



Distr.: General
13 April 2007

English only



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Third meeting**

Dakar, 30 April–4 May 2007

Item 5 (h) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference of the Parties:
financial resources**

**Other possible sources of funding or entities to facilitate the
adequacy and sustainability of funding for activities relevant to
the implementation of the Convention ****

Note by the Secretariat

1. The Conference of the Parties, by paragraph 7 of its decision SC-2/10, requested developed country Parties, other Parties and other sources, including relevant funding institutions, to provide information to the Secretariat on ways in which they could support the Convention. In paragraph 8 of the same decision the Conference requested the Secretariat, in order to facilitate the adequacy and sustainability of funding for activities relevant to the implementation of the Convention, to identify other possible sources of funding and/or entities and to propose arrangements with those entities for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting. In paragraph 9 of the decision, the Conference requested the Secretariat, on the basis of the information to be provided pursuant to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the decision, to prepare a report reviewing the availability of financial resources in addition to those provided through the Global Environment Facility and ways and means of mobilizing and channelling those resources in support of the objectives of the Convention, as requested by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries in its resolution 2, for consideration by the Conference at its third meeting.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.3/1.

** Stockholm Convention, Article 13; reports of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants on the work of its first meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/31), annex I, decision SC-1/11 and on the work of its second meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.2/30) annex I, decision SC-2/10.

2. In response to decision SC-2/10, the Secretariat has prepared a report on possible sources of funding for activities relevant to the implementation of the Convention in addition to those provided through the Global Environment Facility. That report is set forth in the annex to the present note. It has not been formally edited.

Annex

Report on other possible sources of funding for activities relevant to the implementation of the Convention in addition to that provided through the Global Environment Facility

1. Introduction

1. This report surveys the availability of additional financial resources in support of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). These are in addition to the financing provided by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) – the principal entity entrusted, on an interim basis, with the operations of the financial mechanism of the Convention.

1.1. Structure and overview of the report

2. Section 2 of this report surveys possible sources of funding. It shows that there are significant flows of philanthropic and development funding of which a portion could be allocated to persistent organic pollutant related activities. However, it is also clear that the programme of work under the Stockholm Convention is rarely a priority focus of donor institutions – whether public or private. In the context of broader funding priorities – notably development, the environment and health – there may, however, be an opportunity to interest some of these institutions in the work of the Convention.

3. Section 3 explores ways and means of mobilizing and channelling resources from the various funding sources identified in Section 2. It includes a section on raising the awareness among funding institutions of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention and the work which needs to be done. This awareness raising is presented as the core component of a fund raising strategy and action plan for the Convention. There are also three sections on innovative funding structures – specifically the Global Mechanism, the Global Fund and the Multilateral Fund -- which provide insights for a possible additional entity under the financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention.

4. Section 4 provides some conclusions with some possible immediate next steps which the Parties may want to consider with respect to securing additional funding for the Convention's programme of work.

2. Possible sources of funding

5. This section of the report reviews the possibilities of securing additional financing from three major categories of funding institutions:

- Private foundations,
- Corporate foundations, and
- Bilateral donor programmes.

6. Together these institutions manage billions of dollars which potentially could be tapped to support the work of the Convention. For each category, an overview of the category is provided, its potential for funding is assessed and, where possible, indicative examples are presented. Further discussion on the ways and means of mobilizing and channelling resources from these sources can be found in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Private foundations

7. Private foundations are a major possible source of funding for persistent organic pollutant related activities. Private foundations are non-profit, non-governmental organisations with independent asset bases and independent boards. They generally make grants for charitable causes to other non-profit organisations, but they also can make grants to government programmes.

8. The United States-based Foundation Center has observed that in the United States there has been significant growth in recent years in the number and size of private foundations. Their research is summarised in table 1.

Table 1. Growth of private foundations

Growth of US Foundations			
	1990	2003	Change*
Number of Foundations	32,401	66,398	105%
Total Assets (in billions of US\$)	\$142.5	\$476.7	235%
Total Giving (in billions of US\$)	\$8.7	\$30.3	249%

*Percent change represents current dollars.

9. Adjusting for inflation, the level of grant-making in the United States has more than doubled from 1990 to 2003 to a total of US\$ 30 billion. In 2003, roughly 15% or US\$ 4.5 billion of this total was spent outside of the United States.

10. It is perhaps worth noting that this level of funding is significantly smaller than the level of giving in the United States from gifts from living individuals and from individual bequests. In 2003, individual and bequest giving in the US was nearly \$200 billion! Unfortunately, individuals and their estates do not get a tax deduction if their funds are donated outside of the United States. Hence, these sizeable sums of money are less likely to be available for persistent organic pollutants-related work outside of the United States.

11. Of the US\$ 30 billion of private foundation spending in 2003 – which was for both domestic and international grants – about 60% of this amount or US\$ 18 billion supported projects in the areas of education, health and human services. Health, in particular, is a sector of giving in which additional funding for Persistent organic pollutants-related work might be forthcoming.

12. Two other broad funding areas which may be relevant to the Stockholm Convention are development and the environment. Unfortunately, in the United States “development” in the sense of assistance for projects in developing countries is not a major focus of private foundations. Nevertheless, by associating development issues with either health or environmental issues, there may be an opportunity to secure additional funding from United States private foundations. The environment area may also provide opportunities for persistent organic pollutants-related funding.

13. Annex 1 provides a list of the top 100 private foundations by assets. They have combined worth of over US\$ 212 billion. To date, little of this wealth has been allocated to persistent organic pollutants-related work either in the United States or internationally. Two examples, however, of the type of funding for persistent organic pollutants which could be supported by private United States foundations follow.

14. Since 2001, the Mitchell Kapor Foundation has been supporting the development of the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) and its participation in the processes of the Stockholm Convention. Mitchell Kapor, who was the founder of the Lotus Corporation, has placed roughly US\$ 30 million into his foundation. Though it is not one of the larger foundations in the United States, it has made persistent organic pollutants a focus of its grant-making.

15. In November 2006, the Ford Foundation – which is the second largest United States private foundation with assets of over US\$ 11 billion --- announced that it had made a US\$ 2.2 million grant “to build understanding of environmental hazards in Vietnam and bring critical health services to people living with long-term disabilities.” Importantly, they announced that these funds would “support research to help identify dioxin ‘hot spots’, pilot projects to develop new clean-up technologies, and survey research and public health programs to understand and address the health needs of people living with disabilities.”

16. Regarding private foundations in Europe, there is much less aggregate information available. A survey by Philanthropy in Europe, however, reported that in 2003, the top 40 grant-giving foundations in Europe gave away over € 3 billion. The rankings of these foundations can be found in Annex 2.

Though this is considerably less than the grants made by United States foundations, it appears that a much greater proportion of European grants fund projects in developing countries. Two examples of Persistent organic pollutants-related funding follow.

17. The United Kingdom-based Wellcome Trust – arguably the wealthiest private foundation in Europe with over € 13 billion in assets – recently funded the production of an awareness-raising film on persistent organic pollutant contamination in Inuit mothers of the Arctic. The film ‘Invisible’ was produced by Wonderdog Productions. It “tells the story of how man-made chemicals are building up in our bodies and being passed from mother to child” and it explains that today “scientists cannot find a single woman anywhere in the world who does not have chemicals such as flame retardants in her breast milk.”

18. In 2002, the Heinrich Böll Stiftung co-financed research in Poland on persistent organic pollutants in human breast milk. This research was carried out in three towns with chemical factories and found significant contamination:

“The determined concentrations of persistent organic pollutants exceed the domestic and world standards of health safety by many times. ... Considering the production profile of industrial plants located in the towns in which our investigations were conducted, they have been a source of persistent organic pollutants for many decades. During that period, consecutive generations received elevated intakes of most dangerous toxins. ...”

“The exposure of the population, and especially children, to long-term high intakes of Persistent organic pollutants results in irreversible genetic and immunological changes - increased incidence of various infections, cancer, and cardiovascular diseases. Thus, it is necessary to take quick steps in order to precisely identify the sources of persistent organic pollutants and eliminate them.”

<http://www.mindfully.org/Health/2002/Breast-Milk-PolandApr02.htm>

19. As these examples indicate, private foundations in the United States of America, Europe and elsewhere have the potential to provide substantial funding for much need work on persistent organic pollutant identification, awareness-raising, mitigation and elimination.

2.2. Corporate foundations

20. Corporate foundations are another major possible source of funding for the Stockholm Convention. Corporate foundations are non-profit, non-governmental legal entities which receive funds from their parent companies. Officers of the parent company often sit on the boards of these foundations.

21. It is important, however, to keep in mind that a considerable amount of corporate giving also comes directly from companies themselves and not through their affiliated foundations. Because there is less aggregate information on direct corporate giving, this section focuses specifically on the opportunities of securing more funding from corporate foundations. Direct funding from corporations themselves remains yet another possible source of funding.

22. Annex 3 provides a list of the top 50 private foundations in the United States by assets. They have combined worth of over US\$ 7.5 billion. To date, however, little of this wealth appears to have been allocated to work on persistent organic pollutants either in the United States or internationally.

23. A preliminary analysis of the potential for securing funding from corporate foundations indicates that persistent organic pollutants -related issues are generally not a funding priority. Priority funding areas for the large United States corporate foundations include housing, education, youth, children, and entrepreneurship. The following table of the top 20 United States corporate foundations indicates that none of them appears to be supporting work on persistent organic pollutants, while only two have a focus on supporting international development (DEV) and four on supporting environmental issues (ENV).

Rank	US Corporate Foundation (State)	DEV	ENV	HEA	POP
1	The Wells Fargo Foundation (CA)	No	No	No	No
2	Alcoa Foundation (PA)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3	Verizon Foundation (NJ)	No	No	Yes	No
4	The Pfizer Foundation, Inc. (NY)	No	No	Yes	No
5	Fidelity Foundation (MA)	No	No	No	No
6	General Motors Foundation, Inc. (MI)	No	No	Yes	No
7	AT&T Foundation (TX)	No	No	No	No
8	Freddie Mac Foundation (VA)	No	No	No	No
9	The Goldman Sachs Foundation (NY)	No	No	No	No
10	Fannie Mae Foundation (DC)	No	No	No	No
11	IBM International Foundation (NY)	No	No	No	No
12	The Merck Company Foundation (NJ)	No	Yes	Yes	No
13	Abbott Laboratories Fund (IL)	No	No	Yes	No
14	The USAA Foundation, Inc. (TX)	No	No	No	No
15	Alabama Power Foundation, Inc. (AL)	No	Yes	No	No
16	MetLife Foundation (NY)	No	No	Yes	No
17	The Capital Group Companies Charitable Foundation (CA)	No	No	No	No
18	Citigroup Foundation (NY)	Yes	Yes	No	No
19	WellPoint Foundation (CA)	No	No	Yes	No
20	The HCA Foundation (TN)	No	No	Yes	No

24. Nine of the foundations, however, broadly support health (HEA) issues. This preliminary analysis indicates that securing more funding for persistent organic pollutants-related work will probably be most effective if the projects are clearly associated with the health impacts of persistent organic pollutants mitigation or elimination rather than with their impacts on development or the environment.

2.3. Bilateral donor programmes

25. National governments are clearly an important source of funding for national persistent organic pollutants-related activities. For developing countries and countries with economies in transition, however, most government budgets are already terribly over-stretched and securing extra funding for work on persistent organic pollutants is likely to remain an uphill struggle. Hence, for these countries, opportunities for securing additional bilateral support need to be explored.

26. One of the best sources of information on bilateral funding is the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Members of DAC include all of the more developed countries. In 2005, official development assistance (ODA) from DAC members was roughly US\$ 107 billion. Importantly, over 95% of this ODA went to poorer developing countries. This indicates that bilateral support for persistent organic pollutants-related work in middle income countries may be somewhat harder to secure.

27. It may be important to promote persistent organic pollutants in the context of donor priorities. For example, DAC's Development Cooperation Report 2006 (published in February 2007) reviewed the policies and programmes of the bilateral donors and identified their key features in 2006:

- "Poverty reduction continues to be a strong, if not central focus for most donors.
- Members remain committed to the Millennium Development Goals.

- Fighting corruption was a core objective of donors' governance agendas.
- Several donors enhanced their programmes supporting security sector reform.
- Much is still to be achieved in the area of policy coherence.
- More attention is being given to monitoring and evaluation, with a focus on results."

28. It is also important to assess where the ODA support is actually going. According to DAC, education and health continue to account for about 15% of aid. ODA support for infrastructure has dropped as have support transfers for agriculture. Importantly, general budget support has also fallen. Roughly 40% of aid currently goes to education, health, government, infrastructure and production. Another 20% in 2006 went to debt relief, with significant amounts of debt relief for Iraq and Nigeria. (See Annex 4 for a breakdown of bilateral aid by major purposes in 2005.)

29. Similar to the opportunities for securing funding from private foundations and corporate foundations, it appears that a focus on the health impacts of persistent organic pollutants activities may be strategic to secure more bilateral funding.

30. An example of bilateral funding for work related to persistent organic pollutants is the current project on elimination of acute risks of obsolete pesticides in Moldova, Armenia and Georgia. Funded in part by the TMF programme (Thematische Mede Financiering) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs this project started in early 2005 and is scheduled to be completed at the end of 2007. The project recognizes both the health benefits and the environmental benefits of pesticide elimination and aims at storing and eliminating the pesticides in partner countries in the Dutch development aid programme. The project is intended to bring about the following results:

- A local stakeholders structure is set up;
- Key risks are identified and classified;
- Local action plans are developed;
- Dissemination risks of obsolete pesticides are mitigated through proper storage;
- Local people are trained in stock taking, risk assessment and packaging of obsolete pesticides;
- An internet forum and a network on obsolete pesticides are set up; and
- The project results are communicated to the international community, national governments and potential donors.

31. In addition to bilateral funding, members of DAC also provide the bulk of multilateral funding through intergovernmental agencies such as the United Nations system and the World Bank Group. Regarding multilateral finance, the Global Environment Facility is already playing a major facilitating role through its implementing agency partnerships with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank, and through its executing agency partnerships with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and others. Efforts to secure additional financial resources for work related to persistent organic pollutants through the intergovernmental agencies would probably best be undertaken in the context of the Global Environment Facility's role as the principal entity entrusted on an interim basis with the operations of the financial mechanism under the Convention.

3. Ways and means of mobilising and channelling these resources

32. This section of the report addresses the challenges of raising the profile of the Stockholm Convention so as to secure more funding for persistent organic pollutants-related activities. It also reviews three funding mechanisms – the Global Mechanism, the Global Fund and the Multilateral Fund – to seek insights for developing new ways and means to mobilise resources for the work programme of the Convention.

3.1. Raising the profile of the Stockholm Convention

33. If the programme of work planned under the Stockholm Convention is to secure additional funding, the profile of the Convention and its objectives must be raised significantly – particularly within the donor community including private foundations, corporate foundations and bilateral donor programmes.

34. As noted above, the health impacts of persistent organic pollutants-related projects is probably a factor which would attract the most interest within the donor community, but environment and development impacts should also be emphasised. Currently, however, there appears to be far too little awareness or understanding among donors – both public and private – of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention and the programme of work which needs to be implemented to meet these objectives.

35. In order for donors to be made aware of the Convention, it would be necessary to develop a coherent set of fundraising instruments. These range from developing an engaging and informative website to disseminating reports and newsletters on persistent organic pollutants-related projects to producing descriptive programme and project briefs as well as brochures and flyers. It is especially important to recognise that in today's internet-connected world the very first due diligence step of a potential investor or donor is to review an organisation's website. Thus to secure additional funding it is important to ensure that the Convention's website be developed into an informative, donor-friendly site.

36. The Convention will also need to engage in major events at the international, regional and national levels where key donors are present and the Convention's work programme can be promoted. It is important to meet with donors regularly, to build relationships with them and to keep them updated on persistent organic pollutants-related developments.

37. Regarding raising the interest of private foundations, it may for example be advantageous to have the Convention discussed at the meetings of various foundation associations such as the Bellagio Forum. Regarding corporate foundations, it would be good to aim to have the Stockholm Convention on the agenda of an upcoming annual meeting of the World Economic Forum, for example. Finally, regarding securing more bilateral donor support, the Secretariat could become more actively engaged in the work programme of the OECD DAC and other bilateral structures.

38. An additional and often under-emphasised component of raising the profile of the Stockholm Convention is the role of non-governmental organizations. Foundations and governments are less likely to support a programme of work if civil society – often seen to be in part represented by non-governmental organizations – is not demanding it.

39. The Stockholm Convention needs to be placed on the donor map. For example, a current guide to finding development information online from the UK-based Institute of Development Studies (IDS) categorises development information as follows. The IDS development themes are:

- Ageing Populations
- Agriculture
- Aid
- Capacity Building
- Children and Young People
- Climate Change
- Conflict
- Conservation and Biodiversity
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- Debt
- Disasters and Emergencies
- Education
- Finance and Economics
- Food Security
- Forestry
- Gender
- Globalisation
- Governance
- Health Systems
- Health
- HIV and AIDS
- Information Communication Technologies
- Livelihoods
- Migration
- Participation
- Poverty

- Sexuality
- Tourism
- Trade
- Urban Areas
- Water and Sanitation

40. This development list includes issues such as conservation and biodiversity, corporate social responsibility, health systems and health. It does not include persistent organic pollutants.

3.2. Insights from the Global Mechanism

41. The Global Mechanism (GM) was established under Article 21 of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). According to a new introductory brochure released in February 2007:

“The GM is an innovative entity that tackles the problems surrounding natural resource degradation by supporting country Parties in mobilizing financial resources to address the land and natural resource degradation, rural development and poverty reduction nexus, in keeping with the spirit of the [UNCCD] Convention.”

42. What is particularly interesting for the Stockholm Convention is the way in which the GM is now aiming to support the efforts of UNCCD Parties to mobilise financial resources. It is doing this by:

“increasingly specializing in providing a range of financial advisory services to country Parties, in close cooperation with International Finance Institutions (IFIs) - in particular the World Bank Group, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the regional development banks.”

43. The GM sees its role not as a donor per se, but rather as a catalytic financial broker building capacity and sharing knowledge so as to upscale financing for sustainable land management at the country level. This is to be accomplished through aligning UNCCD objectives with national development priorities. Key elements of the effort are “partnership-building, “mainstreaming,” and “engaging in policy processes.”

44. Specifically, the GM is focusing on securing new financial resources for a UNCCD-related programme of work through ensuring that sustainable land management is integrated into the emerging new financial architecture for development assistance. They explain:

“The GM’s approach to Convention implementation addresses the relevance of new financing modalities such as alignment with country priorities and harmonization of international support to development programming. Increased understanding of new financial instruments such as basket funds, direct budget support, sector-wide approaches (SWAs) and other programme-based approaches (PBAs) is also highly relevant for other conventions and the implementation of global policy processes.”

45. Importantly for the Stockholm Convention, the GM presents a model for a possible additional entity of its financial mechanism. Such an entity would work with the GEF, the international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the broader donor community to ensure that work related to the Stockholm Convention is integrated into the new development funding modalities at the country level. Such an entity could be developed within the Secretariat of the Convention or elsewhere. In this regard, it is clear that the GM hopes that lessons can be learned from its experiences for securing new financial resources for persistent organic pollutants. They write:

“The GM therefore hopes its experience will serve as a model for other conventions and international processes, which find themselves in a similar situation in terms of resource mobilization.”

46. Furthermore, the experiences of Parties in mainstreaming persistent organic pollutants into their national budgetary processes could provide practical examples of how a GM-type entity could support resource allocation decisions for financing work related to the Stockholm Convention.

3.3. Insights from the Global Fund

47. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria was established in 2002 to fund interventions to combat these diseases. The guiding principle for the fund is country-ownership based on multi-stakeholder consultations. Equally important is the concept of “performance-based funding.” A 2005 brochure on the Global Fund explains performance-based funding:

“Essentially this means that only those grant recipients who can demonstrate measurable and effective results from the monies received will be able to receive additional funding. In other words, initial funding is awarded solely on the basis of the technical quality of applications, but continued and renewed funding is dependent upon proven results and targets achieved.”

48. Building on their national implementation plans, Parties should be able to establish baselines for persistent organic pollutant related projects and then be able to measure the tangible results of these projects. Hence, it appears that persistent organic pollutants-related work could cope with the rigors of performance-based funding as explained by the Global Fund:

“In order to measure performance, the Global Fund has put in place a rigorous system of measurement and evaluation. This begins at the time of grant agreement signing, when targets and indicators are agreed upon between the recipients and the Global Fund. Results are tracked at every point in the process, from disbursement requests to performance updates and on through requests for continued funding at the two-year point of the grant.”

49. By adopting a performance-based funding approach, the Parties could send a strong signal to the donor community that funding persistent organic pollutants-related work will deliver substantive and measurable results.

50. In addition, the full set of principles adopted by the Global Fund could relate as well to the development of any new entities under the financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention. These principles are:

1. “Operate as a financial instrument, not an implementing entity
2. Make available and leverage additional financial resources
3. Support programs that evolve from national plans and priorities
4. Operate in a balanced manner in terms of different regions, diseases and interventions
5. Pursue an integrated and balanced approach to prevention and treatment
6. Evaluate proposals through independent review processes
7. Operate with transparency and accountability”

51. Notably, the third of these principles focuses on supporting programmes that evolve from national plans and priorities. This relates directly to the approach that has been adopted by the GM and indicates that a combination of the GM approach and the Global Fund approach could be considered for developing a new financial modality for work related to persistent organic pollutant issues.

52. Building on there operating principles as well as the concept of performance-based funding, in 2005 the Global Fund disbursed an additional US\$ 1 billion in funding to needy countries and committed to expanding its funding portfolio to 385 programmes in 131 countries with a value of roughly US\$5 billion. Clearly the principles and the structures that the Global Fund has put in place to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria has succeeded in securing significant levels of funding from the donor community.

3.4. Insights from the Multilateral Fund

53. The Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol was set up in 1991 – before the Rio Summit – to assist developing countries to implement the Protocol. In many respects it has features similar to the Global Fund. A September 2005 brochure which was prepared for the 20th anniversary of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer explains:

“The Multilateral Fund has provided finance for various activities including industrial conversion, technical assistance, information dissemination, training and capacity building aimed at phasing out the ODS [ozone-depleting substances] used in refrigeration, foam blowing, industrial cleaning, fire extinguishing, soil fumigation and cosmetic and pharmaceutical products.”

“The Multilateral Fund is a financial mechanism, not an implementing body. The separation from implementation responsibilities allows it to have an objective and rigorous project review procedure and an impartial monitoring and evaluation system to identify problems in implementation and to find solutions to them. Financing is based on performance-based funding with independent verification of results, flexibility in the use of funding to promote national ownership, and provision of penalties for non-achievement.”

54. Notably, like the Global Fund, financing is now also based on performance-based funding. Furthermore, like the Global Environment Facility, it applies an “incremental cost” approach to funding. Since its beginning in 1991, the Multilateral Fund has provided roughly US\$2 billion for over 5,000 projects to tackle ODS. As explained on its website, over its life, the Fund can be credited with a number of significant achievements:

- “Projects approved through 2004 have already eliminated the consumption of nearly 169,800 ODP tonnes and the production of 74,600 ODP tonnes.
- National Ozone Units have been established in 139 developing countries, raising understanding of how to implement environmental regulations and the capacity and confidence to do so.
- Virtually all Parties to the Protocol have been able to meet their phase-out targets, and prospects are good that this success rate will be continued in the future.”
- Furthermore, of particular relevance to the Stockholm Convention:
- “The Fund has played a pivotal role in demonstrating that international environmental agreements can be highly successful.
- The idea of funding only 'incremental costs' has been very successful and could have widespread implications for other agreements.
- The Fund is an excellent model of how to achieve successful technology transfer which could make both economic and environmental sense.”

55. Like the Stockholm Convention, the Vienna Convention focuses on funding programmes to eliminate harmful chemicals – in this case, chemicals such as CFCs and halons which depleted the ozone layer. Hence, insights from the Multilateral Fund relate not only to its principles, governance and operational structure, but also to the nature of the projects it has funded. Of particular interest are the national ozone units and their supporting regional networks. The experiences of these units and networks may provide further insights for persistent organic pollutants-related work programmes.

56. Regarding incremental cost financing, as the principle entity of its financial mechanism, the Global Environment Facility is already positioned to provide this type of funding to the work programme of the Stockholm Convention. Nevertheless, there may be opportunities for learning lessons from how the incremental cost concept has been applied for chemical elimination projects under the Multilateral Fund. Finally, it may also be worth exploring opportunities for more formal collaboration with the Fund to secure additional funding for persistent organic pollutant-related work.

4. Conclusions

57. Significant levels of philanthropic and development funding are available from private foundations, corporate foundations and bilateral donor programmes. Though there are some examples of this funding being directed to persistent organic pollutant -related projects, persistent organic pollutants may not currently be a priority within the donor community.

58. Immediate actions can be undertaken to raise awareness among the donors of the objectives and the work programme of the Stockholm Convention. These include efforts to talk directly to donors supported by engaging and informative communication materials, notably a donor-friendly internet site. It is also observed that there is a need to re-interest the international non-governmental organization community in the work of the Convention.

59. For new funding to be secured – some of which may provide “core cost” financing to match the GEF’s critically important incremental cost financing – Parties may need to consider agreeing on a programme of work or strategy on financial resources. This could address two immediate priorities:

- raising the profile of the Stockholm Convention within the donor community, and
- exploring options for establishing additional entities under the Convention’s financial mechanism.

Annex I

Top 100 US Grant-making Foundations (as of Oct 06)

Rank	Name (State)	Asset size (US\$)
1	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (WA)	29,153,508,000
2	The Ford Foundation (NY)	11,615,906,693
3	J. Paul Getty Trust (CA)	9,618,627,974
4	The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (NJ)	9,359,361,000
5	Lilly Endowment, Inc. (IN)	8,360,760,584
6	The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (CA)	7,336,131,000
7	W. K. Kellogg Foundation (MI)	7,298,383,532
8	The David and Lucile Packard Foundation (CA)	5,788,480,930
9	The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (NY)	5,586,112,000
10	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (IL)	5,490,449,000
11	Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (CA)	5,042,534,007
12	The California Endowment (CA)	3,729,571,524
13	The Starr Foundation (NY)	3,546,599,566
14	The Annie E. Casey Foundation (MD)	3,295,299,665
15	The Rockefeller Foundation (NY)	3,237,183,825
16	The Kresge Foundation (MI)	2,752,257,750
17	The Duke Endowment (NC)	2,708,834,085
18	The Annenberg Foundation (PA)	2,603,501,021
19	Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (MI)	2,480,562,766
20	Carnegie Corporation of New York (NY)	2,244,208,247
21	Casey Family Programs (WA)	2,184,894,330
22	John S. and James L. Knight Foundation (FL)	2,071,507,291
23	The McKnight Foundation (MN)	2,050,595,000
24	The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc. (MD)	2,027,561,526
25	Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, Inc. (GA)	1,950,691,385
26	The New York Community Trust (NY)	1,897,604,374
27	Richard King Mellon Foundation (PA)	1,882,031,732
28	Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation (MO)	1,860,797,344
29	The Cleveland Foundation (OH)	1,716,136,165
30	Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (NY)	1,693,460,630
31	Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (NY)	1,581,350,875
32	The James Irvine Foundation (CA)	1,541,924,918
33	Houston Endowment Inc. (TX)	1,512,185,118
34	The Chicago Community Trust (IL)	1,503,994,247
35	The Wallace Foundation (NY)	1,447,299,661
36	W. M. Keck Foundation (CA)	1,333,252,000
37	The Brown Foundation, Inc. (TX)	1,314,216,005
38	Tulsa Community Foundation (OK)	1,255,966,405
39	The William Penn Foundation (PA)	1,253,208,618
40	The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation, Inc. (OK)	1,239,040,694
41	Donald W. Reynolds Foundation (NV)	1,204,806,991
42	Lumina Foundation for Education, Inc. (IN)	1,196,062,690
43	The Michael and Susan Dell Foundation (TX)	1,178,008,895
44	Walton Family Foundation, Inc. (AR)	1,129,770,302
45	Freeman Foundation (NY)	1,105,466,120
46	The California Wellness Foundation (CA)	1,095,660,990
47	Daniels Fund (CO)	1,090,055,954
48	Marin Community Foundation (CA)	1,071,953,470
49	The Moody Foundation (TX)	1,056,384,643
50	Kimbell Art Foundation (TX)	1,019,561,229
51	John Templeton Foundation (PA)	947,837,251
52	Howard Heinz Endowment (PA)	933,443,085
53	The Freedom Forum, Inc. (VA)	924,229,500
54	Greater Kansas City Community Foundation (MO)	895,377,250
55	The Joyce Foundation (IL)	892,492,212
56	The Ahmanson Foundation (CA)	890,412,590
57	Conrad N. Hilton Foundation (NV)	889,768,443
58	Columbus Foundation and Affiliated Organizations (OH)	850,089,853

Rank	Name (State)	Asset size (US\$)
59	The Oregon Community Foundation (OR)	850,034,138
60	Barr Foundation (MA)	850,000,000
61	The Meadows Foundation, Inc. (TX)	842,877,031
62	Hall Family Foundation (MO)	814,088,561
63	The San Francisco Foundation (CA)	809,539,000
64	The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (NY)	808,121,944
65	Bush Foundation (MN)	796,152,567
66	Weingart Foundation (CA)	795,207,659
67	Horace W. Goldsmith Foundation (NY)	788,615,258
68	Longwood Foundation, Inc. (DE)	785,221,853
69	The Henry Luce Foundation, Inc. (NY)	780,692,462
70	The Packard Humanities Institute (CA)	779,174,772
71	Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. (NY)	773,436,060
72	Surdna Foundation, Inc. (NY)	769,100,511
73	California Community Foundation (CA)	762,726,071
74	Community Foundation Silicon Valley (CA)	760,821,244
75	M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust (WA)	758,617,116
76	The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc. (WI)	755,894,000
77	Fred C. and Katherine B. Andersen Foundation (MN)	752,341,252
78	The J. E. and L. E. Mabee Foundation, Inc. (OK)	750,335,362
79	Burroughs Wellcome Fund (NC)	702,980,765
80	Boston Foundation, Inc. (MA)	686,124,331
81	The Pittsburgh Foundation (PA)	684,438,252
82	Hartford Foundation for Public Giving (CT)	664,546,568
83	Marguerite Casey Foundation (WA)	663,183,945
84	The AVI CHAI Foundation (NY)	653,609,340
85	Communities Foundation of Texas, Inc. (TX)	647,469,000
86	The Commonwealth Fund (NY)	634,403,522
87	Wayne & Gladys Valley Foundation (CA)	623,762,552
88	The Saint Paul Foundation, Inc. (MN)	617,910,511
89	The John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc. (NY)	614,197,200
90	Peninsula Community Foundation (CA)	611,716,329
91	The Robert A. Welch Foundation (TX)	611,141,615
92	The Minneapolis Foundation (MN)	597,646,545
93	William Randolph Hearst Foundation (NY)	597,342,514
94	Jack Kent Cooke Foundation (VA)	592,886,751
95	J. Bulow Campbell Foundation (GA)	588,384,744
96	McCune Foundation (PA)	585,046,089
97	Broad Foundation (CA)	560,931,566
98	Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta, Inc. (GA)	560,410,937
99	The Wells Fargo Foundation (CA)	554,108,137
100	Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund (CA)	553,365,428
	Total assets (\$)	212,325,976,457

Annex II

Top 40 European private foundations (as of 2003)

Rank	Name (Country)	Grants (€)
1	Wellcome Trust (UK)	701,000,000
2	Fundación La Caixa (Spain)	169,000,000
3	Stichting NOVIB (Netherlands)	154,700,000
4	Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (Portugal)	132,000,000
5	Volkswagen Stiftung (Germany)	124,400,000
6	Compagnia di San Paolo (Italy)	117,400,000
7	Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Germany)	110,000,000
8	Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Germany)	102,000,000
9	Aga Khan Foundation (Switzerland)	91,000,000
10	Fondazione Cariplo (Italy)	90,100,000
11	Fondazione Monte dei Paschi di Siena (Italy)	80,050,000
12	Fundacion ONCE (Spain)	78,200,000
13	Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse (Sweden)	66,150,000
14	Bertelsmann Stiftung (Germany)	65,000,000
15	Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Torino (Italy)	64,500,000
16	HIVOS (Netherlands)	59,500,000
17	Wolfson Foundation (UK)	58,200,000
18	Fondation de France (France)	58,000,000
19	Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Sweden)	55,000,000
20	Gatsby Charitable Foundation (UK)	55,000,000
21	Garfield Weston Foundation (UK)	47,500,000
22	Robert Bosch Stiftung (Germany)	47,000,000
23	Technologiestichting---STW (Netherlands)	46,000,000
24	Fundacion Telefonica (Spain)	45,000,000
25	Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung (Germany)	45,000,000
26	Vehbi Koc Foundation (Turkey)	44,400,000
27	Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt (Germany)	40,000,000
28	Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Padova e Rovigo (Italy)	40,000,000
29	Henry Smith's Charity (UK)	36,400,000
30	Avina Stiftung (Switzerland)	33,000,000
31	Tudor Trust (UK)	32,300,000
32	ZEIT Stiftung (Germany)	28,000,000
33	Software AG Foundation (Germany)	26,000,000
34	Fundacao Oriente (Portugal)	26,000,000
35	King Baudouin Foundation (Belgium)	25,000,000
36	Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Roma (Italy)	25,000,000
37	Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach-Stiftung (Germany)	24,400,000
38	Bayerische Landesstiftung (Germany)	21,800,000
39	Jacobs Foundation (Switzerland)	21,200,000
40	Suomen Kultuurirahasto (Finland)	20,000,000
	Total grants (€)	3,105,200,000

Annex III

Top 50 US Corporate Foundations (as of Oct 06)

Rank	Name (State)	Assets (US\$)
1	The Wells Fargo Foundation (CA)	554,108,137
2	Alcoa Foundation (PA)	512,821,331
3	Verizon Foundation (NJ)	425,490,454
4	The Pfizer Foundation, Inc. (NY)	358,286,236
5	Fidelity Foundation (MA)	323,032,392
6	General Motors Foundation, Inc. (MI)	255,698,530
7	AT&T Foundation (TX)	233,864,354
8	Freddie Mac Foundation (VA)	225,922,595
9	The Goldman Sachs Foundation (NY)	200,921,959
10	Fannie Mae Foundation (DC)	178,738,695
11	IBM International Foundation (NY)	164,195,806
12	The Merck Company Foundation (NJ)	160,982,025
13	Abbott Laboratories Fund (IL)	160,827,628
14	The USAA Foundation, Inc. (TX)	152,336,576
15	Alabama Power Foundation, Inc. (AL)	149,168,819
16	MetLife Foundation (NY)	148,885,452
17	The Capital Group Companies Charitable Foundation (CA)	141,254,474
18	Citigroup Foundation (NY)	131,761,174
19	WellPoint Foundation (CA)	127,721,112
20	The HCA Foundation (TN)	126,590,426
21	Georgia Power Foundation, Inc. (GA)	126,494,362
22	The Batchelor Foundation, Inc. (FL)	123,698,086
23	The JPMorgan Chase Foundation (NY)	122,701,486
24	Grand Victoria Foundation (IL)	118,765,585
25	The Dow Chemical Company Foundation (MI)	115,244,709
26	Steelcase Foundation (MI)	113,151,982
27	ExxonMobil Foundation (TX)	110,612,415
28	AEGON Transamerica Foundation (IA)	108,861,302
29	Ford Motor Company Fund (MI)	107,283,149
30	The PepsiCo Foundation, Inc. (NY)	106,561,857
31	Micron Technology Foundation, Inc. (ID)	105,598,235
32	Cisco Systems Foundation (CA)	104,695,664
33	The Prudential Foundation (NJ)	104,122,812
34	The Cargill Foundation (MN)	100,283,183
35	Amgen Foundation, Inc. (CA)	99,227,433
36	New York Life Foundation (NY)	97,380,953
37	Wachovia Regional Foundation (PA)	93,914,273
38	Thrivent Financial for Lutherans Foundation (WI)	88,032,430
39	New Balance Foundation (MA)	86,282,973
40	Independence Community Foundation (NY)	84,643,459
41	Intel Foundation (OR)	83,912,682
42	CVS/pharmacy Charitable Trust, Inc. (RI)	81,287,564
43	The Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Inc. (NC)	77,860,108
44	Levi Strauss Foundation (CA)	74,186,552
45	Enterprise Rent-A-Car Foundation (MO)	74,060,534
46	Scripps Howard Foundation (OH)	73,350,056
47	Motorola Foundation (IL)	72,381,716
48	The MBNA Foundation (DE)	69,704,941
49	First Tennessee Foundation (TN)	68,477,351
50	Eli Lilly and Company Foundation (IN)	68,280,213
	Total assets (\$)	7,593,666,240

Annex IV

Bilateral aid for major purposes in 2005

	(%)	DAC	USA	EU	Japan
Social infrastructure		30.5	42.8	40.1	20.0
Education		6.1	2.7	6.6	4.9
Health		3.8	4.9	5.4	1.2
Population		2.3	5.2	0.5	0.0
Water/sanitation		4.8	3.9	6.1	12.3
Government/civil society		9.7	18.3	16.0	0.6
Other social infrastructure/services		3.7	7.9	5.6	1.0
Economic infrastructure		10.6	7.8	17.1	23.4
Transport/communications		5.6	3.7	10.8	17.1
Energy		3.1	2.4	3.2	6.1
Other		2.0	1.6	3.0	0.2
Production		5.2	5.4	6.2	7.7
Agriculture		3.3	2.5	1.9	5.8
Industry/mining/construction		1.3	2.3	2.9	1.1
Trade/tourism		0.5	0.7	1.4	0.8
Multi-sector		6.5	4.4	5.6	3.1
Programme assistance		2.5	3.6	14.0	1.6
Debt related		27.5	16.3	0.0	32.9
Humanitarian aid		10.0	15.5	11.1	3.6
Administrative expense		4.0	4.2	5.4	4.1
Unspecified		3.2	0.0	0.4	3.5
Total (%)		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0