and increase awareness of the need to combat against AMR using a One Health approach. Information shared with the press regarding fund beneficiaries, official notices, reports and publications will acknowledge the role of the MPTF. More specifically, the administrative agent will ensure that the role of the contributors is fully acknowledged in all external communications related to the MPTF.
5.2.1. Visibility: editorial and production arrangements, use of logos

The development of a specific logo for the AMR MPTF is not envisaged. The editorial and production arrangements shall align with the articles outlined in the Tripartite Co-Publishing Agreement last signed by all Participating Organizations on 20 December 2017 (see Annex 9).

Similarly, and as described in the aforesaid Co-Publishing Agreement, the logos of all Parties will be printed in alphabetical order, in accordance with the approved Tripartite logoblock in English, French and Spanish (see Annex 10).

5.3. Settlement of Disputes

The Participating Organizations and Administrative Agent will use their best efforts to promptly settle through direct negotiations any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or in connection with the Memorandums of Understanding or any breach thereof. Any such dispute, controversy or claim which is not settled within sixty (60) days from the date either participant has notified the other participant of the nature of the dispute, controversy or claim and of the measures which should be taken to rectify it, will be resolved through consultation between the Executive Heads of each of the participants.

5.4. Privileges and Immunities

All three Tripartite agencies have agreements with government that allow them to operate within the country, and in general the programme activities should be carried out in accordance with each agencies systems and practices. FAO and WHO as UN agencies have certain diplomatic privileges and immunities for staff and those working on the project, and may have exemption from import and sales duties for project activities and assistance with customs clearance. This means that it may be advantageous for FAO and WHO to manage the procurement of items for the programme, particularly if importation may be complex or costly. In exceptional circumstances, if it is felt that diplomatic privileges and immunities may be important for OIE staff members or consultants for a particular activity, FAO or WHO can provide them with an honorary contract, which would then give them the same privileges and immunities as UN agency staff in line with the provisions of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies.

5.5. Modification and Closure of Fund

The Steering Committee will be able to modify any of the provisions of the Terms of Reference, including the duration of the Fund. The Fund will have an initial duration of five years (August 2019 - December 2024).

The below table provides an overview of final dates based on the Fund end date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final date for allocation decisions</td>
<td>31 October 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final date for fund transfer to projects</td>
<td>1 January 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational end date for all projects</td>
<td>31 December 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final narrative report for all projects</td>
<td>30 April 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final financial statements for all projects</td>
<td>31 May 2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Steering Committee can revise the date for the operational closure of the fund. The Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR takes lead in the operational closure of the Fund by monitoring the operational closure dates of the projects on a semi-annual basis and following up with the Participating Organizations to submit final narrative reports one month after the operational end date of the project. Projects are operationally closed when all activities have been completed, and the final narrative report is received. The final narrative report is submitted to the Administrative Agent who will change the project status to operationally closed.

Project closure should be initiated in such a way as to permit the orderly conclusion of the activities and the completion of final reports, the withdrawal of personnel, funds and property, the settlement of accounts
between the Administrative Agent and Participating Organizations, and the settlement of contractual liabilities that are required in respect of any subcontractors, consultants or suppliers.

Any balance remaining in the individual Participating Organizations’ separate ledger accounts after operational completion of the activities for which they are responsible under the approved programmatic document will be returned to the Fund Account as soon as administratively feasible and before financial closure. Any balance remaining in the Fund Account upon completion of the Fund will be used for a purpose mutually agreed upon or returned to the donor(s) in proportion to their contribution to the Fund as decided upon by the donor(s) and the Steering Committee. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Administrative Agent and Participating Organizations will expire upon the delivery to the donor(s) of the certified final financial statement.
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## Annex 1. Result Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs &amp; Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.</strong> Improved countries capacities for designing and implementing AMR related policy frameworks, investment plans and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator**

1.a Number of countries that have established a fully functional One Health Multi-sectoral Coordination Group (MCG). (Ref. TrACSS 4.1.D)

**Country indicator:** Fully functional One Health Multi-sectoral Coordination Group (MCG) established. (Ref. TrACSS 54.1D)

**Definition:**

Fully functional defined as below:

- A mechanism to coordinate the actions across ministries on addressing AMR
- Clear representations of the key stakeholders related to AMR/AMU with determined lead ministry/ministries and dedicated funding to support its operations.
- Meeting regularly and minimum twice a year
- Key stakeholders include human health, animal (terrestrial and aquatic) health, environment, food, including plant food production and plant health

1.b Number of countries where the regulatory framework has been reviewed in line with the international standards on AMU and AMR, including antimicrobials used as pesticides. (Ref. TrACSS 9.2&GAP M&E Framework)

**Country indicator:** The regulatory framework has been reviewed in line with the related international standards (e.g. OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes, Codex Alimentarius) on AMU and AMR, including antimicrobials used as pesticides. (Ref. TrACSS 9.2 &GAP M&E Framework)

**Definition:**

National regulatory framework: refers to national policies and legislation;

International standards and guidance refer to internationally approved documents containing clear guidance for countries and other stakeholders.
This indicator takes into consideration international standards in areas related to human health, animal health (terrestrial and aquatic), food safety, plant health and all dimensions of environmental protection, that directly impact on AMR.

The review activities include at least one of the following:
- Analyse the regulatory framework to identify potential gaps and weaknesses
- Develop a work plan to fill existing regulatory gaps and weaknesses

1.c Number of countries that have developed or updated operational plan for implementing national action plans on AMR (NAP) with associated budget consideration (Ref. TrACSS5,D)

Country indicator: Operational plan for implementing national action plan on AMR developed or updated with associated the budget consideration.

Definition:
The operational plan should
- Include responsible parties, time bound actions and the consideration of resources and budgeting.
- The development or updating of an operational plan should include consideration of the resourcing and budget requirements for delivery.

Output 2. Improved countries capacities for mainstreaming and for costing AMR as well as changes in practices to minimize AMR

2.a Number of countries that have established or reviewed National Action Plan on AMR (NAP) with the estimation of the annual costs of the implementation. (Ref. TrACSS 5D)

Country indicator: National Action Plan on AMR (NAP) with the estimation of the costs of the implementation of the NAP by year have been established or reviewed. (Ref. TrACSS 5D)

2.b Number of countries that have undertaken the assessment of investment needs, existing resource finance and funding gaps for implementing National Action Plan with the involvement of all relevant sectors. (Ref. TrACSS 5E and GAP M&E Framework)

Country indicator: Assessment of investment needs, existing resource finance and funding gaps for implementing National Action Plan conducted with the involvement of all relevant
sectors. (Ref. TrACSS 5E and GAP M&E Framework)

2.c Number and list of studies or analysis developed to identify the costing for AMR interventions.

Definition:
Please provide the list of studies or analysis

Output 3. Engagement plans with critical stakeholder groups implemented

3.a Number of countries that have undertaken AMR focused stakeholder analysis

3.b Number and list of stakeholders’ engagement plans developed and/or implemented at the national level

Definition:
- Stakeholder analysis is a systematic and comprehensive analysis, across sectors of the actors and organisations that have, or may have influence on policies and activities related to AMR and antimicrobials use
- Key stakeholders are identified through stakeholder analysis (e.g. value chain analyses, knowledge practice and attitudes surveys, other surveys for contextualization of AMR situation in specific stakeholders)
- Plans for engaging with key stakeholders shall lay out the initiatives including dialogue among the key stakeholders in tackling AMR

Output 4. Systems for generating, analysing and interpreting data on resistance and consumption/use patterns developed or strengthened

4.a Number of countries where multisectoral Co-ordination Group (MCG) is supported by the Tripartite to review the data and data quality on AMU/AMC and/or AMR in relevant sectors, and consider the need to adapt the delivery of national strategies

Definition:
- National strategies: the strategies for addressing AMR
- Regularly review: at least once a year
- Relevant sectors include but not limited to human health, animal health, environment, food, and plant health sectors
- Data could be from national surveillance system or studies etc.

4.b Number of countries showing an increased and/or maintained number of targeted laboratories have the capacity to perform antimicrobial susceptibility testing and/or bacterial isolation and identification according to international standards.

Country indicator: Percentage of targeted laboratories with capacity to perform antimicrobial susceptibility testing and bacterial isolation and identification according to international standards.

Definition: targeted laboratories involved in the national AMR surveillance system in the food and agricultural sectors. Some labs are targeted to perform bacterial isolation and identification and others to perform also AST.

4.c Number of national monitoring systems supported for AMC/AMU or number of national surveillance system supported for AMR

Country indicator

National surveillance system for AMR supported in human health, animal health, plant health, food and environment

National system for monitoring AMC/AMU supported in human health, animal health, plant health and food

Definition
Support include but not limited the development of or conducting training, SOPs, Guidelines.

National surveillance system: could be by sector or integrated

Output 5. Systems for biosecurity and IPC strengthened in targeted countries

5.a Number of national plans that are developed or reviewed to ensure good production practices (Ref TrACSS 8.2)
**Definition:**

National plan aims for promoting good health, management and hygiene practices to reduce the use of antimicrobials and minimize development and transmission of AMR in animal production (terrestrial and aquatic) and human health.

---

5. b Number of countries that are supported to implement and/or scale up minimum requirements for infection prevention for food production, in accordance with international standards (GAP M&E Framework 3.d).

**Definition:**

Good practices include but not limited to husbandry, biosecurity, and IPM programmes (Integrated Pest Management)

International standards include but not limited to:

- OIE
  - Terrestrial Code
  - Aquatic Code

- Codex Alimentarius:  
  - Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding

---

5.c Number and list of national IPC programme developed/strengthened in line with core components for IPC (Ref. GAP M&E)

Country indicator: National IPC programme supported in line with IPC core components (TrACSS 8.1 D)

**Definition:**

national IPC programme/intervention shall

- be developed based on the guidelines/curriculum
- have the aim of promoting biosecurity, hygiene

**Core component:** [https://www.who.int/infection-prevention/tools/core-components/en/](https://www.who.int/infection-prevention/tools/core-components/en/)

---

5.d Number of countries supported to conduct key stakeholders (e.g. veterinarians, farmers, health workers) training for the scaled-up implementation of national IPC
programme/interventions.

Output 6: Systems for optimized use strengthened in critical sectors

6.a Number and list of countries that developed, revised or updated regulatory framework for antimicrobials use for critical sectors (GAP M&E Framework 4.a, 4.b and 4.c)

Country indicator: Regulatory framework for human and veterinary medical products are developed or updated.

Country indicator: regulatory framework for antimicrobials for critical sectors developed, revised or updated.

Definition:
Critical sectors can be identified by the countries based on the country priorities.

Regulatory framework should:
- Cover all stages of the cycle (manufacture, supply, sale, use, disposal)
- Meet other requirements in the OIE and Codex Alimentarius standards
- Regulatory framework shall cover human health, animal (terrestrial and aquatic) health, plant health, food safety and environment

6.b Number and list of legal regulatory instruments that have been revised or developed based on international standards.

Country indicator: Guidelines for responsible and prudent use of antimicrobials based on international standards are developed or revised.

Output 7. Improved countries capacities to design targeted awareness/Behaviour Change raising initiatives

7.a Number of countries that are supported in delivering of nationwide AMR campaign targeting priority stakeholder groups based on stakeholder analysis and targeted messaging within sectors (TrACSS 6.1 D)
7.b Number and list of communications strategies developed, or implemented to support improved capability for communication and behaviour change initiatives on AMR. (TrACSS 6.1 E)

**Definition:**

Communication strategies means a clear strategic approach to communicate with key stakeholders on AMR based on utilizing most effective media (e.g. newsletters, digital platform, tools etc.), including monitoring.

**Output 8. Evidence-based and cost-effective priority actions developed for different contexts**

**8.a Number and list of studies are undertaken to support prioritization of actions on addressing AMR (To be reviewed and expanded)**

**Definition:** Actions should be in line with NAP

**Output 9. Strategic global-level governance advocacy initiatives on AMR implemented**

**9.a Number of global initiatives for high level advocacy (To be reviewed and expanded)**

**Definition:**

Global initiatives include but not limited to: the establishment of Global Leaders Group on AMR; advocacy conveyed by the global leaders group

---

**Outcome & Indicators**

**Outcome 1. Risks of AMR and the benefits of addressing them reflected in national budgets**
and in development/multi-lateral partner sector-wide investments

**Indicator**

1.a Number of countries that include AMR within United Nations Sustainable Development and Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF)

1.b Number of countries that have functional monitoring and evaluation framework on National Action Plan in place. (TrACSS 5.1)

**Definition**

Functional Monitoring and Evaluation Framework:
- Generate Monitoring report annually to improve decision making
- Is in line with GAP M&E framework

1.c Number of countries that include their AMR response in national budget and national development plan.

**Criteria:** At least two ministries build AMR into their budget

---

**Outcome 2. Increased comprehensiveness and quality of the policy dialogue and practice**

2.a Number of countries whose AMR Multi-sectoral Coordination mechanisms engage with a broad range of relevant partners

**Definition:**

Relevant partners include but not limited to
- local government
- civil society/ Faith-based groups
- private sector
- research and academia

---

**Outcome 3. Evidence base/representative data on AMR/AMU improved for policy-makers and sectors implementing AMU practices**

3.a Number of countries whose Multisectoral Coordination Group (MCG) reviews and uses data on AMU/AMC and/or AMR across relevant sectors to strengthen policy and practice.

**Definitions**

- Data shall be in a clear and meaningful format.
- Data shall reflect the resent situation (within the last two years, unless demonstrating
historical trends)

Data can be sourced from government systems, academia or private sector

- Data could include: Consumption or use of antimicrobials in the human sector, Use in animals or plant productions
- Resistance of bacteria in humans, animals, plant, food and environment.
- Data can be used to inform policies, priorities, guidelines or advocacy materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.b Number of countries showing an increased capacity of targeted laboratories in FAO Assessment Tool for Laboratories and AMR Surveillance Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country indicator: Percentage of targeted laboratories reaching PIP 3 in FAO Assessment Tool for Laboratories and AMR Surveillance Systems (FAO-ATLASS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- targeted laboratories: laboratories involved in the national AMR surveillance system in the food and agriculture animal and plant production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased capacity means the targeted laboratories improved their FAO-ATLASS PIP stage to PIP 3 and above. For example, a laboratory reached PIP 3 or a laboratory went from PIP 3 to 4.

- FAO-ATLASS PIP 3: Laboratories have the capacity to test in a standardized manner some samples for AST on few pathogens and to manage biological material and data with basic quality assurance procedures. Challenges may exist in the laboratory for the financial autonomy or the management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.c Number of countries that review and use data on levels and trends in sales/imports/use of antimicrobials in food producing animals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition methodology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) total volume of sales, imports (or use) in mg/kg biomass, in food producing animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) percentage of total sales/imports (or use) classified by antimicrobial class. (GAP M&amp;E Framework 4.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.d Number of countries that submit data for SDG monitoring indicator 3.d.2: Proportion of patients with bloodstream infections due to selected antimicrobial resistant organisms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition: Data submitted within the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outcome 4. Use of antimicrobials optimized in critical sectors |
4.a. Proportion of antibiotics consumed in the human sector that are in the Access category (Ref TRACSS 9.1.1)

4.b Percentage of antimicrobials intended for use in food-producing animals by antimicrobial classes (Ref GAP M&E Framework 2.b.4)

4.c Number of countries that implemented one or more (additional) international instruments on AMR.

**Definition:** Implementable instruments are those that give standards or provide for mechanisms that lead to direct regulatory or policy change. This excludes action plans or declarations etc.

*e.g. Policy/Regulation on: Governance, Antimicrobial Use, Prevention of Infections, Surveillance and Monitoring, environment*

**Outcome 5. Improved understanding of AMR risks and response options by targeted groups**

5.a Number of national wide targeted awareness campaigns that are established (TrACSS 6.1)

**Definition:**

National wide

- The scale of the initiative should at the national level

Targeted awareness campaign shall include the following factors:

- Identify targeted group e.g. health worker, pharrmers, veterinarian
- Tailored the message based on the risk factors identified by survey or study

5.b Number of countries that have improved understanding of AMR risks and response options by targeted groups shown by validated instruments

**Outcome 6. Multi-sectoral coordination strengthened at national level**

6.a Number of countries that adopt an integrated approach to implement the national action plan on AMR (TrACSS 4.1 Ex)

**Definition:**
- **Integrated approach** should involve two or more sectors working together in specific activities to achieve a shared deliverable. Integration can be between human health, animal health, plant health, food and environmental sectors.

- **The implementation** should be reviewed on a yearly basis, which produce lessons for adapting the implementation strategy for the following year.

- Details of integrated approaches shall be provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 7. Momentum on Global AMR Agenda sustained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.a number of global and regional economic community discussions that addressed AMR issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition:**

Global and regional economic community discussion include but not limited to G20, G77, ASEAN, SADC, AU etc.

| 7.b The level of multi-lateral development bank and fund investment in AMR |

- **Guidance on logic framework formulation**

**Log frame** is a mandatory part of the proposal, which is intended for outlining:

- **Where do we want to be:** the short-term (outputs), medium term (outcomes) and long-term results the project will deliver by implementing its activities.

- **How will we know we have got there:** the performance indicators associated with each result and their
  - means of verification, e.g. data source for the performance indicators
  - initial (baseline) and expected values (targets)

- **What may stop us from getting there:** the critical assumptions, e.g. the necessary conditions for the achievement of results

- **Where do we want to be**

**Results** are defined as changes which derive from activities conducted and inputs employed. Hence the activities themselves are not results and therefore are **not** part of the log frame.

The results the Tripartite is aiming to achieve have already been identified and are presented in the Tripartite Results Matrix see Figure 1 and Appendix 3. This means that you are NOT requested to formulate the outputs, outcomes and impacts for your projects. Rather you are requested to choose the ones that apply most to your needs and context.

---

5 Bibliography: *Results Reporting Guidelines (EFTA, EEA and Norway Grants); FAO Handbook on the Logical Framework Approach* (January 2010); *Results-based Management for International Assistance Programming*. 
How do we measure the progress

Each outcome and outputs require one or more indicators.

Indicators are means to measure achievement/change produced by the intervention, or to help assess a development.

They must be specific, observable and come from reliable data.

The indicators need to be SMART:

- **Specific**: Clearly defines what is being counted/measured
- **Measurable**: Clearly define how the indicator will be measured.
- **Achievable**: You can actually measure the indicator.
- **Relevant**: Must be related to the output or outcome.
- **Time-bound**: Have a clear time for collecting the information (Monthly? Biannually? Annually).

![Indicators - overview](image)
Core indicators for each of the outputs and outcomes have been suggested by the secretariat. Where it is possible it would be helpful to use these indicators to design your monitor and evaluation framework, as this will make aggregation of results and global reporting easier.

Meanwhile, we would like to receive feedback from countries on the core indicators we provided. For example, why you didn’t select some of the indicators; data are not available? Not applicable to the activities planned or hard to measure due to the lack of staff, information sharing. The feedback will help us to further improve the core indicators.

Because country contexts and approaches vary, and therefore we encourage countries to develop no more than two additional indicators for each output.

**Types of indicators**

**Quantitative indicators** are variables that measure results in one of the following terms:

- Number or proportion/percentage:
  - Example: number engagement plans have been implemented/proportion of stakeholders groups with implemented engagement plans

  Use (preferably) numbers for outputs and proportions/percentages for outcomes – you can often use your outputs as denominators for your outcomes
  
  Example: Number of people reached through AMR awareness campaigns (output indicators); Proportion of surveyed respondents showing changed behavior on AMR
  
  Example: infection rate per 100,000 population

- Average
  - Example: average reporting time, calculated on a given timeframe

- Level (on a predefined scale, e.g as 1-5)
  - Example: number of countries scoring at level 3 or above in the design capacity index (whereby capacity index is composed of weighted parameters describing the country’s capacity of designing awareness, BC and educational interventions)

**Qualitative indicators**: judgements, opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards a given situation or subject. They can include changes in sensitivity, satisfaction, influence, awareness, understanding, attitudes, quality, perception, dialogue, etc. Most qualitative indicators can be expressed in quantitative (numerical) terms (Proportion of people/employees/groups demonstrating/self-reporting a high level of awareness on AMR).

**Binary indicators** - presence or absence of the measurement variable with a simple ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Example: ‘Database on AMU developed” could be an output indicator where the reported value is simply ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

**Baseline and targets**

Without knowing the starting and end point, we cannot measure progress. Each indicator should have a starting value (based on available evidence) and intermediate or end value (based on projected change). The differential between the starting and the end value is the measure of the change produced by the intervention as measured through the indicator.
Regardless of the type, each indicator should have a baseline and target values. The attached is an example in order to be useful. If it’s not possible to collect baseline data, in some cases, you can indicate the baseline "N/A" which can mean that you simply don’t know or cannot gather baseline information.

Means of verification

In order to assess whether an indicator is feasible you have to ascertain a source of data for it. If you are not able to identify a tangible source of data or if retrieving the data is too difficult/costly, then you should reconsider the indicator.

Questions to be asked when specifying the data sources:

- What evidence do we need?
- Where will the evidence be located?
- How are we going to collect it?
  - Is it available from existing sources? (e.g. progress reports, records, accounts, national or international statistics, etc)
  - Is special data gathering required? (e.g. special surveys)
- Who is going to collect it? (e.g. the project team, consultants, stakeholders etc)
- Who will pay for its collection?
- When/how regularly it should be provided (e.g. monthly, quarterly annually)
- How much data gathering (in terms of quantity and quality) is worthwhile?

Some typical data sources include:

- Minutes of meetings and attendance lists
- Soft copies of products developed (strategies, manuals, etc.)
- Stakeholder feedback, results of focus groups
- Surveys and reports
- Newspapers, radio and TV recordings, photographs, satellite imagery
- National and international statistics
- Project records, reviews and reports

How to select indicators

Indicators design should focus on the effects an intervention has had for the intermediaries or end beneficiaries.

Example 1

If you are carrying an awareness-raising campaign, it is the effects of the campaign that count. While it is important to measure how many people were reached by the campaign (output), it is even more important
to measure how many have increased their knowledge and/or changed attitude behavior as a result of a campaign (outcome).

Example 2
If you are supporting a laboratory, it is important to focus on the effects on lab’s capability as a result of your support. This means that at the output level you can count the number of services/products you delivered to enhance lab’s capability (trainings/people trained, protocols/guidelines/plans designed, equipment provided). At the outcome level though you should capture the extent of improvements (e.g. reduced time for sample turnaround or improved quality of diagnosis) or number of labs improved (ex. Number of labs with improved PT testing or with improved biosafety/biosecurity and/or QA scores)

IMPORTANT:

1. **use indicators sparingly** (two good ones per each output or outcome are sufficient)! They should reflect what is MOST STRATEGIC to showcase as change (to funding partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and trigger COSTS in terms of time and data collection.
2. Consider the data availability and feasibility of collection when selecting an indicator
3. If there is no time or money to design and collect data on score and indexes, identify proxy measures that can capture. Proxy indicators measure change indirectly and may be used if results:
   - are not directly observable like the quality of life, organizational development or institutional capacity
   - are directly measurable only at high cost which is not justified
   - are measurable only after long periods of time beyond the life span of the project.

Example: you can select one specific question from a post-campaign survey to construct a proxy for the outcome Improved understanding of AMR risk and response options by targeted groups – Number of stakeholders who responded that they will not use antibiotics in xyz cases even if available without prescription.

4. An indicator should be expressed in **neutral terms**, not indicating the direction of change (increase or decrease), nor embedding a target.

   *For example, “An increase of 30% of AMR provisions in the national budgets/sector-wide investments,” should be reformulated to “Percent of budgets/sector-wide investments with AMR provisions incorporated as a result of the Tripartite actions.” The direction (increase) will be evident from comparing the baseline (2%, for example) with the target (20%, for example).*

What may stop us from getting there - Assumptions

Identifying constraining factors and conditions that need to be in place is the last step in designing a logframe.

Assumptions are hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of development intervention. Since assumptions are conditions that remain after mitigatory measures have been put in place, in order to formulate the assumptions you need to:

1. **Formulate** the risks
2. **Identify** their mitigation measures.
3. **Distinguish** between risks that can be mitigated by the project designer and those external to the project.
4. The risk that can be mitigated should be captured in the project design and/or implementation strategy – **do not consider as assumption**

5. The risks that cannot be mitigated should be flipped into positive statements and turned into assumptions - **consider as assumption** and include in the logframe Column 6

At least one assumption should be formulated for each output and outcome as condition/s that should be in place in order to enable the realization of outputs or outcomes.

**Example:**

Formulating assumptions for the outcome *Multi-sectoral coordination strengthened at national level*

**Scenario 1**

1. Risk – lack of focal points in the key Ministries
2. Mitigation measure: identify the focal points (within project sphere of influence)
3. Include in the project an activity on identifying the focal points in collaboration with the host government
4. This cannot be considered as an assumption since the risk can be mitigated by project designers.

**Scenario 2**

1. Risk – existing focal points are not sufficiently motivated (as a result of a decreased momentum or competing Government agendas) to coordinate AMR activities
2. Mitigation measures: outside of the project sphere of influence
3. This can be considered as an assumption and should be re-written in positive and include in the logframe: *Momentum on AMR remains high; there are no competing Government agendas that detract incentives from the coordination on AMR;*
Annex 2. Risk Management Log

The following risk ranking matrix captures the hierarchy of risks, allowing an assessment of the most appropriate responses to the identified risks, particularly to those risks most likely to impede success (very high and high).

**Probability/likelihood:** Very Likely (5), Likely (4), Possible (3), Unlikely (2), Rare (1)

**Impact:** Insignificant (1), Minor (2), Moderate (3), Major (4), Extreme (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Impact/Probability</th>
<th>Countermeasures / Management response</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | COVID-19 restrictions delay operations and delivery                          | Financial          | 1. Major programme elements are delayed
Probability: Very Likely (5) (3)
Impact: Moderate (3)  
2. COVID-19 mitigation measures add to the cost of projects and the overall programme, particularly at country level
Probability: Very Likely (5)  
Impact: Moderate (3) | Mitigation measures planned up-front in each proposal – converting activities to respect government restrictions in movement and social distancing  
Early discussion and alerts to resource partners and Steering Committee | AMR MPTF Steering committee  
Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR  
Country and Global Project Coordinators |
| 2  | AMR MPTF does not mobilize sufficient financial resources to reach optimal operational levels | Financial          | 1. The AMR Tripartite Workplan operates below full capacity
Probability: Possible (3)  
Impact: Moderate (3)  
2. The Fund is unable to generate sufficient revenue to cover secretariat costs
Probability: Unlikely (2)  
Impact: Moderate (3) | Concerted and high level outreach/ strategic dialogue with partners  
Resource Mobilization Strategy & Action Plan  
Support and advocacy provided by the initial donors | AMR MPTF Steering committee  
Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR |
| 3  | AMR not supported sufficiently by each Organization as a core issue/mandate  | Political          | 1. Insufficient high-level visibility
Probability: Possible (3)  
Impact: Major (4)  
2. Insufficient core resources apportioned to AMR teams
Probability: Unlikely (2)  
Impact: Major (4) | Maintain AMR visibility and results, keep high on the agenda and include regular reports to governance structures | Each member of the Tripartite |
| 4  | Weak involvement of participating organizations in the AMR MPTF             | Programmatic       | 1. The Fund is unable to draw from participating organizations’ expertise to develop and deliver quality integrated policy and technical services
Probability: Unlikely (2)  
Impact: Extreme (5)  
2. The Fund is unable to achieve its objective of tripartite collaboration
Probability: Possible (3)  
Impact: Major (4) | Regular Communications, workplanning and strategic mtgs | AMR MPTF Programme Manager  
Joint Tripartite Secretariat  
Country and Global Project Coordinator s |
| 5  | Fund does not leverage longer term resources for sustainability of results, beyond the lifespan of the AMR | Programmatic       | 1. The Fund is unable leverage IFIs, Domestic resources and Private Sector actors to continue actions and leading to the scaling-up and sustainability of results, particularly at country level | Clear action plan to engage firm buy-in and ownership at country level to ensure sustainability of results, at global and | AMR MPTF Steering committee  
Joint Tripartite |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Impact/Probability</th>
<th>Countermeasures / Management response</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPTF</td>
<td>MPTF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probability: Possible (3) Impact: Extrem (5)</td>
<td>country levels</td>
<td>Secretariat on AMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund implementation is delayed due to decisions and changes introduced by</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>1. AMR MPTF implementation is delayed Probability: Possible (3) Impact: Major (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country and Global Project Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government counterparts</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
<td>2. AMR MPTF funds remain unspent Probability: Unlikely (2) Impact: Major (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fund implementation is delayed due to constraints with administration</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
<td>1. AMR MPTF funds is not received in due time Probability: Unlikely (2) Impact:</td>
<td>Effective secretariat and network of technical support to ensure delivery</td>
<td>AMR MPTF Programme Manger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Tripartite Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>2. AMR MPTF implementation is delayed (see COVID-19 risks as outlined above)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country and Global Project Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probability: Possible (3) Impact: Moderate (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. AMR MPTF funds remain unspent Probability: Unlikely (2) Impact: Moderate (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AMR MPTF Results undermined due to poor quality of policy and technical</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
<td>1. Quality of AMR MPTF results undermined Probability: Unlikely (2) Impact: Major</td>
<td>Coordinated support to country teams and regular communications and workplan monitoring for bottlenecks</td>
<td>AMR MPTF Programme Manger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support provided at country level</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Tripartite Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. AMR MPTF reputation is compromised Probability: Unlikely (2) Impact: Extreme (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country and Global Project Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AMR MPTF funding is mis-managed</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
<td>1. AMR MPTF compromised and potentially put on hold Probability: Unlikely (2)</td>
<td>Financial accountability and safeguards</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Impact: Extreme (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operationa l</td>
<td>2. AMR MPTF and Tripartite’s reputation is compromised Probability: Unlikely (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPTFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact: Extreme (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3. Risk Assessment Tool

This template permits the collection of information on potential partner private sector entities, helps to evaluate whether or not the AMR MPTF should pursue engaging in a partnership with the private sector entity for a financial contribution.

This template contains the practical steps to be followed to reach a decision on a given partnership. The risk assessment (the tool as outlined) will be facilitated and initially compiled by the Fund Coordination Team, and then be reviewed by each Organization according to their own Private Sector Due Diligence policies and procedures. Any decision to engage in a Private Sector partnership will be agreed by consensus – that is, the Tripartite and the Administrative Agent agrees that the private sector entity passes their due diligence assessment.

This risk Assessment is a mandatory requirement for any type of partnership between the AMR MPTF and a private sector entity. Special attention should be paid to complete it well in advance of the planned partnership.

Content of this document:
- Collate background information.
- Step 1: Assess the Private sector entity against AMR MPTF Exclusionary Criteria.
- Step 2: Research Potential Controversies.
- Step 3: Assess the Private sector entity Commitment to ESG and the Partnership Risks and Benefits.
- Step 4: Make a Decision.
- Step 5: Monitor and Prepare Communication Materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collate Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private sector entity information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the private sector entity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details of AMR MPTF’s main contact(s) at the private sector entity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector entity description / background:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling private sector entity and subsidiaries:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries / regions of operation of the private sector entity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual turnover in US$:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility of the information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships between AMR MPTF staff and the private sector entity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN partner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does AMR MPTF currently have, or has it previously had, any relationship with the private sector entity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If yes, please briefly explain in the comment box the nature of the relationship with the private sector entity.

Comments: [Comments]

## Level of due diligence

The risk assessment needs to be completed for any potential partnership with a private sector entity. If the private sector entity is a general participant in an AMR MPTF event, no risk assessment needs to be done. For major event panelists it is recommended that the exclusionary criteria are checked. For any other type of engagement, the due diligence needs to be done as defined in the “Level of Due Diligence” matrix (either limited or full due diligence).

Select the appropriate level of due diligence to be applied from the table below (several types of partnership may apply, select all that are applicable).

### NB: Note that for private sector partnerships that involve funding, the funding stream must also be reviewed to ensure compliance with AMR MPTF’s Social and Environmental Standards, including through AMR MPTF’s Social and Environmental Screening Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of activity of the private sector entity Type of partnership</th>
<th>Low-risk</th>
<th>High-risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and policy dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilization / Private sector entity providing financial resources to AMR MPTF to implement the Workplan ≤ US$100,000 (total contribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilization / Private sector entity providing financial resources to AMR MPTF to implement the Workplan &gt;US$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core business for inclusive market development (programmatic joint initiative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations (e.g. pro-bono provision of technology to support a MR MPTF project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational partnerships (broader collective partnerships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the planned collaboration:

Comments: [Comments]

### Step 1: Assess the Private sector entity against AMR MPTF Exclusionary Criteria

#### 1.1 Exclusionary criteria

The AMR MPTF cannot be engaged with private sector entities involved in the below mentioned exclusionary criteria. The thresholds have also been defined for parent companies, subsidiaries and supply chain, remember to also check any potential issues with them. If any evidence is found, the issue needs to be compared with the exclusionary criteria
matrix and defined whether the evidence is within or above the exclusionary criteria threshold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Evidence above threshold</th>
<th>Evidence within threshold</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture, sale or distribution of controversial weapons or their components, including cluster bombs, anti-personnel mines, biological or chemical weapons or nuclear weapons.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture, sale or distribution of armaments and/or weapons or their components, including military supplies and equipment.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replica weapons marketed to children.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture, sale or distribution of tobacco or tobacco products.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violations of UN sanctions and the relevant conventions, treaties, and resolutions, and inclusion in UN ineligibility lists or AMR MPTF vendor sanctions list.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the manufacture, sale and distribution of pornography.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture, sale or distribution of substances subject to international bans or phase-outs, and wildlife or products regulated under the CITES.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling including casinos, betting etc. (excluding lotteries with charitable objectives).</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of human rights or complicity in human rights violations.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use or toleration of forced or compulsory labor.</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


7. There is no threshold option as AMR MPTF will not, under any circumstances, partner with a private sector entity that has activities related to controversial weapons.

8. Initiatives and activities with private sector entities falling under the auspices of the Montreal Protocol; and the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions on Ozone depleting substances, POPs and Mercury respectively, will not be covered under this policy but under their specific guidelines.

9. CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) is an international agreement between governments. Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. [http://www.cites.org](http://www.cites.org)
Use or toleration of child labor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Evidence above threshold</th>
<th>Evidence within threshold</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments: [Comments]

### Conclusion

- **All “No evidence” boxes ticked and “Limited due diligence” selected above:**
  - Continue with the risk assessment.
- **All “No evidence” boxes ticked and “Normal due diligence” selected above:**
  - Continue with the risk assessment.
- **One or more “Evidence within threshold” or “Not known” boxes ticked / Exception:**
  - Explain in the comment box why a partnership is still worth pursuing.
  - The complete risk assessment tool including your conclusions must be escalated to HQ after finalization.
- **Any exclusionary criteria above threshold, or several “Not known” boxes ticked:**
  - Refrain from engaging

Comments: [Comments]
### 2.1 Potential Controversies

Potential partner private sector entities may be exposed to controversies or there may be factors that can cause reputational risks to the AMR MPTF. Annex 2 of the Risk Assessment Tool Guidelines contains guidance on how to gather information.

List below any controversies and possible reputational risks that are not already covered in step 1.1., i.e. controversies not directly related to exclusionary criteria. Use the comment box to provide details of the criticism. Controversies and reputational risks may relate to issues such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Discrimination at work<sup>10</sup>  
- Freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining  
- Occupational health and safety  
- Poor employment conditions | - Corruption  
- Fraud  
- Tax evasion |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Product-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Community health and safety  
- Impact on livelihoods  
- Local participation  
- Social discrimination  
- Indigenous peoples | - Product safety  
- Controversial products or services, e.g. use of conflict minerals in the products  
- Marketing of breast milk substitutes contrary to the WHO’s International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes<sup>11</sup> |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Ownership or management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Pollution (including climate change)  
- Impact on ecosystems and landscapes  
  Overuse of resources  
- Waste management  
- Mistreatment of animals | - Controversies related to the individuals owning or managing the private sector entity |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant criticism from local or global NGOs / media/social media or other significant partners of AMR MPTF locally or globally</th>
<th>□ No evidence □ Evidence □ Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recurring local public events against the private sector entity (e.g. local demonstrations)</td>
<td>□ No evidence □ Evidence □ Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global public events (e.g. significant demonstrations at several locations, significant online protests)</td>
<td>□ No evidence □ Evidence □ Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant legal case in progress/in court etc.</td>
<td>□ No evidence □ Evidence □ Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td>□ No evidence □ Evidence □ Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: [Comments]

---

<sup>10</sup> This also includes assessing potential partner’s commitment to gender equity. For example, do they have family friendly policies, equal wages for equal jobs, work-life balance policies, etc.

<sup>11</sup> The WHO’s International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes is available at [WHO website](https://www.who.int/).
### Conclusion

- **All “No evidence” boxes ticked**
  - 'Normal due diligence' - Continue with the risk assessment.
  - 'Limited due diligence' - If there was no evidence of exclusionary criteria and no evidence of significant controversies you may skip Step 3 and move directly to the Step 4 “Make a decision”. The decision can be taken locally.

- **One or more “Evidence” or “Not known” boxes ticked**
  - Research publicly available sources (e.g. search for public statements from the private sector entity), or contact the private sector entity to assess how it addresses the identified significant controversies. List these elements in the comment box below.
  - Continue with the risk assessment. Consult with HQ to determine escalation of the decision to HQ after risk assessment finalization.

**Comments:** [Comments]

### Step 3: Assess the Private sector entity’s Commitment to ESG and the Partnership Risks and Benefits

#### 3 a) Private sector entity’s engagements

**Is the private sector entity a participant in the UN Global Compact?**

- Yes
- No
- Not known

If "yes" to the question above:

a) Is the private sector entity actively communicating its progress and level of reporting? See: General Communication on Progress (CCP)

- Yes
- No
- Not known

**Does the private sector entity have any sustainability-related certifications or reporting (e.g. ISO14001, SA8000, AA1000, OHSAS 18001, or GRI Principles)?**

- Yes
- No
- Not known

Provide details in the comment box below.

**Is the private sector entity included in any sustainability or ESG-related indices (e.g. FTSE4Good, Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes, etc.), or similar national/regional initiatives? Does the private sector entity abide by any voluntary sustainability or ethical principles or guidelines?**

- Yes
- No
- Not known

List them in the comment box below.

**Comments:** HAIFU will consider an application to join the UN Global Compact, has developed a Code of Conduct for ESG reporting and socially responsible investing strategy.

#### 3 b) Private sector entity’s commitment to ESG issues

**Human rights:**

- Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system that seeks to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts, especially on the local communities, that are **directly linked to its operations**?

  - Yes
  - Not applicable
  - No
  - Not known

- Does the policy and a monitoring system cover **occupational health and safety issues**, ensuring that workers are afforded safe, suitable and sanitary working conditions?

  - Yes
  - No
  - Not known

---

12 The private sector entity does not have to have a positive answer to all these questions, especially SMEs and even larger domestically oriented private sector entities may not be engaged in these initiatives.

13 Examples of voluntary sustainability or ethical principles include: e.g. Principles for Responsible Investment, Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, Equator Principles.

14 The private sector entity does not have to have a positive answer to all these questions, especially SMEs and even larger domestically oriented private sector entities may not have all the different policies and systems in place.

15 An example of a framework specifically designed for human rights
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system cover land or property issues, i.e. does the private sector entity ensure that all affected owners and users of the land or property used by the private sector entity have been adequately consulted and compensated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system cover the rights of indigenous peoples, and in particular the principles of self-determination and self-governance, the right to lands and natural resources, including issues of resettlement, and the right to free, prior and informed consent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system cover the private sector entity’s security arrangements, i.e. whether or not they comply with international human rights principles for law enforcement and the use of force (e.g. have security personnel received adequate human rights training)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have an appropriate dispute resolution mechanism that is in line with the human rights norms and principles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system that seeks to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts that are directly linked to products and services by its business relationships (business partners, entities in its value chain, other non-State or State entities)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system to ensure fair labor practices at its operations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system adequately ensure equal opportunity to all employees and applicants regardless of ethnic origin, color, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, marital status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system that seeks to promote fair labor practices in its interactions with suppliers and business partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system ensure freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system ensure the elimination of forced or compulsory labor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy and monitoring system ensure the elimination of child labor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system to minimize environmental damage at its operations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system which it applies to working with suppliers to improve environmental performance, extending responsibility down the supply chain?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system to reduce emissions (emissions to air, waste and effluents)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 Useful resources can be found at [ILO website](http://www.ilo.org).

17 Useful resources can be found at [Global Compact website](http://www.globalcompact.org).

58 International Labor Standards provide a framework for fair labor practices. The fundamental conventions include: Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948; Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949; Forced Labour Convention, 1930; Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138); Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999; Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951; and Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958. ([ILO](http://www.ilo.org))
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system to ensure that natural resources are used in a sustainable manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity take action to reduce energy consumption?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity prevent, minimize and remedy significant impacts on biodiversity?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have emergency procedures in place to prevent and address industrial accidents affecting the environment and human health effectively?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Good governance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the private sector entity have a policy and a monitoring system stating that it will not engage in corruption at any time or in any form in its interaction with suppliers, intermediaries, governments and business partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** [Comments]

**Conclusion**

Is the private sector entity's commitment to ESG appropriate in relation to its exposure to risks? In principle, most answers would be expected to be positive for multinationals. For smaller and domestically oriented private sector entities more flexibility can be applied.

- **Yes**
  - Continue risk assessment.
- **No or not known / exception**
  - Explain in the comment box below why you believe that the private sector entity is willing and able to address significant gaps.
  - Continue risk assessment.
- **No or not known**
  - Refrain from engaging.

**Comments:** [Comments]

**3 c) Partnership Risks**

The AMR MPTF must maintain impartiality and accountability to all of its private and public stakeholders. The AMR MPTF’s engagement with the private sector must therefore allow TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF to remain unbiased, while supporting its overall goals and objectives. Similarly, the agreed partnership must not in any way compromise the integrity and independence of the Tripartite and of the AMR MPTF or that of the parties involved.

Evaluate market risks and select applicable statements below:

**Impartiality**

The Tripartite and the AMR MPTF will not – and will not be perceived to – give any unfair advantage to one or more businesses within an industry, sector or market, neither is it perceived to have endorsed a particular business, product or service.

The Social Enterprises selected to be supported through TA/social impact assessments will be determined through an open & transparent process.

- **Correct**
- **Incorrect**
- **Not known**

**No market distortion**

The partnership will not have negative unintended consequences by distorting a market by giving one business or group of businesses an unfair advantage and/or by crowding out other economic actors.

The selected grantees and or social enterprises will not be allowed to purchase any profit bearing capital assets that would benefit them economically vis-à-vis the market. The grants are used only for technical assistance and social impact relates assessments.

- **Correct**
- **Incorrect**
- **Not known**
### Non-exclusivity

The AMR MPTF will not enter into an exclusive relationship with a private sector entity that would exclude TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF from working with another private sector entity from the same sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Reasonable benefit

The benefit to the private sector entity from the collaboration will not be disproportionately high compared to the public benefits or benefits to TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF/Participating UN Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Non-dependency in procurement / No conflict of interest

The private sector entity has been informed that partnering with TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF will not provide preferential treatment in procurement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Political Risks

It is unlikely that any potential political risks would arise during the partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments: [Comments]

#### 3 d) Partnership Benefits

The balance between expected risks and expected benefits must be in line with the risk tolerance of TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF. TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF may generally be willing to bear higher risks if the benefits of the partnership clearly outweigh the risks.

Select applicable statements below:

- There are significant potential gains in terms of achieving one or more of TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF’s strategic priorities within the TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF Strategic Plan and Private Sector Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The private sector entity is among the most suitable partners available in the country/regional context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- There is considerable potential for long-term engagement with the private sector entity, in which resources are contributed on a significant scale, and there may be a significant outcome in terms of human development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The partnership is likely to create immediate results in the well-being of communities that are facing high rates of poverty and a low human development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The partnership will create wider awareness of, and support for, TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF and its causes from positive exposure and publicity surrounding the collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The partnership allows access to new innovations for development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other (specify):

- Comments: [Comments]

---

19 Political risks include the consequences and likelihood of changes in government. Special attention should be given to countries under United Nations sanctions. Political risks also include the risk of having the government withdraw support for the partnership or TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF engaging in close partnership with an actor that is seen as business arm of the political elite.
### Conclusion

- **All “Correct” boxes ticked under Market risks and Political risks.**
  - The risk-benefit analysis indicates that the partnership is worth pursuing.  
  - Go to step 4 “Make a decision”.

- **One or more “Incorrect” or “Not known” boxes ticked under step Market risks and Political risks, but they are clearly outweighed by the “Yes” boxes ticked under step Benefits.**
  - The risk-benefit analysis indicates that the partnership is worth pursuing.  
  - Record your reasoning in the comment box below.  
  - Go to step 4 “Make a decision”.

- **One or more “Incorrect” or “Not known” boxes ticked under step Market risks and Political risks and they are not sufficiently outweighed by benefits.**
  - Refrain from engaging.

### Comments:

### Step 4: Make a Decision

Based on the information collected in this template, make a suggestion as to whether or not TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF should engage in the partnership. Some partnerships may be considered worth pursuing given certain conditions. These conditions should be defined at this stage, and should be communicated to and accepted by the private sector entity. Use the box below to set out your proposal as to whether or not TRIPARTITE/AMR MPTF should engage in the partnership, including the conditions, if applicable. Remember that it is essential that there is separation between the staff who are directly involved in developing the relationship and making a recommendation as to whether or not to proceed, and the staff who make the final decision.

#### Suggested decision by the initiating unit

- If all ☒: approve ☐ without or ☐ with conditions (see below).
- If one or more ☐: escalate the Risk Assessment Tool, including your conclusions, to HQ.
- If one or more ☒: refrain from engaging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for the decision:</th>
<th>[Rationale]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions:</td>
<td>[Conditions]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### For cases that do not require escalation: decision by the RC/RR for COs, or the Regional Director for Regional Bureaus, or designated persons with the proper authority (please specify).

- Approve ☐ without or ☐ with conditions (see below).
- Refrain from engaging.

| Person designated to make the decision: | [Name] |
| Rationale for the decision:         | [Rationale] |
| Conditions:                         | [Conditions] |

#### In escalated cases, decision by HQ

- Approve ☐ without or ☐ with conditions (see below).
- Refrain from engaging.

| Rationale for the decision: | [Rationale] |
| Conditions:               | [Conditions] |
### Step 5: Risk Log, Monitoring Plan and Communication Materials

The Project Manager should also document the risks that have been identified into a risk log (sample [here](#)). If the partnership is part of a project that already has a risk log, these risks can be added into the existing mechanism. In low-risk and short term partnerships the project manager may decide that risk log is not needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has a risk log been done?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒ Attach the risk log to this document or explain in the comment box below where it can be found.</td>
<td>⇒ Explain in the comment box below why a risk log has not been done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Risk log will be defined and actuated once the fund is created and targeted towards thematic investments.

The Project Manager should regularly scan publicly available information and informal intelligence systems for new controversies surrounding the private sector entity or its industry. Any significant issues that might cause potential damage should be flagged to HQ, and should be recorded in the [Private Sector Due Diligence Database](#). Similarly, the Project Manager should regularly assess whether or not the private sector entity is meeting the conditions (if any) defined in step 4 above. Especially if there are specific conditions set for the partnership it is recommended to prepare a monitoring plan.

The Project Manager can be supported in the monitoring activities by the Regional Bureau or HQ, especially in difficult cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has a monitoring plan been defined?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒ Attach the monitoring plan to this document or explain in the comment box below where it can be found.</td>
<td>⇒ Explain in the comment box below why a monitoring plan has not been defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Same as above

The Project Manager is in charge of drawing up the needed communications materials that cover the basic details about the partnership and possibly address the main risks identified during the risk assessment process. For partnerships that do not involve significant risks, the Project Manager may decide that there is no need for communications materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the needed communications materials been drawn up?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒ Attach the communications materials to this document or explain in the comment box below where they can be found.</td>
<td>⇒ Explain in the comment box below why communications materials have not been drawn up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Same as above
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## Annex 4.1 Country concept note template

**Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) MULTI-PARTNER TRUST FUND**

*Combatting the rising global threat of AMR through a One Health Approach*

### Country Concept Note – Submission TEMPLATE

#### 1: Concept note overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG targets</th>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>Implementing entities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead Focal Point</th>
<th>Tripartite counterparts</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Alignment with National Action Plan</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMR MPTF: (Name of country and title that describes proposal)</td>
<td>Choose at least 1 impact statement from the Tripartite AMR Results Matrix</td>
<td>Choose relevant outcome statements from the Tripartite AMR Results Matrix (see annex 1)</td>
<td>identify related SDGs targets (up to 10)</td>
<td>Country/Region</td>
<td>Tripartite agencies involved, including other UN organizations or partners</td>
<td>XX months</td>
<td>Lead Tripartite member</td>
<td>Tripartite counterparts</td>
<td>Context and rationale (200 words)</td>
<td>Describe how it will help delivery of the NAP</td>
<td>Main beneficiaries (direct and indirect) numerical targets if possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Outputs and Main Activities

1. **Tripartite AMR Results Matrix output XX**
   - Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work: XX

2. **Tripartite AMR Results Matrix output XX XX**
   - Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work: XX

3. **Tripartite AMR Results Matrix output XX XX**
   - Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work: XX

### Total Budget

Indicative figure (based on results based-budgeting per output)

#### 2: Fulfilling key AMR MPTF criteria

1. **Willingness and interest of the government to address AMR with an existing multi-sectoral /One Health approach:** this will be assessed by the presence of a NAP, levels of commitment and engagement as assessed by the Tripartite, and feasibility of the government to make positive progress over an 24 month period. A supporting letter from the government will be required with the final full submission.

(max 200 words)
2. Alignment with National Action Plan and government priorities

(max 200 words)

3. The Tripartite is able to demonstrate contribution to desired impacts and added value in the short term.

(max 200 words)

4. Likelihood that it will catalyze further action and results.

(max 200 words)
Annex 4.2  AMR-MPTF Concept Note Review Template

1. Concept note information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept note information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer’s geographical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And/or Reviewer’s areas of technical interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Recommendations from reviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical review of concept note</th>
<th>Tick where appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve as is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve with minor changes(^{20})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve with significant changes(^{21})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit(^{22}) at a later date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall comments on technical review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget(^{23}) of concept note</th>
<th>Tick where appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall comments on budget

3. Technical notes - fulfilling key AMR-MPTF criteria

---

\(^{20}\) Minor changes are those that would not involve a change in the outputs, scale or scope of the project. They would not require substantive redesign, and countries would be likely to be able to shift rapidly to full proposal development.

\(^{21}\) Significant changes are those where the outputs scale or scope is changed. For example, reviewers may suggest that the scale of a concept note is excessive, at least for the first round of support and advise for phasing between outputs. Alternatively, a reviewer might think that without investment in coordination the multi-sectoral approach will be unsustainable.

\(^{22}\) If a concept note is way out of scope or scale, (e.g., focusing on actions in individual sectors, or large infrastructure programmes, or is either very high or very low value) the reviewer may recommend that the country team are just invited to resubmit.

\(^{23}\) There may be insufficient detail within the concept note for a real assessment of whether a proposed budget is appropriate, particularly if there is co-funding from other sources. The reviewer may however indicate if the funds requested seem particularly high or low.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes?</th>
<th>No?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evidence of government commitment: is there a functioning multisectoral AMR committee and/or active engagement of ministries outside of health?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well is the proposal aligned with the National Action Plan and government AMR activities priorities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the evidence of Tripartite collaboration (have they identified a clear focal point and roles for each organisation)? Is there evidence of collaboration in existing activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the likelihood of this programme generating clear and meaningful evidence on the benefits of Tripartite collaboration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are the proposed activities sufficient to deliver the stated outputs within the proposed delivery time frame?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the rationale for why proposed activities have been prioritised clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is there evidence of realistic consideration of human resource requirements, for delivery and coordination?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is it realistic that the proposed activities can be delivered at sufficient scale to generate outputs within eighteen months to two years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there consideration of sustainability implications post intervention?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has alignment been demonstrated with the MPTF Theory of Change at outcome and output level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does this concept note consider practical requirements for project delivery (M&amp;E programme management, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Recommendations for the full proposal in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is redundant or over ambitious given the time frame? Would you recommend phasing interventions, or cutting outputs? If so, how and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any gaps been identified? Are there any potential gaps that in your expertise as reviewer may not have been identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any risks been identified? Are there any potential risks that in your expertise as a reviewer may not have been identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other observations of factors to be considered in design that would strengthen the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Activities might, for example, be prioritized on the basis of immediate need, opportunity, fit with other programmes and investments, or need to generate political momentum.
Annex 4.3  Global concept note template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Concept note overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to AMR MPTF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Focal Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tripartite counterpart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with tripartite</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Outputs and Main Activities**

4. AMR MPTF Results Matrix output XX  
   Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work:  
   • XX

5. AMR MPTF Results Matrix output XX XX  
   Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work:  
   • XX  
   •XX

6. AMR MPTF Results Matrix output XX XX  
   Key Activities and lead tripartite or joint work:  
   • XX

**Risks**  
Reference to key risks pertaining to achieving the outputs and outcomes

**Total Budget**  
Indicative figure
Proportion claimed from MPTF

2: Fulfilling key AMR MPTF criteria

5. Importance of the activity to Multisectoral/One Health implementation at country level and for sustaining the momentum for AMR at a global level  
   (max 200 words)

6. Demonstrated Tripartite capacity and comparative advantage to deliver meaningful results in the next twenty-four months.
7. Strategic cohesiveness with the overall Tripartite workplan (sustainable and efficient) and Contribution to the AMR MPTF’s Theory of Change and Results Matrix.

8. Likelihood that it will catalyse further action and results.

9. Please complete the table below with the allocation of resources to each organization in your programme (a full budget will be requested at the Proposal development stage, after the Concept Note and the allocated amount has been approved by the AMR MPTF Steering Committee).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAO Role in delivery</th>
<th>Estimated Budget in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIE Role in delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Role in delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) MULTI-PARTNER TRUST FUND

Combatting the rising global threat of AMR through a One Health Approach

Country Proposal Submission TEMPLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full proposal overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing entities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Tripartite Focal Point**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counterpart Tripartite Focal Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Background | Context and rationale and how this intervention will contribute to MPTF and NAP objectives. This section should include the following information:  
• Describe the national AMR situation, including which sectors are important for AMR and why. It should also detail how they have been involved in the response to date.  
• What has the national response been to date, what are the priority sectors and value chain in the National Action Plan for AMR?  
• What have the main achievements been to date for AMR control in the country? What are the main gaps?  
• Relation of the AMR programme to national planning and policy instruments and strategy (e.g. health sector strategy, One Health strategic framework).  
• Summary of ongoing or recently completed AMR efforts and the principal local, national and international actors involved in the issue.  
• How have the Tripartite organisations supported this work, and what work is ongoing? Is AMR incorporated in |}

| Other Implementing Partners | For example:  
AMR Coordination Committee  
Government Departments  
Parastatals  
Civil Society Organisations  
Private Sector  
Academia  
Other partners |}

| Budget | Total amount (USD) based on budget summary in Annex  
Total amount (USD) allocated to each Tripartite partner |
| Status of National Action Plan for AMR | • When was the National Action Plan for AMR developed?  
• When was the last progress report?  
• Are there plans to refresh the NAP (if so when and over what timeframe)?  
• How often does the AMR coordination committee meet?  
• To which entity does the AMR national coordination committee report?  
• Is the private sector involved?  
• Is civil society involved?  
• Is academia involved?  
• How do the Tripartite organisations support the NAP committee and national coordination? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Choose at least 1 impact statement from the Tripartite AMR Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome(s)</strong></td>
<td>Choose relevant outcome statements from the Tripartite AMR Results Matrix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Outputs and Key activities** | Summary of the selected Outputs from the Tripartite AMR Results Matrix  
Summary of prioritised Activities from the concept note submission |
| **Link to National Action plan** | Paragraph summarizing the expected contribution to the achievement and indicating relevant objectives of National action plan |
| **Link to country’s development priorities** | |

We the responsible officers of the Tripartite organisations take responsibility for the efficient delivery of this proposal. We confirm that the proposal has been developed in close collaboration with government.

---

counterparts and that it is aligned with the wider agenda around the Sustainable Development Goals. We will work to ensure that addressing AMR is appropriately included in the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, and that there is a strategy to sustain and scale up the outputs of this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FAO Country representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Regional Representative OIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>WHO Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joint Programme Description**

7. **Baseline and situation analysis**

1. **Problem statement (max 1 page)**

   Explain the problem to be addressed. Outline how Tripartite action will support national efforts to address such challenges and accelerate progress towards sustainable implementation of the National Action Plan for AMR. This section should emphasize the most critical needs / gaps that the joint Tripartite programme will address. Draw on relevant analysis and information from national and international sources.

1.2 **AMR MPTF Results Matrix (Please refer to Appendix 3)**

   List the Outcome(s), Output(s) adopted from Tripartite Results Matrix (Appendix 3) and Activities that are designed with the focus of this joint Tripartite programme and identify indicators and baseline data that can be used to measure programme progress.

1.3 **Stakeholder mapping and target groups (max 2 pages)**

   Map key stakeholders and briefly explain their involvement in addressing AMR at national level. Focus particularly on stakeholders in areas that will be targeted by the AMR MPTF country grant, identifying their interest and relationships. Please also identify the programme beneficiaries where possible.

8. **Programme strategy**

2. **Overall strategy (max 2 pages)**

   Summarize the strategy of the joint Tripartite programme, including:

   a) why it is transformational (will deliver results at scale);
   b) why it is better than alternative approaches;
   c) how it contributes to accelerate the progress on achieving the NAP;
   d) what will be the added value of the Tripartite;
e) how it relates to AMR GAP priorities and initiatives;
f) how the programme would support government, and how government will sustain and scale results
g) how this programme fits with existing work of tripartite organisations and other development partners.
h) what is the anticipated situation after this phase of the joint Tripartite programme is effectively completed?

3. Theory of Change (max 2 pages)

There is no standard methodology for developing a Theory of Change (ToC). However, any ToC should address how the envisaged broader systemic change is expected to emerge, and what the contribution of the joint Tripartite programme is expected to provide. The ToC is not a plan or a results framework but the description of the rationale behind those. The ToC provides the basis for managing for results. Managing for results starts during the preparation and planning phase of programmes. The ToC can be described as the intended change process and depicts how the causally related results occur in the programmes environment. It captures a shared understanding of the path that leads to the desired objective (change), in a form that is understandable to all actors. The ToC addresses the following questions:

- What results (please refer to Tripartite Results Matrix) are the Tripartite collaboration trying to achieve?
- What is the priority objective from the perspective of project partners?
- How do different results relate to each other?
- What does the project assume responsibility for?
- What contributions do partners make towards achieving results?
- Can the objectives be achieved using the resources that the partners are able to provide?

Answering these question leads to a complex, not always linear ToC which opens a systemic view, as it maps the entire change process influenced by the different actions/measures. The ToC is seen as a way to plausibly demonstrate impact and shows which objectives can realistically be achieved within the time frame and financial scope of a programme; it will also demonstrate which impacts can be expected beyond the project’s sphere of responsibility.

4. Expected results and Narrative (max 2-3 pages, excluding tables)

This narrative should relate directly to the work plan (Annex 4) and log framework (Annex 1)

- Describe the Tripartite activities and outputs and outline the interrelationship between them and how they can contribute to the outcome.
- Indicate which Tripartite partner(s) will be accountable for the delivery of specified results at activity and output level.
- Refer to the pre-determined outcomes/outputs of the AMR MPTF ToC.
- Identify capacity needs and precondition requirements of government to sustain results.
- Indicate trans-boundary and regional issues and opportunities where relevant
- Briefly outline the expected progress towards the selected outcome(s) from Tripartite AMR result matrix.
- Describe the changed situation with respect to AMR management in the country at the end of this phase of investment. Do it in the form of storytelling, as a future scenario for early 2022 (not longer than half a page).
- Describe how the joint Tripartite programme will contribute to strengthened gender and equity issues (avoiding disadvantage to vulnerable groups).

5. Budget, sustainability and value for money (max 2 pages)

- Justify the budget in terms of “value for money.” Give specific examples of how costs have been contained (economy) and how the joint Tripartite programme design represents the most efficient approach
- Outline the options considered for to identify the most efficient and effective intervention to address the problem.
- Sustainability: Describe how the approach to delivery will enhance the chances that impact and benefits will be sustained after the end of the joint Tripartite programme.
- Demonstrate how long-term financial sustainability will be secured at the end of the programme.
• Demonstrate how the intervention supports equitable and sustainable outcomes.

6. Partnership and stakeholder engagement (max 2 pages)

• Briefly explain:
  - how this joint Tripartite programme would support the work of the National AMR coordination committee;
  - which government departments would be involved in programme delivery and what is their role; and
  - the unique contribution of the Tripartite.

• Strategic contributions from other partners and the ways in which other stakeholders (including the financial sector and private investors/capital) will be involved and/or consulted.

• Explain how the joint Tripartite programme will pool and mobilize expertise from across the Tripartite at country, regional and global levels

• Explain how you plan to engage with existing AMR donors delivering assistance at country level in areas related to the joint Tripartite programme taking advantage of potential synergies and avoiding overlaps

• If there is a risk that there might be double counting of results between existing programmes explain how this will be avoided.

7. Programme implementation in the light of COVID-19

• Explain how programme implementation may be affected by COVID 19.

• Identify how you plan to mitigate any COVID 19 related risks.

• Explain aspects of the proposed programme that have changed from the concept note to align more closely with the national COVID 19 response.

8. Communication, Advocacy and Lesson Learning

• Identify opportunities for advocacy within the joint Tripartite programme.

• Identify aspects of the programme that might be particularly interesting for targeted communication and lessons learning.

• Identify opportunities for high-level strategic influencing, communication and advocacy.

9. Programme implementation

9. Governance and implementation arrangements (max 3 pages)

• Explain the composition, roles and responsibilities of Country AMR MPTF Team, including the implementation arrangements, roles and responsibilities of each Tripartite organisation.

• Explain how the day to day programme operations will be coordinated (through the appointment of a national coordinator based in one of the agencies, or in the national coordination office).

• Explain the role of the leaders of Tripartite Organisations in providing strategic oversight in raising AMR as a political and development issue with government and other stakeholders, and in engaging relevant stakeholders in decision making when necessary.

• Explain government-level engagement and leadership including how the results of the joint Tripartite programme will be internalised and sustained by government and other stakeholders.

• Explain how the AMR MPTF country programme will fit with ongoing activities of government, the tripartite and other donors, and, where appropriate, how this avoids duplication or introducing parallel structures.

• Do not explain the accountability for specific outputs and outcomes because it should be covered in the previous section. Focus on coordination, decision-making, reporting.
10. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Sections 3.2 and 3.3 are standard text required for UN trust fund management. Country teams should note these arrangements.

Reporting on the AMR MPTF will be results-oriented, and evidence based. Each Tripartite organisation will provide the Convening/Lead Agent with the following narrative reports prepared in accordance with instructions and templates developed by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR:

- Annual narrative progress reports, to be provided no later than three (3) months (31 March) after the end of the calendar year, and must include the results matrix, updated risk log, and anticipated activities and results for the next 12-month funding period;
- Mid-term progress review report to be submitted halfway through the implementation of the Joint Programme26 (depending on timing this may merge with the annual report);
- Final consolidated narrative report, after the completion of the joint Tripartite programme, to be provided no later than three (3) months after the operational closure of the activities of the joint Tripartite programme.

As a minimum, the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will prepare and report on the activities funded through the AMR MPTF on a 6-month monitoring basis. Additional insights (such as policy papers, value for money analysis, case studies, infographics, blogs) might need to be provided, per request of the Tripartite joint Secretariat on AMR. The joint Tripartite programme will allocate resources for monitoring and evaluation in the budget.

Data for all indicators of the results framework will be shared with the Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR on a regular basis, in order to allow the Fund Secretariat to aggregate results at the global level and integrate findings into reporting on progress of the AMR MPTF.

You will be required to include information on complementary funding received from other sources for the activities supported by AMR MPTF, including in-kind contributions and/or South-South Cooperation initiatives, in the reporting done throughout the year.

Headquarters’ level shall provide the Administrative Agent (UNDP MPTF Office) with the following statements and reports prepared in accordance with its accounting and reporting procedures, consolidate the financial reports, as follows (more information on the reporting will be provided at the later time):

- Annual financial reports as of 31 December each year with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the AMR MPTF, to be provided no later than four months after the end of the applicable reporting period; and
- A final financial report, after the completion of the activities financed by the AMR MPTF and including the final year of the activities, to be provided no later than 30 April of the year following the operational closing of the project activities.

In addition, regular updates on financial delivery might need to be provided, per request of the Fund Secretariat.

The joint Tripartite programme may be subjected to a Programme Review (methodology to be determined) or joint final independent evaluation (JFEI) by the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, using the guidance on Joint Evaluation and relevant UNDG guidance on evaluations. Evaluation results will be disseminated amongst government, development partners, civil society, and other stakeholders. A joint management response will be produced upon completion of the evaluation process and made publicly available on the evaluation platforms or similar of PUNOs.

11. Accountability, financial management, and public disclosure

Standard text – do not change.

26 This will be the basis for release of funding for the second year of implementation
The AMR MPTF will be using a pass-through fund management modality where UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office will act as the Administrative Agent (AA) under which the funds will be channelled for the MPTF through the AA. Each Tripartite organisation receiving funds through the pass-through has signed a standard Memorandum of Understanding with the AA.

Each Tripartite organisation shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the AA of the AMR MPTF (Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office). Such funds will be administered by each Tripartite Agency, in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures. Each Tripartite agency shall establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the AA.

Indirect costs of the Tripartite Organizations recovered through programme support costs will be 7%. All other costs incurred by each tripartite agency in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs.

Funding by the AMR MPTF will be provided on annual basis, upon successful performance of the programme.

Procedures on financial transfers, extensions, financial and operational closure, and related administrative issues are stipulated in the Operational Guidance of the AMR MPTF.

Each Tripartite organisation will take appropriate measures to publicize the AMR MPTF and give due credit to the other Tripartite agencies. All related publicity material, official notices, reports and publications, provided to the press or Fund beneficiaries, will acknowledge the role of the host Government, donors, tripartite partners, the Administrative Agent, and any other relevant entities. In particular, the AA will include and ensure due recognition of the role of each Participating Organization and partners in all external communications related to the AMR MPTF.

*Legal Clause: Please indicate if a UNDAF or UNSDCF containing Legal Context information exists currently in the country, if yes, please provide a copy; if no, please include FAO Legal Provisions as appendices (Appendices 2.1 and 2.2) to the document before signing with the Government.

Yes  
No  
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# Annexes

## Annex 1 - Log Framework Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMR MPTF Log framework</th>
<th>Name of country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MPTF Outcome Objectives | Indicator 1: *These indicators serve the measurement of the Outcome and will be standardised*  
Baseline value:  
Target value: | Which data sources are we using for the indicator? | Hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention. |
| MPTF Output Objectives | Indicator | Source of Verification | Key Activities | Key Assumptions and Risks |
| Output A  
Prefill from the Tripartite RC | Indicator A.1: *These measure the Output. One per Output can be sufficient.*  
Baseline value:  
Target value: | A.1 | Activities A:  
list key activities in bullet points (these are described in more detailed in the proposal) | |
| Output B  
Prefill from the Tripartite Results | Indicator B.1:  
Baseline value:  
Target value: | B.1 | Activities B: | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMR MPTF Log framework</th>
<th>Name of country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Key assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix</strong></td>
<td>Indicator B.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output C</strong></td>
<td>Indicator C.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator C.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td>C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output D</strong></td>
<td>Indicator D.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator D.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td>D.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output E</strong></td>
<td>Indicator E.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator E.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td>E.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities D:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities E:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2 - Risk Matrix Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Category: Contextual Programmatic Institutional</th>
<th>Worst Case Consequence for the Project</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>Mitigating Action</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 3 – Outline of Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>FAO</th>
<th>OIE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff and other personnel costs&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contractual Services&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travel&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transfers and Grants Counterparts&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General Operating and Other Direct Costs&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Indirect support costs (Max. 7% of overall budget)&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

**Please indicate which organisation will receive pre-financing facility**<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Staff and other personnel costs: Includes all related staff and temporary staff costs including base salary, post adjustment and all staff entitlements. This includes the costs of a full-time project coordinator, based either in one of the organisations or the National coordination committee.

<sup>28</sup> Supplies, Commodities, Materials: Includes all direct and indirect costs (e.g. freight, transport, delivery, distribution) associated with procurement of supplies, commodities and materials. Office supplies should be reported as “General Operating”.

<sup>29</sup> Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation: The procurement of durable equipment is not eligible for the AMR MPTF.

<sup>30</sup> Contractual Services: Services contracted by an organization which follow the normal procurement processes. It used for procurement of services requiring provision of intellectual or specialization services not foreseen under works and construction contracts such as, but not limited to, maintenance, licensing, studies, technical, training, advisory services. These are ruled by FAO policy MS 502 or MS 507 ruling LoA.

<sup>31</sup> Travel: Includes staff and non-staff travel paid for by the organization directly related to a project.

<sup>32</sup> Transfers and Grants to Counterparts: Includes transfers to national counterparts and any other transfers given to an implementing partner (e.g. NGO) which is not similar to a commercial service contract as per above. Please reference FAO policy MS 502.

<sup>33</sup> General Operating and Other Direct Costs: Includes all general operating costs for running an office. Examples include telecommunication, rents, finance charges and other costs which cannot be mapped to other expense categories. In addition, backstopping work from Headquarters (including from the project lead technical officer) could also be factored in these categories.

<sup>34</sup> Indirect Support Costs: (No definition provided).

<sup>35</sup> Max 25,000 USD fund can be used as pre-financing. More detailed information can be found in the guiding notes.
# Annex 4 - National Work Plan Template

Name of Country
Start Date
Projected End Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Lead Tripartite Org</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For in-country planning purposes, it may be helpful to insert the budget for each activity into the plan. This level of detail is not however required in the version submitted to the Secretariat. The outputs should align with the Tripartite AMR results matrix and log framework. This workplan should align with the plans of the respective organizations.
Appendices

Appendices are attached as separate attachments to the email received containing this guidance.

- Appendix 1 – Details of Budget template (excel sheet)
- Appendix 2.1 – FAO legal document cover page
- Appendix 2.2 – FAO legal document clause
- Appendix 3 – Tripartite Results Matrix

Checklist before submission

1. Country Proposal Submission Template
2. Log Framework Template (see Annex 1) (use of SMART output methodology up to the activity level)
3. Risk Matrix Template (see Annex 2)
4. Outline of Budget Templates (see Annex 3)
5. Work Plan Template (see Annex 4)
6. Details of Budget Template (see Appendix 1)
7. Legal clause (please see paragraph 3.3 Accountability, financial management, and public disclosure and Appendices 2.1 and 2.2)

Please also attach the supporting documents:

8. AMR National Action Plan
9. Any AMR progress reports or other relevant documentation (the recent 3 years)
10. Endorsement of AMR National Coordination Committee
11. Letter of support from key line ministries (at least Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture)
12. Submission letter signed by heads of tripartite organisations
## 1. Full proposal overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th><strong>AMR MPTF</strong>: Title that describes proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td><strong>XX months</strong> – (estimated start date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead Tripartite Focal Point

- **Name**
- **Agency**
- **Title**
- **E-mail**
- **Telephone number (include country and city code)**
- **Address**

### Counterpart Tripartite Focal Points

- **Name**
- **Agency**
- **Title**
- **E-mail**
- **Telephone number (include country and city code)**
- **Name**
- **Agency**
- **Title**
- **E-mail**
- **Telephone number (include country and city code)**

### Other Implementing Partners

*For example:*
- Other UN or international/regional organizations
- Potential government counterparts.

### Budget

- **Total amount (USD) based on budget summary in Annex**
- **Total amount (USD) allocated to each Tripartite partner**

### Background

*Context and rationale and how this intervention will contribute to AMR MPTF objectives and supporting action at country / regional /
Joint Programme Description

10. Baseline and situation analysis

12. Problem statement (max 1 page)

Explain the problem to be addressed. Outline how Tripartite action will support national efforts to address such challenges and accelerate progress in addressing AMR at global, regional and country level. This section should emphasize the most critical needs / gaps that the joint Tripartite programme will address. Draw on relevant analysis and information from national and international sources.

13. AMR MPTF Results Matrix (Please refer to Appendix 3)

List the Outcome(s), Output(s) adopted from Tripartite Results Matrix (Appendix 3) and Activities that are designed with the focus of this joint Tripartite programme and identify indicators and baseline data that can be used to measure programme progress.

11. Programme strategy

14. Overall strategy (max 2 pages)

Summarize the strategy of the joint Tripartite programme, including:

i) why it is transformational (will deliver results at scale);
ii) why it is better than alternative approaches;
iii) what will be the added value of the Tripartite;
iv) how it relates to AMR GAP priorities and initiatives;
Strategic fit

m) How does this work fit with ongoing:
   a. tripartite collaborative work?
   b. related work in the tripartite organisations?
   c. work in other organisations?

Supporting impact at country / regional / global level

n) How does this contribute to impact at country, regional and global levels?

15. Theory of Change (max 2 pages)

There is no standard methodology for developing a Theory of Change (ToC). However, any ToC should address how the envisaged broader systemic change is expected to emerge, and what the contribution of the joint Tripartite programme is expected to provide. The ToC is not a plan or a results framework but the description of the rationale behind those. The ToC provides the basis for managing for results. Managing for results starts during the preparation and planning phase of programmes. The ToC can be described as the intended change process and depicts how the causally related results occur in the programmes environment. It captures a shared understanding of the path that leads to the desired objective (change), in a form that is understandable to all actors.

16. Expected results and Narrative (max 2-3 pages, excluding tables)

This narrative should relate directly to the work plan (Annex 4) and log framework (Annex 1)

- Describe the Tripartite activities and outputs and outline the interrelationship between them and how they can contribute to the outcome.
- Indicate which Tripartite partner(s) will be accountable for the delivery of specified results at activity and output level.
- Refer to the predetermined outcomes/outputs of the AMR MPTF ToC.
- Briefly outline the expected progress towards the selected outcome(s) from Tripartite AMR result matrix.

17. Value for money

- Justify the budget in terms of “value for money.” Give specific examples of how costs have been contained (economy) and how the joint Tripartite programme design represents the most efficient approach
- Outline the options considered for to identify the most efficient and effective intervention to address the problem.

  i. Sustainability

  - Describe how the approach to delivery will enhance the chances that impact, and benefits will be sustained after the end of the joint Tripartite programme.
  - Demonstrate how long-term financial sustainability will be secured at the end of the programme.
  - Demonstrate how the intervention supports equitable and sustainable outcomes.

18. Partnership and stakeholder engagement (max 2 pages)

- Explain how strategic contributions from other partners and the ways in which other stakeholders will be involved and/or consulted.
- Explain how the joint Tripartite programme will pool and mobilize expertise from across the Tripartite at country, regional and global levels
- If there is a risk that there might be double counting of results between existing programmes explain how this will be avoided
19. Programme implementation in the light of COVID-19

- Explain how programme implementation may be affected by COVID-19.
- Identify how you plan to mitigate any COVID-19 related risks.
- Explain aspects of the proposed programme that have changed from the concept note to align more closely with the national COVID-19 response.

20. Communication, Advocacy and Lesson Learning

- Identify opportunities for advocacy within the joint Tripartite programme.
- Identify aspects of the programme that might be particularly interesting for targeted communication and lessons learning.
- Identify opportunities for high-level strategic influencing, communication and advocacy.

12. Programme implementation

21. Governance and implementation arrangements (max 3 pages)

- Explain the composition, roles and responsibilities of the project team, including the implementation arrangements, roles and responsibilities of each Tripartite organisation.

22. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Sections 3.2 and 3.3 are standard text required for UN trust fund management. Country teams should note these arrangements.

Reporting on the AMR MPTF will be results-oriented, and evidence based. Each Tripartite organisation will provide the Convening/Lead Agent with the following narrative reports prepared in accordance with instructions and templates developed by the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR:

- Annual narrative progress reports, to be provided no later than three (3) months (31 March) after the end of the calendar year, and must include the results matrix, updated risk log, and anticipated activities and results for the next 12-month funding period;
- Mid-term progress review report to be submitted halfway through the implementation of the Joint Programme36 (depending on timing this may merge with the annual report);
- Final consolidated narrative report, after the completion of the joint Tripartite programme, to be provided no later than three (3) months after the operational closure of the activities of the Joint Tripartite programme.

As a minimum, the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR will prepare and report on the activities funded through the AMR MPTF on a 6-month monitoring basis. Additional insights (such as policy papers, value for money analysis, case studies, infographics, blogs) might need to be provided, per request of the Tripartite joint Secretariat on AMR. The joint Tripartite programme will allocate resources for monitoring and evaluation in the budget.

Data for all indicators of the results framework will be shared with the Joint Tripartite Secretariat on AMR on a regular basis, in order to allow the Fund Secretariat to aggregate results at the global level and integrate findings into reporting on progress of the AMR MPTF.

You will be required to include information on complementary funding received from other sources for the activities supported by AMR MPTF, including in-kind contributions and/or South-South Cooperation initiatives, in the reporting done throughout the year.

36 This will be the basis for release of funding for the second year of implementation.
Headquarters’ level shall provide the Administrative Agent (UNDP MPTF Office) with the following statements and reports prepared in accordance with its accounting and reporting procedures, consolidate the financial reports, as follows (more information on the reporting will be provided at the later time):

- Annual financial reports as of 31 December each year with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the AMR MPTF, to be provided no later than four months after the end of the applicable reporting period; and
- A final financial report, after the completion of the activities financed by the AMR MPTF and including the final year of the activities, to be provided no later than 30 April of the year following the operational closing of the project activities.

In addition, regular updates on financial delivery might need to be provided, per request of the Fund Secretariat.

The joint Tripartite programme may be subjected to a Programme Review (methodology to be determined) or joint final independent evaluation (JFEI) by the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, using the guidance on Joint Evaluation and relevant UNDG guidance on evaluations. Evaluation results will be disseminated amongst government, development partners, civil society, and other stakeholders. A joint management response will be produced upon completion of the evaluation process and made publicly available on the evaluation platforms or similar of PUNOs.

23. Accountability, financial management, and public disclosure

Standard text – do not change.

The AMR MPTF will be using a pass-through fund management modality where UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office will act as the Administrative Agent (AA) under which the funds will be channelled for the MPTF through the AA. Each Tripartite organisation receiving funds through the pass-through has signed a standard Memorandum of Understanding with the AA.

Each Tripartite organisation shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the AA of the AMR MPTF (Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office). Such funds will be administered by each Tripartite Agency, in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures. Each Tripartite agency shall establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the AA.

Indirect costs of the Tripartite Organizations recovered through programme support costs will be 7%. All other costs incurred by each tripartite agency in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs.

Funding by the AMR MPTF will be provided on annual basis, upon successful performance of the programme.

Procedures on financial transfers, extensions, financial and operational closure, and related administrative issues are stipulated in the Operational Guidance of the AMR MPTF.

Each Tripartite organisation will take appropriate measures to publicize the AMR MPTF and give due credit to the other Tripartite agencies. All related publicity material, official notices, reports and publications, provided to the press or Fund beneficiaries, will acknowledge the role of the host Government, donors, tripartite partners, the Administrative Agent, and any other relevant entities. In particular, the AA will include and ensure due recognition of the role of each Participating Organization and partners in all external communications related to the AMR MPTF.
Annex 1 - Log Framework Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMR MPTF Log framework</th>
<th>Name of country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Key assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPTF Outcome Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Indicator 1: These indicators serve the measurement of the Outcome and will be standardised</td>
<td>Which data sources are we using for the indicator?</td>
<td>Hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPTF Output Objectives</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source of Verification</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Assumptions and Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output A</strong></td>
<td>Indicator A.1: These measure the Output. One per Output can be sufficient.</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Activities A: list key activities in bullet points (these are described in more detailed in the proposal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefill from the Tripartite RC</td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator A.2:</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output B</strong></td>
<td>Indicator B.1:</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Activities B:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefill from the Tripartite Results</td>
<td>Baseline value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AMR MPTF Log framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact:</th>
<th>Name of country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix</strong></td>
<td>Indicator B.2: Baseline value: Target value: B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output C</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator C.2: Baseline value: Target value: C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output D</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator D.2: Baseline value: Target value: D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output E</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prefill from the Tripartite Results Matrix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator E.2: Baseline value: E.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target value:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2 - Risk Matrix Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Risk Category:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worst case consequence for the project</th>
<th>Risk Score</th>
<th>Mitigating action</th>
<th>Action owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Total Direct Costs

TOTAL

Please indicate which organisation will receive pre-financing facility 45

37 Staff and other personnel costs: Includes all related staff and temporary staff costs including base salary, post adjustment and all staff entitlements. This includes the costs of a full-time project coordinator, based either in one of the organisations or the National coordination committee.

38 Supplies, Commodities, Materials: Includes all direct and indirect costs (e.g. freight, transport, delivery, distribution) associated with procurement of supplies, commodities and materials. Office supplies should be reported as "General Operating".

39 Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture including Depreciation: The procurement of durable equipment is not eligible for the AMR MPTF.

40 Contractual Services: Services contracted by an organization which follow the normal procurement processes. It used for procurement of services requiring provision of intellectual or specialization services not foreseen under works and construction contracts such as, but not limited to, maintenance, licensing, studies, technical, training, advisory services. These are ruled by FAO policy MS 502 or MS 507 ruling LoA.

41 Travel: Includes staff and non-staff travel paid for by the organization directly related to a project.

42 Transfers and Grants to Counterparts: Includes transfers to national counterparts and any other transfers given to an implementing partner (e.g. NGO) which is not similar to a commercial service contract as per above. Please reference FAO policy MS 502.

43 General Operating and Other Direct Costs: Includes all general operating costs for running an office. Examples include telecommunication, rents, finance charges and other costs which cannot be mapped to other expense categories. In addition, backstopping work from Headquarters (including from the project lead technical officer) could also be factored in these categories.

44 Indirect Support Costs: (No definition provided).

45 Max 25,000 USD fund can be used as pre-financing. More detailed information can be found in the guiding notes.
Annex 4 - Global Work Plan Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Tripartite Org</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For planning purposes, it may be helpful to insert the budget for each activity into the plan. This level of detail is not however required in the version submitted to the Secretariat. The outputs should align with the Tripartite AMR results matrix and log framework. This workplan should align with the plans of the respective organizations.
Appendices

Appendices are attached as separate attachments to the email received containing this guidance.

- Appendix 1 – Details of Budget template (excel sheet)
- Appendix 2 – Tripartite Results Matrix

Checklist before submission

13. Global Proposal Submission Template
14. Log Framework Template (see Annex 1) (use of SMART output methodology up to the activity level)
15. Risk Matrix Template (see Annex 2)
16. Outline of Budget Templates (see Annex 3)
17. Work Plan Template (see Annex 4)
18. Details of Budget Template (see Appendix 1)
Annex 4.6  Instructions to develop full proposals

The Antimicrobial Resistance Multi-Partner Trust Fund (AMR MPTF)

Combating the rising global threat of AMR through a One Health Approach

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TRIPARTITE ORGANISATIONS IN DEVELOPING FULL PROPOSALS FOR SUBMISSION

**Introduction**

This note should be read in conjunction with the AMR MPTF full proposal template. It provides guidance to Tripartite country offices on the process of developing a proposal and completing the form.

The first section of the proposal template builds on the concept note approved and provides a high-level summary of the proposal. The second section asks for more detail. FAO and WHO country teams and OIE regional teams that have been asked to submit full proposals to the AMR MPTF have been selected on the basis of a strong track record of multisectoral working and Tripartite collaboration, and because a strong concept note was submitted.

Full proposals based on the concept notes will need to provide more detail on plans and budgets for implementation, and how this Tripartite intervention fits with the broader AMR and country context in achieving AMR MPTF objectives. The full proposal should contain more details on:

1. Background and context including how the proposal fits with ongoing actions that are being supported by the Tripartite, government and other development partners;
2. The deliverables, deadline and responsible parties;
3. Implementation budgets and supporting data and/or rationale justifying budget request;
4. Evidence on how the proposed activities are in line with the National Action Plan for AMR and how they will contribute to the Tripartite Results Matrix (Appendix 3);
5. Risk and proposed mitigation methods;
6. The potential for scale up and longer-term sustainability of impact

The focus of the proposal is on how the Tripartite will work together to support AMR-related activities and as well as showcase how the programme proposed accelerate progress in addressing AMR in country in the timeframe of 24 months. It should build on the comparative advantages and strengths of the three organisations, not only in technical areas, but also political areas and how they will use their convening power to raise the importance of AMR in different sectors.

Sustainability and scale up are crucial. In addition to the technical support that will be provided for activities, the proposal should also set out how actions can be sustained longer-term, outlining how the Tripartite organizations will work with national authorities to advocate for AMR as a key development component of national policy, plans and budgets.

The full proposals must propose a set of results that will be delivered within the prescribed 24-month time frame and the consideration of activities which require a longer time frame to demonstrate the result. An effective proposal may include a combination of short-term early wins (which will often build on ongoing activities) and longer-term systemic changes. As this is the first round of funding proposals, it is important that each country Tripartite team proposes a number of key tangible results that they commit to delivering within the 24-month time frame.

The process of developing the proposal should build on firm foundations; hence it is important that this detailed design process be an open and participative process involving relevant stakeholders at the right time, and fitting within the broader context of AMR action in the different sectors. It is vital that the National AMR Committee, and other relevant national institutions are involved throughout, and that the proposal aligns with and builds upon or leverages synergies with national plans and strategies. This would also include how the proposal will leverage upon existing investments and projects supported by other funders or partners.

**Suggested first steps to take before proposal development**
Step 1. Formulate a country AMR MPTF team – The country AMR MPTF team should be established by the focal points of the FAO and WHO country offices and OIE regional or sub-regional office. These focal points will be actively involved in proposal development and coordinate the efforts on behalf of their respective organization. There must be one lead focal point who coordinates the Tripartite efforts in the country. If the focal points were not yet been identified in the concept note development phase, this should be done urgently.

Step 2. Agree process and responsibilities – The focal points of the three organizations should meet and agree on the process and responsibilities for full proposal development. Noting that the OIE focal point might be based in a different location, meetings could take place virtually. If there are any problems with contacting the other organizations, please inform the Tripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR46, which put into place actions to facilitate communication.

Step 3. Identify and consult with the partners – The national AMR coordination committee should be informed, and there should be a discussion on how they would be involved in the proposal development. A decision on whether a consultation should take place with the wider stakeholders to inform proposal development. There should also be a discussion on how the respective regional and sub regional offices will be involved in the proposal development and delivery process.

Step 4. Inform the UN regional coordinator – Country representatives of FAO and WHO should inform the UN regional coordinator that a proposal is being developed. This is an opportunity for a discussion on AMR more generally, the importance of AMR being included in the development agenda, and in the next iteration of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework.

Step 5. Access Pre-Financing facility – Developing the full proposal will require resources. There will need to be consultations and meetings, and some countries may wish to hire a consultant or dedicate a member of staff to manage the process. A pre-financing facility has been established to allow for these costs to be reclaimed when the full grant is approved. If countries wish to access this facility the maximum threshold is 25000 USD, which can be used for human resource and meeting costs. Only one agency per country will be eligible, and this will usually be the organization leading the proposal development. The facility should be negotiated in advance with the Tripartite Joint Secretariat. Note that the funds will only be released when the full grant is approved, as this cost should be considered and included in the programme budget, and in the unlikely event a full proposal is not approved the funds cannot be reclaimed.

Development of Results-Orientated Timebound Programme Proposal

The proposal needs to set out the resources required for the sequencing and time bound delivery activities towards the delivery of programme outputs over the 24-month time frame. Programme delivery milestones should be identified that can be easily measured to demonstrate direction of travel towards the successful achievement of the selected programme output. The programme narrative will need to be accompanied by a logical framework template (Annex 1).

The focus of the proposal should be on joint Tripartite action, and for all outputs proposed there should be a multisectoral approach. This does not mean that all agencies have to be involved in all activities, as in many instances this would be inefficient. In general, it is not envisaged that this round of proposals would fund substantive programmes or activities that are confined to one sector, and priority should be given to those activities where collaboration is necessary.

Practical issues

Flow of funds
The total joint Tripartite programme budget needs to be accurately allocated between the three organizations, reflecting the actual responsibilities and programmed expenditures of each organization.

When the proposal is approved, the money will be disbursed from the MPTF Office to the headquarters of the three Tripartite organisations. Headquarters will subsequently release the funds to the country account of that organisation in line with the proposal and in accordance with organizational policies and rules. Each organisation will manage, report and account against these funds to their headquarters (see attached note on AMR UNDP guidance on programme operationalization).

46 FAO: Jing Xu (jing.xu@fao.org); OIE: Saija Kalenius (amr.oie.net@oie.int); WHO: Liz Tayler (taylere@who.int)
Programme coordination
Programme coordination across sectors and agencies is complex and requires time. For effective and implementation there will need to be a dedicated programme Coordinator that is based in one of the organizations or for example the national AMR coordination committee, who will coordinate and manage implementation across the three organizations. The costs of a full-time programme coordinator can be charged in the budget. He/she should be the main contact able to quickly interact with the Tripartite focal points and the programme lead across all sectors. While their prime responsibility should be programme management, coordination and reporting, they may have additional responsibilities in facilitating Tripartite support to multisectoral coordination at national level, and the effective working of the AMR coordination committee.

There will be significant administrative work associated with the joint Tripartite programme such as arranging meetings, hiring consultants or providing grants to other organizations. Additional administrative capacity will be required for this, and should be factored into the proposal, or provided as an in-kind contribution.

Technical Support from Regions
Most of the MPTF resource goes directly to country teams. This allows in country teams to call down assistance from regional and HQ teams. There could be a component of the budget set aside to resource this.

Equipment, Vehicles
The procurement of durable equipment is not eligible for the AMR MPTF.

Monitoring and Evaluation and Lesson learning
Monitoring Evaluation and lesson learning are particularly important for first round countries, where documenting lessons-learning and sharing lessons will be particularly important. Some countries will participate in a programme review. The proposal should outline how the programme’s progress will be monitored and identify key evaluation criteria that would confirm programme success were the programme to be evaluated at a later date. Countries should allocate 7-10% of their budget to Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL).

The expectation is that a great deal will be learned from this first wave of joint Tripartite country programmes for other countries to learn from. As a result, there will be a major focus on monitoring, identifying and capturing lessons from the differing contexts for wider dissemination regionally and globally.

Provision has been made for inception and lesson learning workshops to enable Tripartite teams from each country (comprising the key staff involved in the joint programme from the Tripartite agencies, and national counterparts) to come together to discuss their programme with other countries, and to learn and share experience.

It is not clear whether in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic that physical meetings will be possible in the immediate term, but some finance for lesson learning and sharing (estimated USD 25k of the M&E budget) should still be set aside for this.
Annex 5. AMR MPTF Approved Fund Allocation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of allocation decision/meeting</th>
<th>Participating Organization</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>FAO</th>
<th>OIE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total allocation approved in USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current transfer approved in USD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation Decision of the Steering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Programme Number/Title</th>
<th>Participating Org</th>
<th>Total Approved Amounts (USD)</th>
<th>Precedently Transferred Amounts (USD)</th>
<th>Current Transfer Amounts (USD)</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Decision of the SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ALLOCATIONS APPROVED**

| $ | - | $ | - | $ | - | $ | - |

On behalf of the steering committee, I request the Administrative Agent to transfer funding for approved proposals to respective Participating Organizations.

Chair, Steering Committee

Name:
Title:
Signature:
Date:

Mandatory supporting documentation:

- The approved Programme Document and Budget
- The minutes of the SC meeting, documenting resource allocation decision

The Antimicrobial Resistance Multi-Partner Trust Fund (AMR MPTF) Secretariat and the Administrative Agent have elaborated the guidance for the AMR MPTF programme/project establishment and reporting processes as described in the Terms of Reference (TOR) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the United Nations Development Programme and Participating Organizations (POs).

As outlined in the MOU, each PO assumes full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent. Project implementation is to be followed by the individual POs internal rules, directives and procedures.

POs are accountable to the AMR MPTF for results achieved and are obligated to report on their activities and expenditures in line with the Steering Committee approved country signed MOU.

AMR MPTF projects will become operational after following the required steps:

**Steps 1 and 2**
- Once the Steering Committee has approved a country programme, the MPTFO creates a project in the MPTFO system (which will be displayed on the AMR MPTF web-page of the GATEWAY – see http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/AMR00), recording Steering Committee approved allocations. A specific project factsheet webpage is generated in the GATEWAY and populated using the project cover page;
- In order to transfer AMR MPTF funds to an PO, MPTFO must have on file a countersigned MOU by this PO;

**Step 3**
- Based on the Steering Committee Chair instructions, the Administrative Agent transfers the initial allocation to each PO as specified in the Fund Transfer Request (FTR);

**Step 4**
- A payment notification is sent to all POs by email once the transfer is processed by the MPTFO. It includes the transferred amount and the MPTFO project identification number assigned to each specific AMR MPTF project for the entire duration of the Fund;

**Step 5**
- AMR MPTF funding is transferred by the MPTFO to the PO Headquarters’ account. To access funding at the country level, each PO is to follow its individual internal rules and procedures, related to the funds application;
• The POs have to establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the Administrative Agent from the AMR MPTF account. The MPTFO project identification number must be referenced in the PO’s system to ensure correct reporting of the expenditure as per reporting guidelines. There must be a one-to-one mapping between the MPTFO project and the PO’s project. Please see the list of PO Headquarter focal points below for any additional clarifications and guidance;

Step 6

• With the purpose of accurate mapping and future expenditure recording and reporting, the POs must follow UNDG budget cost breakdown of the AMR MPTF Steering Committee approved country programme when establishing a project budget in their ERP system.

Important Information

POs are accountable to the AMR MPTF for results achieved and are obligated to report on their activities and eligible expenditure in line with the Steering Committee approved country/regional Programme and signed MOU.

All financial reports must be submitted and aligned with the correct MPTF Office project reference number and follow the Steering Committee Programme approved UNDG budget structure - present expenditure using the same breakdown per lines as set out in the approved Budget. (see “Guidance Note on Programme reporting requirements”).

No transfer of AMR MPTF funds between different POs can be made. Any budgetary revision or cost extensions must follow the required procedure described in the Operational Manual.

Any deviations from the Steering Committee approved Programme during its implementation must follow established AMR MPTF Programme/Budget revision procedures. (see “Guidance Note on Programme revisions”).

Unspent balances at the end of the project are to be refunded by transfer to the MPTF Office AMR MPTF account (see “Guidance Note How to close projects”).
Annex 7. Programme/project Annual Progress Report template

Insert Logo for Participating UN Organisation(s)

[Name of Fund or Joint Programme]

MPTF OFFICE GENERIC ANNUAL PROGRAMME NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT

REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Title &amp; Project Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Number (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTF Office Project Reference Number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Organization(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme/Project Cost (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total approved budget as per project document:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTF /JP Contribution, by Agency (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Contribution (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions (donors) (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Review - if applicable please attach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: dd.mm.yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation Report - if applicable please attach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: dd.mm.yyyy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable) Country/Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National counterparts (government, private, NGOs &amp; others) and other International Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Duration (months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date (dd.mm.yyyy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original End Date (dd.mm.yyyy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current End Date (dd.mm.yyyy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Organization (Lead):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

47 The term "programme" is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

48 Strategic Results, as formulated in the Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) or project document.

49 The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as "Project ID" on the project's factsheet page the MPTF Office GATEWAY.

50 The MPTF or JP Contribution, refers to the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations, which is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY.

51 The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY.

52 As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

53 If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities.

---
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Guidelines:

The Narrative Progress Report template is based on the UNDG 2003 template, which is currently under review and is in line with the UNDG Results Based Management Handbook (October 2011).

Building on continued efforts made in the UN system to produce results-based reports, the progress report should describe how the activities (inputs) contributed to the achievement of specific short-term outputs during the twelve month reporting period, and to demonstrate how the short-term outputs achieved in the reporting period collectively **contributed to the achievement of the agreed upon outcomes** of the applicable Strategic (UN) Planning Framework guiding the operations of the Fund.

In support of the individual programme reports, please attach any additional relevant information and photographs, assessments, evaluations and studies undertaken or published.

Where available, the information contained in the Programme Summaries and Quarterly and/or Semi-Annual Updates prepared by the Participating Organizations may be useful in the preparation of the Annual Narrative Progress Report. These Summaries and Updates, where applicable, are available in the respective Fund sections of the MPTF Office GATEWAY (http://mptf.undp.org/).

Formatting Instructions:

- The report should be between 10-15 pages. Include a list of the main abbreviations and acronyms that are used in the report.
- Number all pages, sections and paragraphs as indicated below.
- Format the entire document using the following font: 12point Times New Roman and do not use colours.
- The report should be submitted in one single Word or PDF file.
- Annexes can be added to the report but need to be clearly referenced, using footnotes or endnotes within the body of the narrative.
NARRATIVE REPORT FORMAT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In ¼ to ½ a page, summarise the most important achievements of Programme during the reporting period and key elements from your detailed report below. Highlight in the summary, the elements of the main report that you consider to be the most critical to be included in the MPTF Office Consolidated Annual Report.

I. Purpose

- Provide the main objectives and expected outcomes of the programme in relation to the appropriate Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF/UNSDCF) and project document (if applicable) or Annual Work Plan (AWP).

II. Results

- This section is the most important in the Report and particular attention should be given to reporting on results / and changes that have taken place rather than on activities. It has three parts to help capture this information in different ways (i. Narrative section; ii. Indicator based performance assessment; and iii. A specific story).

i) Narrative reporting on results:
From January to December 2019, respond to the guiding questions indicated below to provide a narrative summary of the results achieved. The aim here is to tell the story of change that your Programme has achieved in 2019. Make reference to the implementation mechanism utilized and key partnerships.

- **Outcomes**: Outcomes are the strategic, higher level of change that your Programme is aiming to contribute towards. Provide a summary of progress made by the Programme in relation to planned outcomes from the Project Document / AWP, with reference to the relevant indicator(s) in these documents. Describe if any targets were achieved, or explain any variance in achieved versus planned results during the reporting period. Explain who the main beneficiaries were.

- **Outputs**: Outputs are the more immediate results that your Programme is responsible for achieving. Report on the key outputs achieved in the reporting period, in relation to planned outputs from the Project Document, with reference to the relevant indicator(s) in these documents. Describe if any targets were achieved, or explain any variance in achieved versus planned results during the reporting period. If possible, include the percentage of completion of the outputs and the type and number of beneficiaries.

- **Describe any delays in implementation, challenges, lessons learned & best practices**: If there were delays, explain the nature of the constraints and challenges, actions taken to mitigate future delays and lessons learned in the process. Provide an updated risk analysis (have any of the risks identified during the project design materialized or changed? Are there any new risks?). Were there any programmatic revisions undertaken during the reporting period? Please also include experiences of failure, which often are the richest source of lessons learned.

- **Qualitative assessment**: Provide a qualitative assessment of the level of overall achievement of the Programme. Highlight key partnerships and explain how such relationships impacted on the achievement of results. Explain cross-cutting issues pertinent to the results being reported on. For Joint Programmes, highlight how UN coordination has been affected in support of achievement of results.
ii) Indicator Based Performance Assessment:

Using the Programme Results Framework from the Project Document / AWP - provide an update on the achievement of indicators at both the output and outcome level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, clear explanation should be given explaining why, as well as plans on how and when this data will be collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>outcome 1^4</th>
<th>achieved indicator targets</th>
<th>reasons for variance with planned target (if any)</th>
<th>source of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indicator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicator 1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicator 1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicator 1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^4 Note: Outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets should be as outlined in the Project Document so that you report on your actual achievements against planned targets. Add rows as required for Outcome 2, 3 etc.
| Indicator 1.2.2 | Baseline: | Planned Target: |
iii) A Specific Story (Optional)

- This could be a success or human story. It does not have to be a success story – often the most interesting and useful lessons learned are from experiences that have not worked. The point is to highlight a concrete example with a story that has been important to your Programme in the reporting period.
- In ¼ to ½ a page, provide details on a specific achievement or lesson learned of the Programme. Attachment of supporting documents, including photos with captions, news items etc, is strongly encouraged. The MPTF Office will select stories and photos to feature in the Consolidated Annual Report, the GATEWAY and the MPTF Office Newsletter.

Problem / Challenge faced: Describe the specific problem or challenge faced by the subject of your story (this could be a problem experienced by an individual, community or government).

Programme Interventions: How was the problem or challenged addressed through the Programme interventions?

Result (if applicable): Describe the observable change that occurred so far as a result of the Programme interventions. For example, how did community lives change or how was the government better able to deal with the initial problem?

Lessons Learned: What did you (and/or other partners) learn from this situation that has helped inform and/or improve Programme (or other) interventions?

III. Other Assessments or Evaluations (if applicable)

- Report on any assessments, evaluations or studies undertaken.

IV. Programmatic Revisions (if applicable)

- Indicate any major adjustments in strategies, targets or key outcomes and outputs that took place.

V. Resources (Optional)

- Provide any information on financial management, procurement and human resources.
- Indicate if the Programme mobilized any additional resources or interventions from other partners.
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Foreword (message of steering committee-chairs) - Optional

Executive Summary

Fund Dashboard (1 pager with key statistics to be defined by each fund if available) - Optional

1. SDG achievements
   This should mention any updates on the SDG targets relevant to the fund and its scope, any work that is in process or expected eg. planned surveys, the percentage of funds directed to each SDG target. The section can be used to reiterate the fund’s mandate and its relevance.

2. Achievements of the Fund
   An introduction could give an overview of the fund allocations. Then, this section should include an overview of all results and programmatic achievements, preferably structured per outcome. This can include global activities, country activities and reporting on thematic areas depending on the fund set-up. This section should include all signature indicators, and could also describe other outcome level results. Lessons learned can conclude this section. Details on projects funded, lists of other indicator results should go into the annex.

3. Fund operational performance
   This section should elaborate on how the fund was managed, the operational activities of the Steering Committee and Secretariat, explain results on the indicators common to all funds as well as fund specific fund performance results. This should also include sections on transparency, accountability and risk management. Lessons learned can again conclude this section. A graphic representation of the governance structure can be put in the annex.

4. Fund financial performance
   This section should include financial performance including the financial tables (will be provided by MPTF Office in May. This can be a separate input from the narrative report).
   - Sources and Uses of Funds
   - Interest
   - Transfers and Expenditures
   - Expenditures reported by Participating Organizations
   - Budget vs. actual at fund level
   - Cost recovery

5. Conclusion – way forward

6. Annexes
   Human Interest stories
   Descriptions of:
   - programme mandate
   - governance structure
   Definitions
   Acronyms
Annex 9. Tripartite Co-publishing Agreement

COPUBLISHING AGREEMENT

between

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
(hereinafter referred to as ‘FAO’)

and

THE WORLD ORGANISATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH
12, Rue de Prony, 75017 Paris, France
(hereinafter referred to as ‘OIE’)

and

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland
(hereinafter referred to as ‘WHO’)

Article 1 – Purpose

FAO, OIE and WHO, hereinafter collectively referred to as ‘the Parties’ and individually as a “Party” agree to collaborate in the joint development, preparation, publishing and distribution of publications and other documents in the English language and other UN official languages in print and electronic formats, hereinafter referred to as ‘the Tripartite Works’.

This agreement constitutes the only and entire legally binding contract between FAO, OIE and WHO with respect to the Tripartite Works herein identified.

Article 2 – Rights

(a) The Parties share the right to publish and distribute the Tripartite Works free of charge in electronic form and the right to publish, distribute free of charge and sell the Tripartite Works.

(b) The Tripartite Works shall be published under the joint imprint of the Parties. The lead publishing Party for each Tripartite Works shall be agreed by the Parties on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Each Party has provided intellectual contribution to the Tripartite Works. Copyright of the Tripartite Works shall be jointly vested in the Parties for the whole term of copyright. All
acts covered by the copyright shall be taken jointly, including any revision of the Tripartite Works. Hence, the Parties shall also decide jointly on the reproduction, publication and dissemination of the Tripartite Works. Each Party shall handle any permissions and reprint requests from third parties that it receives and shall keep the other Parties informed of any permission requests received concerning the Tripartite Works and before granting such rights to third parties. In the event of requests for commercial purposes, permission will be granted only after the Party has received written agreement from the other Parties.

(d) The Parties retain the right to incorporate material based on, or derived from, the Tripartite Works in any subsequent works, provided appropriate acknowledgement of the other Parties is made.

(e) Each Party undertakes to seek the prior consent of the other Parties in the event that they wish to undertake or license translations or local reprints or other derivative versions of the Tripartite Works, provided that such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

(f) The Parties share the right to make the Tripartite Works available on their respective websites.

(g) The Parties share all other rights (including all forms of electronic dissemination rights) not specifically granted in this Agreement.

(h) The Parties warrant that, to the best of their knowledge, they are the sole owners of their contribution to the Tripartite Works, that it has never been published elsewhere in its present form, that it does not infringe upon any copyright or other right(s), that it does not contain libellous or other unlawful material, that they are the sole owner of the rights assigned to the other Parties and that they have obtained in writing the customary permission from the copyright owners whenever a passage is quoted and/or a table or illustration from copyrighted material is used.

Article 3 – Editorial and production arrangements

(a) Content and submission of material. The Parties shall collaborate in the development and final approval of the content. The Tripartite Works shall contain no material of any kind other than that agreed between the Parties. Subject to their policies and administrative procedures, the Parties shall be responsible for submitting the manuscript of the Tripartite Works for approval through their respective clearance channels, prior to commencing editorial production.

(b) Editorial production. The lead Publishing Party shall be responsible for copyediting, designing and typesetting the Tripartite Works, including the preparation of final files for print and electronic dissemination.

(c) Publication date. The Parties undertake to follow the agreed schedule for publication of the English edition of the Tripartite Works.

(d) Print authorization. A complete set of print-ready PDF files, including all text and cover pages, will be provided by the lead Publishing Party before the Tripartite Works are printed. Each party shall review and notify the lead Publishing Party of any errors that need to be corrected without undue delay from receipt of proofs. The final print authorization shall be given by the lead Publishing Party after all changes have been agreed and made. The lead Publishing Party shall provide the Parties with the final approved version of the Tripartite Works in pdf format.

(e) Printing. If necessary, the Parties shall use the print-ready files provided by the lead Publishing Party to print copies for their own institutional use and distribution.

(f) Format. The Tripartite Works shall consist of A4 format, perfect binding, high and low resolution PDFs
(g) Logos. The logos of all Parties will be printed on the Tripartite Works in alphabetical order, in accordance with the approved Tripartite logoblock.

(h) Covers. The text and design of the cover shall be provided by the lead Publishing Party for review and approval by all Parties before the production of the PDF file ready to print.

(i) Title page. The following text shall appear on the title page:

Published by
the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
and
the World Organisation for Animal Health
and
the World Health Organization

(j) Reverse of title page. The reverse of the title page of the Tripartite Works shall contain, as appropriate:

[i] Title of the Tripartite Works

[ii] "© World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) Year of Publication"


(iv) the following copyright notice:

All rights reserved. WHO, FAO and OIE encourage the reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Any proposed reproduction or dissemination for non-commercial purposes will be authorized free of charge upon request, provided the source is fully acknowledged. Any proposed reproduction or dissemination for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, is prohibited without the prior written permission of the copyright holders, and may incur fees.

When WHO is lead publisher:
Requests for permission to reproduce or translate WHO publications – whether for sale or for non-commercial distribution – should be addressed to WHO Press through the WHO website http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright_form/en/index.html.

When FAO is lead publisher:
All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

When OIE is lead publisher:
All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be addressed to a.souvri@oie.int

(v) the following disclaimer:

"The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) or of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted and dashed lines on maps represent
approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement. The
mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not
these have been patented, does not imply that these are or have been
disclosed or recommended by WHO, FAO and OIE in preference to others
of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The published material is being
distributed without warranty of any kind either expressed or implied. The
responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the
reader. In no event shall WHO, FAO and OIE be liable for damages arising
from its use. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not
necessarily represent those of WHO, FAO, OIE”.

[vi] The contact details of the Parties

Publications of the World Health Organization are available on the WHO web site
(www.who.int) or can be purchased from WHO Press, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue
Appia, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 791 3264; fax: +41 22 791 4857; e-mail:
bookorders@who.int).

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and
can be purchased through Publications-sales@fao.org

Publications of the World Organisation for Animal Health are available either on the OIE web
site (www.oie.int) or can be purchased through the OIE online bookshop
(www.oie.int/boutique).

Article 4 – Distribution, financial and reporting arrangements

(a) Print run and distribution of copies. The parties shall print copies of the Tripartite Works
according to their own requirements, using the print-ready PDF files provided by the lead
Publishing Party.

(b) Sales, pricing and costs. Sales and pricing conditions and financial contributions of the
Parties for a possible printed edition shall be agreed among the Parties, who agree to consult
on a case-by-case basis.

(c) Reprints. All reprints shall be published under the joint imprint of the Parties. Requests for
reprints may be made by any of the Parties, who agree to consult on a case-by-case basis.

(d) Royalties. No royalties shall be due between the Parties.

(e) Right to audit. Upon written request, the Parties shall provide any information that the other
Parties may reasonably request on the basis that it is required in order to ascertain the
accuracy of accounts rendered.

Article 5 – Termination of agreement

(a) This Agreement shall be valid for the duration of the copyright in the Tripartite Works.

(b) This Agreement may be terminated with immediate effect by any of the Parties by providing
three months’ written notice thereof to the other[s]. Any such early termination shall be
subject to the settlement of any outstanding obligations. Articles 2, 5 and 6 shall survive
termination of this Agreement.
Article 6 – General conditions

(a) **Privileges and immunities.** Nothing in this Agreement or relating thereto shall be construed as constituting a waiver of privileges or immunities of FAO, WHO, OIE or as conferring any privileges or immunities to the Parties or their personnel.

(b) **Settlement of disputes.** This Agreement and any dispute arising there from shall be governed by general principles of law, to the exclusion of any single national system of law. Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or in relation to this Agreement shall be settled by mutual agreement between the Parties. If the Parties are unable to reach an agreement on any question in dispute or on a mode of settlement other than arbitration, either Party shall have the right to request arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) as at present in force. The Parties agree to be bound by any arbitration award rendered in accordance with the above-mentioned rules as the final adjudication of any such dispute.

(c) **Third party claims.** Each Party shall promptly inform the other Parties of any claim that the Tripartite Works infringe upon any copyright or other rights of third parties, or contains libellous or unlawful material. The Parties shall then discuss and jointly agree on any action to be taken, and the appropriate Party to take such action. The above is without prejudice to the privileges and immunities of FAO, OIE or WHO.

(d) **Correspondence.** All correspondence between the Parties relating to this Agreement shall be addressed as follows:

- FAO: Pedro Javaloyes, Office for Corporate Communication, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153, Rome, Italy
- OIE: Annie Souyri, Publications Unit, 12, Rue de Prony, 75017 Paris, France

Signed for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Name: Pedro Javaloyes
Title: Chief, Publications Group
Date: 18/12/2017

Signed for the World Organisation for Animal Health

Name: Monique Eloit
Title: Director General
Date: 20/12/2017

Signed for the World Health Organization

Name: Dr Laraagh Olllogly
Title: Coordinator, WHO Press
Date: 18 December 2017
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**English**

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

OIE

World Health Organization

**French**

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture

OIE

Organisation mondiale de la Santé

**Spanish**

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura

OIE

Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal