

July 2018



**Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations**



**The International Treaty**  
ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES  
FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

**INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES  
FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

**TENTH MEETING OF THE AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE  
FUNDING STRATEGY AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

**Rome, Italy, 5 – 7 September 2018**

**PROVISIONALLY POPULATED MATRIX OF FUNDING TOOLS**

This document contains an update to Appendix 2, *Matrix of Funding Tools and the Areas and Programmes under the International Treaty*, of the *Annotated Outline: Updated Funding Strategy*. The update responds to the decision of the Governing Body, set out in paragraph 7 i) a) of Resolution 3/2017, to reconvene the *Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on the Funding Strategy and Resource Mobilization*, with a revised mandate, in order to develop the updated Funding Strategy and related Annexes, for consideration and approval by the Eighth Session of the Governing Body.

The full text of the Resolution is made available to the Committee through document IT/GB-7/17/Res3 contained in other documents made available.

# Provisionally Populated Matrix of Funding Tools

---

*Nina Isabella Moeller*

This document was prepared at the request of the Secretariat of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The contents of this document are entirely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Secretariat of the International Treaty.

## Provisionally Populated Matrix of Funding Tools

### Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Summary of findings by Treaty area .....	3
3. Understanding the provisionally populated Matrix .....	5

### 1. Introduction

Through Resolution 3/2017, the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (hereinafter ‘the Treaty’) decided to reconvene the *Ad Hoc* Advisory Committee on the Funding Strategy and Resource Mobilization (hereinafter ‘the Committee’) with the mandate to update the Funding Strategy and related Annexes for consideration and approval by the Eighth Session of the Governing Body. The present document provides a provisionally filled Matrix of Funding Tools and the Areas and Programmes under the International Treaty (hereinafter ‘the Matrix’). The main information basis to populate the Matrix was the document, *Report on Progress: Matrix of Funding Tools Analysis*. The Matrix has been filled as part of a first iteration of the review of the funding landscape of relevance to Treaty implementation, which is meant to inform deliberations in of the Committee.

Due to the many challenges associated with data collection for the purposes of this Matrix, as discussed more fully in the Report on Progress which is to be read in conjunction with the present document, the Matrix presented here visualizes only a limited data set, and may be further refined in future iterations of this exercise. However, while there is certainly scope to improve the information through further iterations of the analysis, it is important to note that there are certain limitations inherent in a Matrix-centred approach.

The Matrix presented in the present document does not show levels of funding flow in USD amounts, primarily due to the very poor inter-institutional comparability of data – such as is due to different reporting periods, and financial accounting frameworks. Instead it visualises where areas of work and programming priorities of each funding tool are commensurate with the areas and programmes under the Treaty.

In addition to the provisionally populated Matrix, this document also provides a short summary of findings by Treaty area. This is a qualitative analysis of the contribution of each funding tool to the different areas and programmes under the Treaty.

### 2. Summary of findings by Treaty area

#### *Ex situ conservation – global level*

The two institutions leading efforts in this Treaty area are the Global Crop Diversity Trust (hereinafter ‘the Crop Trust’) and the Centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR Centres). There is a long term vision and programming mechanisms to ensure funding to genebanks functioning at the global level through these institutions. It needs to be recognized that the World Bank contributes as key donor to the CGIAR Centres.

### ***Ex situ conservation – regional level***

The Crop Trust is the only institution that has reported some specific funding for regional genebanks and that has a long term programmatic approach to support a number of regional collections, which are managed under Article 15 of the International Treaty. These collections also receive funding from bilateral or regional programmes on a more *ad hoc* basis. More data needs to be gathered on financing regional genebanks.

### ***Ex situ conservation – national level***

While there appears to be no leading multilateral channel to support national *ex situ* collections of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA), these collections receive funding, on an *ad hoc* basis, through projects from many multilateral and bilateral channels. While the core funding for national *ex situ* collections will come from national budgets, more information is needed on levels and trends for such funding.

### ***In situ conservation***

There is strong indication that the main multilateral channel through which support flows specifically to *in situ* conservation efforts of crop diversity and crop wild relatives is the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Surprisingly, the GEF has recently invested more in on-farm management and sustainable use than in any other Treaty area. There are other actors that contribute to this Treaty area, such as IFAD and the CGIAR in the area of research for *in situ* conservation, but the main global player is GEF.

### ***On-farm management***

A wide range of players interface in this Treaty area. The Benefit-sharing Fund has on-farm management of PGRFA as one of its main priorities and there are specific programmes within GEF to support this area. Many IFAD grants have a focus on on-farm management coupled with crop diversification and market value chains. While the CGIAR may be seen by others as a leader in *ex situ* conservation and breeding, there is considerable amount of funding channelled through the CGIAR to support on-farm management.

### ***Breeding/Sustainable Use***

The CGIAR channels considerable amounts of funding towards breeding of the crops listed in *Annex I* of the Treaty. Other multilateral and regional mechanisms that channel funding towards breeding need to be further explored; for example, there have been many regional breeding initiatives funded by bilateral programmes or foundations in Africa in recent years. This needs further exploration. The roles of the World Bank and the regional development banks in this context need to be further explored, as well. The role of the private sector has so far not been considered.

There are two highlights in the area of sustainable use (other than breeding): the survey conducted as part of this review has shown that many projects funded in support of on-farm management deal with crop diversification, markets and seed delivery, including those projects funded by the GEF, IFAD and the Treaty's Benefit-sharing Fund (BSF). Other projects in this area are more focused on seed systems and seed policies, where FAO has a long tradition.

### ***Non-monetary benefit-sharing – technology transfer***

The dissemination of improved breeding lines by the CGIAR is an important technology transfer mechanism under the International Treaty. Technology transfer is therefore embedded in the final stages of the breeding programmes of the CGIAR. The BSF has piloted the implementation of specific projects targeting different technology transfer models (North-South, South-South, CGIAR-NARS). Most other funding tools integrate technology transfer in the entirety of their

project portfolios. The role of the World Bank needs to be further explored in this area, as well as those of the regional banks and the private sector.

#### ***Non-monetary benefit-sharing – information systems and Global Information System***

The main resource partners for PGRFA information systems and the Global Information System (GLIS) are FAO, the Crop Trust, the CGIAR, and certain donors through the Fund for Agreed Purposes (FAP) of the Treaty. These are the key institutions and entities that contribute to maintaining the global information infrastructure, as stipulated under Article 17 of the Treaty. The national and regional programmes that contribute data to the GLIS and manage their information systems receive funding mainly from national sources.

#### ***Non-monetary benefit-sharing – capacity building***

Almost all the funding tools listed in the Matrix that were surveyed are involved in capacity building as part of the majority of their projects related to PGRFA. FAO, the Treaty through its FAP, the CGIAR and the Crop Trust are currently the resource partners best placed to provide highly specific capacity building on PGRFA and the Treaty implementation.

#### ***The Multilateral System***

Funding to support the Multilateral System (MLS) is channelled primarily through (i) the funding provided to the global, regional, and national genebanks that sustain the System, that is, mainly the Crop Trust, the CGIAR and national sources, and (ii) the policy and capacity building programmes that the CGIAR and the FAP support to facilitate developing countries' participation in the Multilateral System. The 7th replenishment cycle of the GEF is set to support the joint implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the Treaty and opens up the possibility of funding to enable a policy environment conducive to the functioning of the MLS.

#### ***Farmers' Rights***

There are currently no funding tools that prioritize Farmers' Rights. While very limited *ad hoc* funding is provided by some donors through the FAP, however, on-farm management projects regularly have policy and capacity building components that relate to the implementation of Farmers' Rights.

#### ***Policy development***

The leading institution in policy development is probably FAO, with the CGIAR, and the Treaty itself playing important roles. As indicated above, GEF and IFAD projects will have policy components within individual projects. In this context, the role of the World Bank, as well as the role of agencies such as the UNDP, need to be explored.

### **3. Understanding the provisionally populated Matrix**

Figure 1 below highlights, in blue, which areas are being addressed by each funding tool, that is, to which areas funding has been provided to date or in which areas work has been carried out by each tool.

This visualization of the linkages between funding tools and Treaty areas is based on the data gathered during this initial phase of the exercise, as documented in the Report on Progress. More concrete data is needed from the CGIAR and FAO, but it is foreseen that these organizations contribute, in one way or the other, to most of the areas of Treaty implementation. Thus, the entire rows have been highlighted in blue for both institutions.

**FIGURE 1: PROVISIONALLY POPULATED MATRIX OF FUNDING TOOLS AND THE AREAS AND PROGRAMMES UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY**

<sup>i</sup> “Farmers’ contributions” was removed from this Matrix for reasons of clarity. See also p. 6 of Report on Progress.

<sup>ii</sup> A column on “policy development” was added as this is a relevant area under the Treaty and funding flows in this respect were part of our findings.

<sup>iii</sup> This heading has been amended to reflect the fact that the Fund for Agreed Purposes falls under the guidance of the Governing Body.

<sup>iv</sup> The IFAD row has been moved up in this version of the Matrix, only to better visualise the areas of work of the different Funding Tools for which we have sufficient or reasonable amount of data.