

May 2016

E



## Global Soil Partnership Plenary Assembly



### Fourth session

Rome, 23-25 May 2016

### Report on the financial status of GSP, including the Healthy Soils Facility

#### Executive Summary

- Some progress has been made in mobilizing extra-budgetary resources since the GSP inception, including through such a specially designed tool as the Healthy Soils Facility. However, much higher flows must materialize to match extensive requirements for external assistance. These requirements are likely to be identified even more precisely through the Global and Regional Implementation Plans formulated under the five GSP Pillars (cf. also documents under items 2, 4 and 5 of the agenda).
- At the same time, many partners are to be commended for providing in kind contributions to specific activities, for instance in relation to training facilities, and of course – in a less quantifiable but still impressive manner – the multitude of technical inputs furnished on a purely voluntary basis feeding into key reports or policy instruments developed under the aegis of the ITPS. However, more partners need to follow suit, in line with the expectations stemming from GSP establishment.
- In this context, the present document is essentially focused on apprising the Assembly about the resources mobilized so far in support of GSP objectives. As will be seen, against the planned indicative target given in the programme document of the Healthy Soils Facility of USD 60 million, only approximately 10% - i.e. USD 6.3 million - has been obtained so far.

#### Suggested action by the GSP Plenary Assembly

- The Plenary Assembly may wish to:
  - renew its call to all partners, and especially resource partners, to support the GSP implementation and execution of the Global and Regional Implementation Plans by contributing funds, including through the Healthy Soils Facility, and providing in kind contributions to specific activities in substantially higher volumes.

## I. Introduction

1. The GSP is based on cost-sharing principles, whereby each partner may contribute with different inputs to the implementation of approved work.
2. The Assembly would also recall that FAO's contribution from its Regular Budget, as specified in the Terms of Reference approved by the FAO Council, is limited to hosting the GSP Secretariat at headquarters, and provides only core support staff. The resulting lack of funds limits the capacity and flexibility of the Secretariat in providing support to GSP implementation, especially in terms of technical assistance to the countries, a situation which is in deep contrast with the current phase of growing operational complexity and expansion of GSP-related work at all levels.
3. However, as shown in the table below, some TCP projects (FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme) of direct relevance to the GSP have been approved and are being implemented.

## II. Mobilization of extra-budgetary resources

4. Since the inception of the GSP and particularly after the establishment of the Healthy Soils Facility, as endorsed by the Plenary Assembly, some progress has been made in mobilizing extra-budgetary resources.
5. The first significant example in direct support of the GSP, was the project endorsed by the EC towards the end of 2013, to the tune of EURO 1 million. This project has been successfully implemented during the 2014-2015 biennium.
6. Further to that initial contribution, the EC has provided additional funding of EUR1.5 million for the period 2016-2018.
7. The Russian Federation has also provided funding for the period 2015-2018 amounting to USD 1 million. This project has been of paramount relevance for instance to the preparation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Soil Management. Switzerland has supported the implementation of the International Year of Soils and has made a further contribution to the GSP for 2015-2017 of USD 250,000. The Kingdom of Thailand has also assisted with the International Year of Soils with USD 100,000. Other donors, such as Turkey (via the UTF modality) have committed financial support, as a mark of trust in GSP mandate and objectives.
8. A more complete account of these financial contributions, including from TCP resources, is given in the following table. For extra-budgetary resources, distinction is made between closed and ongoing project.
9. An immediate conclusion is that, against the planned indicative target given in the programme document of the Healthy Soil Facility of USD 60 million, only approximately 10% i.e. USD 6.3 million has been obtained so far.

<b>Overview of funds mobilized in support of the GSP</b>	
<b>Closed projects (extra-budgetary)</b>	
<b>EUROPEAN UNION (GCP /GLO/499/EC)</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>

THAILAND (GCP /GLO/585/THA)	\$100,000
MULTIDONOR PROJECT (GCP /GLO/592/MUL), of which:	\$182,000
® SWITZERLAND	\$100,000
® INTERNATIONAL FERTILIZER ASSOCIATION	\$58,000
® INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION INSURERS	\$12,000
® AUSTRIAN HAIL INSURANCE COMPANY	\$12,000
UNEP (GLO/619/UEP)	\$93,000
TURKEY (UTF/TUR/057/TUR)	\$500,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,225,000</b>
<b>Ongoing Projects (extra-budgetary)</b>	
RUSSIAN FEDERATION (GCP /GLO/650/RUS)	\$1,000,000
EUROPEAN UNION (GCP /GLO/663/EC)	\$1,696,000
MULTIDONOR PROJECT (GCP /GLO/671/MUL) ® SWITZERLAND	\$250,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,946,000</b>
<b>OVERALL AMOUNT</b>	<b>\$5,171,000</b>

<b>(extra-budgetary)</b>	
<b>TCP Projects: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Sudan</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,174,000</b>