

April 2023



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



**International Treaty
on Plant Genetic Resources
for Food and Agriculture**

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

**SEVENTH MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE
FUNDING STRATEGY AND RESOURCE**

3 – 5 MAY 2023

**FINAL REPORT OF THE PANEL OF EXPERTS:
FIFTH CALL FOR PROPOSALS OF THE BENEFIT-SHARING FUND**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its Fifth meeting, the Standing Committee on the Funding Strategy and Resource Mobilization (the Committee) agreed to launch the Fifth Cycle of the Benefit-sharing Fund (BSF-5) on the International Day for Biological Diversity, which fell on 22 May 2022.¹
2. BSF-5 reflects the inputs and guidance provided by the Committee throughout 2021-2022 and incorporates some of the main novelties outlined in the BSF Operations Manual.²
3. According to the BSF Operations Manual, the Independent Panel of Experts (the Panel) conducts the screening of pre-proposals and final review of project proposals. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Panel are made public.³ The ToRs were also circulated to the Bureau of the Ninth Session of the Governing Body and published on the Treaty website.⁴ The *Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Related Standards of Conduct for the Benefit-sharing Fund*,⁵ which Panel members are required to comply with, was shared with the Panel.
4. During the September-November 2022 period the Panel undertook the two-step screening process of the eligible pre-proposals and finalized a list of pre-proposals with their rankings for the Committee's consideration at its sixth meeting. The Panel prepared a report detailing the steps undertaken in this process, which was made available to the Committee at its sixth meeting.
5. The summary of the methodology and outcome of the screening of pre-proposals by the Panel are contained in Section II to this document. Section II also contains a list of recommendations that the Panel made to the Committee to support its deliberations in the pre-proposal phase.
6. At its sixth meeting, the Committee discussed the different scenarios presented by the Secretariat and invited a list of pre-proposals to develop a full project proposal, as contained in *Appendix 3* of the Proceedings of the sixth meeting, *IT/GB-10/SFC-6/23/Proceedings*.⁶ The list was also published on the Treaty website.⁷ In doing so, the Committee acknowledged the need to keep the list short and noted the indicative regional allocation of funds and the number of pre-proposals presented by the Secretariat based on the *Report of the Panel of Experts – Fifth Call for Proposals of the Benefit-sharing Fund* (PoE Report).

¹ IT/GB-9/SFC-5/22/Proceedings, Item IV paragraph 18 available at www.fao.org/3/cb9206en/cb9206en.pdf

² Resolution 3/2019, Annex 2: www.fao.org/3/nb780en/nb780en.pdf

³ Resolution 3/2019, Annex 2, para. 32: www.fao.org/3/nb780en/nb780en.pdf

⁴ The Terms of Reference of the Panel are available at www.fao.org/3/cc3351en/cc3351en.pdf

⁵ Resolution 2/2013, Annex 2, www.fao.org/3/a-be595e.pdf

⁶ IT/GB-10/SFC-6/23/Proceedings available at www.fao.org/3/cc4271en/cc4271en.pdf

⁷ Pre-proposals invited to develop a full proposal: www.fao.org/plant-treaty/areas-of-work/benefit-sharing-fund/fifth-cycle/en/

7. The summary of the methodology for the two-step appraisal of the full project proposals by the Panel is contained in Section III of this Final PoE Report. The outcome of the two-step appraisal of the Panel is summarized in Section IV. The list of projects recommended for funding is provided in Annex 1 to this Final PoE Report. Section V contains an overview of the main elements and some new trends within the portfolio of projects recommended for funding in BSF-5. General recommendations from the Panel to the Committee and Secretariat are contained in Section VI of this document.

II. SCREENING OF THE PRE-PROPOSALS

8. The Panel conducted the screening of the pre-proposals based on the two-step methodology prepared by the Secretariat. The Panel worked in regional groups to collectively identify the best pre-proposals from a total of 172 eligible pre-proposals received for the BSF-5. The Panel screened the project pre-proposals based on the screening criteria established in *Appendix 1: Eligibility and screening criteria of the CfPs-5*.⁸

9. The screening process was structured in two steps, as follows:

- **Step 1:** Technical screening and compilation of shortlist A+ of best pre-proposals for each region
Result: A total of 52 pre-proposals have been classified as A+.
- **Step 2:** Scoring of List of A+ pre-proposals against a set of weighted criteria intended to reveal the technical quality and merit and focused on 6 criteria (target outputs, knowledge management, targeted PGRFA, beneficiaries, partnerships, feasibility)
Result: Scored List of A+ pre-proposals from which the Committee selected the pre-proposals to be invited to develop a full project proposal.

10. The Panel also made a set of recommendations to the Committee in deciding which pre-proposals to invite to prepare a full project proposal, as follows:

- Consider giving priority to pre-proposals that involve countries that have never received funding from BSF;
- Ensure that multi-country projects are included in the portfolio;
- Give priority to applications from national organizations, especially farmers' organizations ahead of those submitted by international organizations;
- Give priority to a diversity of projects to ensure sufficient balance across the three main outputs with a special focus on the quality of knowledge management and communication strategy with clear links to the Treaty implementation.

11. At its sixth meeting (17-18 January 2023), the Committee took note of the PoE Report, and welcomed, in particular, the methodology used in the screening process as well as the summary of findings and recommendations, and approved a list of 34 pre-proposals to be invited to develop a full project proposal.⁹

III. APPRAISAL PROCESS OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

12. The Secretariat received a total of 32 full proposals that have been appraised, scored and ranked by the Panel based on the *Methodology of appraisal of full proposals*, prepared by the Secretariat, and against a set of weighted appraisal criteria (see Table 1). The appraisal criteria reflect the programme of the Fifth Call for Proposals and intend to reveal how each component of the proposal links to a technically sound rationale and methodology, with feasible activities and outputs that will contribute to the delivery of the BSF Results Framework.

13. Two sets of criteria were used by the experts (see Table 1 A and B). First, the *A. Objective criteria* were used to assess the quality and technical merit of the full proposals, including the further scalability and outcome delivery of Phase 2 proposals. Second, the *B. Relative criteria* on BSF-5 efficient and effective leveraging of resources were developed based on the recommendations provided by the Committee at its sixth

⁸ Appendix 1 - Eligibility and screening criteria for pre-proposals: www.fao.org/3/cc0230en/cc0230en.pdf

⁹ IT/GB-10/SFC-6/23/Proceedings available at www.fao.org/3/cc4271en/cc4271en.pdf

meeting.¹⁰ The objective criteria are those that can be appraised within the confines of a single proposal; whilst the relative criteria implied comparing the proposals within the BSF-5 portfolio and with those from the past BSF programme cycles.

Table 1: Objective and Relative Appraisal Criteria

A. Objective criteria: Quality and Technical Merits	1 - Problem definition and rationale
	2 - Addressing an identified pressing problem: activities, outputs
	3 - Methodology is scientifically sound, realistic, and adequate to achieve targeted outputs
	4 - PGRFA material addressed, used, and resulting from the project
	5 - Knowledge management and communications
	6 - Beneficiaries and gender mainstreaming
	7 - Partnerships
	8 - Budget
	9 - Sustainability and exit strategy
	10 - Phase 2 further scalability and outcome delivery
B. Relative Criteria: BSF-5 efficient and effective leveraging of resources	Regional balance; the involvement of countries that have never participated in, or have received limited funding from the BSF; avoid duplication of similar pre-proposals submitted by the same institution; appropriate balance between national and international organisations; consideration of different types of organisations, including farmers' organisations; the building of capacities and skills of new partners for Treaty implementation; and the efficient use of funding.

14. The appraisal process was organized in the following steps:

Step 1: Remote appraisal based on the objective criteria. This implied the remote appraisal and scoring of each project proposal by at least two experts against the objective criteria. In addition, the experts were provided with a summary of recommendations made by the Panel from the pre-screening process and from the Secretariat. The experts were also asked to consider how the full proposals addressed these comments.

Step 2: Ranking of proposals and additional appraisal based on the relative criteria.

This step was undertaken by a select group of representatives of the PoE who met in person, from 17 to 20 April, at FAO Headquarters in Rome. The initial target was to have one expert per region participating in the meeting. However, due to previous commitments and complications, arising at a late stage concerning travel documents, only three experts were able to attend the in-person meeting in Rome. The experts who attended the meeting were: Ms Lamis Chalak (Near East); Ms Elin Ranum (Europe); and Mr Sam Johnston (South West Pacific).

¹⁰ IT/GB-10/SFC-6/23/Proceedings, paragraph 16, available at www.fao.org/3/cc4271en/cc4271en.pdf

Step 2 was divided in the following sub-steps:

- a) As part of the preparatory process, proposals that had not been remotely appraised by the deadline were divided and re-assigned to the Panel representatives during the meeting in Rome. This ensured that each of the proposals were appraised by at least two experts. The average score of each of the 32 proposals was used to prepare an initial ranking of proposals based on the objective criteria.
- b) The Panel representatives analysed, deliberated, and clarified the results of the initial ranking.
- c) Each of the Panel representatives read all the four Phase 2 proposals, in case the proposal was not assigned to them in Step 1 (remote appraisal). This ensured informed deliberations for the ranking of all the Phase 2 proposals.
- d) At programme level, the tentative results were further appraised based on an additional relative criterion of the BSF-5 efficiently and effectively leveraging of resources. The Secretariat provided an estimation of funds distribution of BSF by regions, institutions and crops, and compared the results with the previous BSF cycles. The relative criterion was not based on scoring, instead this was based on collective analysis and deliberations.

Step 3: Concluding deliberations for the list of recommended proposals, which included:

- a) the Panel representatives' analysis, deliberation and unanimous agreement on the results of the appraisal and list of recommended proposals, with corresponding conditions to be submitted to the Committee, for their consideration;
- b) a virtual meeting held with the PoE representatives not attending in-person, where the initial results of Steps 1 and 2 were presented, with the list of recommended proposals, with corresponding conditions. The Panel deliberated, validated and unanimously agreed on the list of recommended proposals, with corresponding conditions to be submitted to the decision-making process of the Committee;
- c) the Draft Report of the Panel of Experts was circulated to all of the experts for comments before finalisation and submission to the Committee.

IV. LIST OF PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IN BSF-5

15. The main outcome of the two-step appraisal presented in Section III is the shortlist of 28 proposals recommended for funding, contained in Annex 1 of this Final PoE Report.

16. Taking into account the relative criteria presented in Section III, the list of recommended proposals contains a few proposals that will need further action and refinement, before concluding the contractual agreements. These proposals are included in the list of proposals recommended for funding with the following conditions:

- PR-154-S-Brazil – the applicant institution revises and further strengthens sections *2.1. Problem definition and project rationale*, *2.2. Project activities, outputs and target indicators*, *2.3. Project Methodology*, *2.7. Mainstreaming gender in project activities*, *3.5. Sustainability and exit strategies*, *Annex 1: Logical Framework* and *Annex 3: Budget*.
- PR-69-S-Uganda, PR-M-67-Uganda, PR-145-M-Congo, PR-135-M-Kenya – All four proposals include activities in Uganda. The Panel recommends the Secretariat to encourage the project managers, and involves the national focal point, to collaborate and identify areas of common interest and synergies, complementarities and exchange of know-how and skills on the targeted PGRFA and related information available within the respective institutions.
- PR-69-S-Uganda, PR-M-67-Uganda – Both proposals have been submitted by the same applicant institution. The Panel recommends that the Secretariat enters into a dialogue with the applicant institution to build synergies among the planned activities, ensure an efficient use of resources and avoid funding duplicated or very similar activities within the same country. Based on this

collaboration and joint programming, the budget of the respective proposals should be reduced accordingly.

- PR-88-S-Philippines, PR-89-S-Philippines – The Panel recommends that the Secretariat encourages the two project managers to collaborate and identify areas of common interest and synergies, complementarities and exchange of know-how and skills on the targeted PGRFA and related information available within the respective institutions.
- PR-108-S-Peru, PR-27-M-Peru, PR-157-M-Uruguay – All three proposals include activities in Peru. The Panel recommends that the Secretariat encourages the project managers, and involves the national focal point, to collaborate and identify areas of common interest and synergies, complementarities and exchange of know-how and skills on the targeted PGRFA and related information available within the respective institutions.

17. The total budget available for BSF-5 is USD 10,940,407 while the overall budget of the recommended proposals is USD 11,090,662 – implying a gap of USD 150,255. Considering the conditionalities described in Section IV, paragraph 16, and that budget revisions are foreseen for the listed proposals to eliminate duplications and overlap in funding similar activities, it is expected that the difference between the available budget and the total amount of the proposed budgets for the recommended proposals will be addressed.

V. OVERVIEW OF THE LIST OF RECOMMENDED PROPOSALS

18. The Panel observed that the portfolio of recommended proposals contains excellent proposals from all regions and that all of them are of good quality and technically sound.

19. It is estimated that a total of 45 countries will be supported through BSF-5. The portfolio of recommended proposals represents a good regional and intra-regional balance.

20. The recommended projects included a total of 15 countries that received limited funding or that have never received funding from the BSF throughout the previous cycles.

21. The Panel noted with satisfaction that the majority in the recommended portfolio (75%) are led by national organizations, including NARS, government institutions, universities and academia, NGOs and civil society organizations. Around 25% are led by international organizations, mainly in the African region and mainly CGIAR centres. The Panel also acknowledged a new trend in BSF-5, where national organizations have demonstrated skills and know-how in developing multi-country projects, a reality that was a prerogative mainly of the international organizations in the past BSF project cycles. The Panel recognized that there are still some challenges in involving and building skills of national institutions to develop and implement technically sound and well-developed proposals and that additional support in building capacities, skills and know-how in both drafting and implementing good project proposals is needed in some regions and this requires a more systemic approach.

22. Some interesting elements of the BSF-5 portfolio relate to implementation of PGRFA management and conservation in areas of conflict, with potential lessons learned and know-how to be documented and shared within the Community of Practice. In addition, the participation of small island developing states (SIDS) from the Caribbean opens up, for the first time, to new prospects of collaboration for the Treaty through the BSF and provides opportunities to build awareness and skills in Treaty implementation and PGRFA management in the region and with SIDS in the Pacific.

23. Overall, the portfolio of recommended proposals largely focuses on knowledge-sharing and capacity-building by engaging local communities, addressing packages of PGRFA and has farmers as the primary beneficiaries. The proposals support national stakeholders and strongly promote resilience to climate change, and the development of sustainable production methods for food security. Many of the proposals also aim to implement community-based approaches, recognized by the Treaty. Recommended proposals have the potential to contribute to the visibility of the BSF and increased awareness, knowledge and technical capacity on crop diversity.

24. The Panel noted that out of the 34 pre-proposals invited by the Committee to develop a full proposal,

two applicant countries, Madagascar and Armenia, did not manage to submit a full proposal. Both pre-proposals targeted underrepresented countries and had received a very high score in the pre-proposal phase. The Panel recommends the Secretariat to contact the applicant organizations and enquire whether they would be able to submit a full proposal which may be granted a certificate of excellence and receive interest by donors.

VI. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendations for the next steps of BSF-5

25. The Panel made a number of recommendations regarding the next steps in the operations of BSF-5. It recalled that throughout the process, the Panel and the Secretariat had made recommendations for further improvement of project proposals and that there are still improvements needed within the portfolio of proposals recommended for funding. This is particularly relevant in terms of ensuring appropriate balance between national and international organisations in the case of multi-country projects and to find ways to most efficiently and effectively use and leverage funds. The Panel recommended that these recommendations for further improvement of the proposals are addressed before concluding the contractual agreements.

26. The Panel noted that most proposals still needed improvement in the project's risk analysis, assumptions in the logical framework, gender mainstreaming approach and the methodological linkages between the project's contributions to the three outputs of the BSF Results Framework. It recommended that applicant institutions ensure that at the end of the inception period these areas are improved.

27. The Panel noted that many proposals provided a weak risk analysis and emphasizes that BSF projects do not necessarily have to be low-risk or no risk, but rather that partners should analyse the risks and explain their mitigation measures more clearly.

Recommendations to the Secretariat for future calls for proposals for an inclusive and systematic management of the call for proposals and related screening and appraisal process

28. The Panel recommends that the guidelines for the development of full proposals support further improvement of some of the sections and specifically recommends that the 'Problem definition and project rationale' should: (i) be more focused on the link between the outputs and outcomes prioritized in the Call, and (ii) be more context-specific and evidence-based with citations.

29. The Panel recommends including a section in the pre-proposal template listing relevant ongoing and previous initiatives in the targeted country or countries.

30. The Panel recommends including a requirement in the pre-proposal application on the involvement of international organizations and that: (i) project consortia provide as much responsibility as possible to national partners in the design and management of the project, and (ii) the budget is mainly allocated to operations of organizations in developing countries.

31. The Panel noted the novel modality to fund second phases of projects in BSF-5 and recommends that the Secretariat compiles lessons learned on this modality, including: (i) to invite only high-performing projects that were funded under past cycles, and (ii) that describe clearly how they will leverage promising achievements and innovations of previous cycles of strategic importance to the Treaty and the BSF Results Framework for mainstreaming, and scaling up and out.

32. The Panel took note of the significant number of countries recommended for funding in BSF-5 that received limited or no funding in previous calls and recommends that the Secretariat further encourages underrepresented countries to participate in the BSF. The Panel recommends that the Secretariat identifies possible measures to achieve this and review how these measures could be applied in the BSF.

33. The Panel wished to acknowledge the excellent work undertaken by the Secretariat in this process. Their initial screening of the proposals was accepted fully by the Panel. The knowledge and experience gained from this initial screening is an important asset and needs to be fully recognized and used in the process. The Panel recommends that the role of the Secretariat therefore be enhanced in future rounds and that, for example, consideration can be given to providing their recommendations to the Committee as well as the Panel's evaluations.

LIST OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

Africa

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-71-M-Malawi	Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique	Harnessing grain legumes and dryland cereals genetic resource for resilient farming systems, food and nutrition security in Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique	Groundnut, Chickpea, Pigeonpea, Sorghum and Millets	600,000.00	48 months	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
PR-95-M-Niger	Burkina Faso, Niger	La diversité des cultures: une opportunité pour les populations vulnérables à la crise sécuritaire et aux changements climatiques au Sahel	Mil (mil a chandelle, Pennisetum glaucum), gombo (Abelmoschus esculentus), Niébé (Vigna unguiculata), fonio (Digitaria exilis) et pois bambara (Vigna subterranea)	586,000.00	48 months	Alliance of Bioversity International and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
PR-103-M-Ethiopia	Ethiopia, Morocco, Tunisia	Revealing the Diversity of Barley Quality Traits through Synergies between On-farm Practices and Technological Innovations	Barley (Hordeum vulgare subsp. vulgare)	500,000.00	36 months	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
PR-69-S-Uganda*	Uganda	Harnessing Common Bean Landraces, Improved Biofortified Climbing Bean Varieties and Underutilized Climate Smart Legumes for Sustainable and Resilient Agri-food Systems in Southwestern and Western Uganda	Beans, Pigeon pea, Garden peas, Chickpeas, Lentils	249,780.00	36 months	National Agricultural Research Organization /National Crops Resources Research Institute
PR-67-M-Uganda*	South Sudan, Uganda	Embracing South-South seed and knowledge sharing for resilient agroecosystems and improved livelihoods: South Sudan and Uganda	Common bean, cowpea, groundnut, Bambara nut, sorghum, Solanum species, and forages	600,000.00	36 months	National Agricultural Research Organisation - Plant Genetic Resources Centre
PR-145-M-Congo*	DRC, Burundi, Uganda	Participatory conservation and utilization of root and tuber crop genetic resources for resilient farming systems and food security in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi and Uganda	Cassava, Sweet potato	600,000.00	48 months	Institut Facultaire des Sciences Agronomiques de Yangambi (Agricultural University of Yangambi)
PR-25-S-Ghana	Ghana	Broadening the Genetic Base of Taro (Colocasia esculenta) towards Improved Yield, Disease and Drought Tolerance & Developing Market-Driven Products of Taro to enhance the Crop's Commercial and Food Security Value in Ghana	Taro	239,174.00	36 months	University Cape Coast
PR-104-M-Eswatini	Eswatini, Mozambique, Tanzania	Enhancing capacities of local communities to adapt to climate changes in Tanzania, Mozambique and Eswatini	Cucurbits, Finger millet, Sorghum, Bambara, Cowpea and Yams	600,000.00	48 months	Tanzania Plant Health and Pesticides Authority (TPHPA)

Asia

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-90-S-Nepal	Nepal	Enhancing conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources in Nepal for food and nutrition security under unpredictable environmental conditions	amaranths, buckwheat, millets, lentil, naked barley, faba bean (focusing on neglected and underutilized species) and other crops	247,500.00	48 months	National Agriculture Genetic Resources Center (Genebank)
PR-88-S-Philippines*	Philippines	Supporting and Promoting Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in Farming Communities in the Philippines through Participatory Approaches, Traditional Variety Reintroduction, Capacity Building, Market Innovation and Digital Communication Platforms	Traditional rice varieties and indigenous vegetables	199,972.00	36 months	Institute of Crop Science
PR-89-S-Philippines*	Philippines	Engendering Access for Smallholder Farmers to Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture for Conservation and Sustainable Use	Traditional rice, corn, sweet potato, potato, cocoyam, kayos (<i>dioscorea hispida</i>), banana, cassava, vegetables (eggplant, squash, stringbean, winged bean)	250,000.00	24 months	SEARICE
PR-54-S-LaoPDR	LaoPDR	Enhancing the capacity of smallholder farmers to improve productivities and value-added of root/tuber crops for commercialization and sustainable development	taro, sweet potato, yam	250,000.00	36 months	NAFRI

Europe

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-173-S-Georgia	Georgia	Strengthening linkages between <i>in-situ/on-farm</i> and <i>ex-situ</i> conservation of local PGRFA from Georgia and use for adaptation to climate change	Wheat, bean, maize	250,000.00	48 months	LEPL Scientific Research center of Agriculture (SRCA)

GRULAC

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-23-S-ElSalvador	El Salvador	Bancos comunitarios de semillas resilientes al corredor seco oriental de El Salvador	maíz, sorgo, frijol, camote y jícama	250,000.00	36 months	Centro Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria y Forestal CENTA
PR-157-M-Uruguay*	Bolivia, Paraguay, Perú, Uruguay	Articulación regional para el acceso y utilización de recursos fitogenéticos adaptados a los sistemas de producción familiar de Bolivia, Paraguay, Perú y Uruguay	quinua, papa, mandioca (cassava), manzana, durazno (pesco), pera, ciruela (prugna), lotus y festuca	585,000.00	36 months	Confederación de Organizaciones de Productores Familiares del MERCOSUR ampliado (COPROFAM)
PR-131-S-Chile	Chile	Identificación y reintroducción de recursos genéticos de legumbres con tolerancia sequía y enfermedades que contribuyan a la seguridad alimentaria y adaptabilidad al cambio climático en la agricultura familiar	Poroto, chícharo (peas) y lenteja	235,020.00	48 months	Instituto de investigaciones Agropecuarias

		campesina del secano interior de Chile				
PR-27-M-Peru*	Bolivia, Chile, Peru	Youth, Citizen Science and E-commerce: scaling integrated conservation solutions and farmers' rights by connecting key diversity hotspots: Bolivia, Chile, and Peru	potato, maize, quinoa	600,000.00	36 months	International Potato Center (CIP), Andean Initiative
PR-108-S-Peru*	Peru	Agrobiodiversity Zones as a genetic resources hotspot and resilient agrifood systems in the Andes of Peru	Four Andean tubers (potato, oca, mashua, olluco) and four Andean cereals (quinoa, cañihua, kiwicha and tarwi)	250,000.00	48 months	Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria – INIA, Peru
PR-141-M-Jamaica	Jamaica, Antigua & Barbuda, St. Lucia	Next Generation Sweet Potato Production in the Caribbean	sweet potato (Ipomoea)	596,993.00	48 months	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)
PR-147-S-Panama	Panama	Establecimiento de bancos comunitarios de semilla de variedades locales y mejoradas en siete comunidades del norte de la provincia de Coclé. Panamá.	arroz, maíz, frijol vigna, frijol phaseolus, ñame, ñampí, camote y plátano	49,901.00	48 months	Instituto de Innovación Agropecuaria de Panamá/ Cosecha Sostenibles Internacional-Panamá (SHI)
PR-154-S-Brazil*	Brazil	Support network for local conservation (in situ/on farm) of plant genetic resources in Brazil and integration with Embrapa genebanks	Rice, maize, common bean, lima bean, cowpea, cassava, potato, sweet potato	198,716.00	36 months	Embrapa Recursos Genéticos e Biotecnologia

Near East

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-41-M-Türkiye	Algeria, Iran, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Türkiye	Improving food security in West Asia and North Africa by identifying and promoting climate resilient wheat varieties resistant to soil borne pathogens	Wheat	600,000.00	48 months	CIMMYT (Turkey)
PR-56-S-Yemen	Yemen	Scaling up community resilience to climate variability and change by promoting community based conservation, utilization and management for PGR with a special focus on women and children in Yemen	Sorghum, Wheat, Barley, Maize, Millet, Bean, Pea, Lentil	244,400.00	36 months	National Genetic Resources Center (NGRC)

South West Pacific

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-59-S-PapuaNewGuinea	Papua New Guinea	Raising the profile of breadfruit production in coastal and island food systems in PNG	Breadfruit	248,529.00	48 months	PNG National Agricultural Research Institute
PR-102-S-Fiji	Fiji	Increasing PGRFA diversity through agroforestry for social-cultural-economic and ecological benefits of 100 farmers in Fiji	Breadfruit, coconut, citrus, major aroids, yams, cassava, banana/plantain, beans, piper methysticum, edible ferns, saccharum edule, and other local nuts, fruits, indigenous fruit trees	250,000.00	36 months	Ministry of forestry

Second phase

ID number	Target countries	Title	Crop(s) addressed	Request funding	Duration	Organization
PR-135-M-Kenya*	Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania	Enabling and scaling Open-Source Seed Systems of Beans Sorghum and Finger millet for climate change adaptation in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania	Beans, Sorghum, Finger millet	600,000.00	48 months	Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT
PR-06-M-Guatemala	Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica	Uso sostenible de la agrobiodiversidad en comunidades indígenas y campesinas de Centroamérica: Una estrategia para la seguridad alimentaria y adaptación climática	Maíz, Frijol, Papa, Sorgo	599,997.00	36 months	Asociación de Organizaciones de los Cuchumatanes (ASOCUCH)
PR-87-M-Zimbabwe	Lesotho, Malawi, Zimbabwe	Strengthening the conservation and sustainable use and management of selected climate resilient PGRFA to enhance smallholder farmer livelihoods	Sorghum, pearl millet, finger millet, beans, sunflower, pigeon peas, cow peas, potato	599,680.00	42 months	Community Technology Development Trust (CTDT)

ANNEX 2**LIST OF ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NEVER RECEIVED FUNDING
FROM THE BENEFIT-SHARING FUND**

Country	FAO Region 1	FAO Region 2
1. Angola	Africa	Africa
2. Antigua and Barbuda	GRULAC	GRULAC
3. Armenia	Europe	Europe
4. Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	GRULAC	GRULAC
5. Burundi	Africa	Africa
6. Cameroon	Africa	Africa
7. Central African Republic	Africa	Africa
8. Chad	Africa	Africa
9. Chile	GRULAC	GRULAC
10. Congo	Africa	Africa
11. Côte d'Ivoire	Africa	Africa
12. Democratic Republic of the Congo	Africa	Africa
13. Djibouti	Near East	Near East
14. Dominican Republic	GRULAC	GRULAC
15. Eritrea	Africa	Africa
16. Eswatini	Africa	Africa
17. Gabon	Africa	Africa
18. Georgia	Europe	Europe
19. Guinea	Africa	Africa
20. Guinea-Bissau	Africa	Africa
21. Guyana	GRULAC	GRULAC
22. Jamaica	GRULAC	GRULAC
23. Kyrgyzstan	Europe	Europe
24. Lesotho	Africa	Africa

25. Liberia	Africa	Africa
26. Libya	Africa	Near East
27. Madagascar	Africa	Africa
28. Maldives	Asia	Asia
29. Mauritania	Africa	Near East
30. Mauritius	Africa	Africa
31. Mongolia	Asia	Asia
32. Montenegro	Europe	Europe
33. Mozambique	Africa	Africa
34. Myanmar	Asia	Asia
35. Pakistan	Asia	Asia
36. Republic of Moldova	Europe	Europe
37. Rwanda	Africa	Africa
38. Saint Lucia	GRULAC	GRULAC
39. Sao Tome and Principe	Africa	Africa
40. Sierra Leone	Africa	Africa
41. South Sudan	Africa	Africa
42. Sri Lanka	Asia	Asia
43. Togo	Africa	Africa
44. Tuvalu	South West Pacific	South West Pacific

ANNEX 3**MEMBERS OF THE PANEL OF EXPERTS OF THE FIFTH CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

Name	Country
Asia	
Mr. Kodeboyina Sivannarayana Varaprasad	India
Grulac	
Mr. Alejandro Puglisi	Argentina
Mr. Juan Carlos Rosas Sotomayor	Honduras
Mr. Fabio de Oliveira Freitas	Brazil
Ms. Mercedes Rivas	Uruguay
North America	
Mr. Campbell Davidson	Canada
Ms. Tracy K.Powell	USA
Africa	
Mr. Patrick Kasava	Zimbabwe
Mr. Mahmadou Sawadogo	Burkina Faso
Near East	
Mrs. Hanaiya Abbas El itriby	Egypt
Mrs. Lamis Chalak	Lebanon
South West Pacific	
Sam Johnston	Australia
Europe	
Mrs. Elin Cecilie Ranum	Norway
Mr. Jan Valkoun	Czech Republic