

UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES
CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS
MAESTRIA EN POLÍTICA Y GESTION DE LA CIENCIA Y LA TECNOLOGIA

August 30, 2002

Mr. Ian Johnson
Chairman, CGIAR
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am pleased to transmit herewith the report of the Review of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC).

The Executive Council (ExCo) created the review panel, composed of Ian Bevege and myself, to address essentially three questions: a) How successful has the Committee been in achieving its mission?; b) Is there continuing need for a separate CGIAR Committee (or other mechanism) addressing genetic resource policy issues?; and c) If there is such a need, what kind of mechanism and what are its terms of reference?

Our review has shown that the GRPC has served the CGIAR System well as an advisory body on genetic resources issues. We fully believe that there is a continuing need for such a committee within the CGIAR structure. The review provides suggestions on how the role and functions of the committee could be enhanced.

In carrying out the review, we consulted a number of key stakeholders, including individuals external to the CGIAR System who have good knowledge of genetic resources issues and broad experience in dealing with them. Their views and perspectives were very helpful in formulating our recommendations.

Ian and I would like to thank you and your colleagues in the Executive Council for the opportunity to participate in the review.

With best wishes and kind regards.

Carlos M. Correa
Director

REPORT OF THE REVIEW
OF THE CGIAR GENETIC RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Review Panel: Carlos Correa (Chair)
Ian Bevege

Secretariat: Manuel Lantin

Advisory Group to the Review:

Bo Bengtsson
Wanda Collins
Joachen de Haas
Panjab Singh

August 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Recommendations	3
Background	5
GRPC's mission	6
Accomplished tasks	6
Scope and methodology of the review	7
Survey findings	8
Is there a continuing need for a separate CGIAR Committee or other mechanism? GRPC or a different mechanism?	11
Scope of policy advice	12
Composition of the GRPC	13
Nomination and selection of members	14
Reporting and decision making	15
Budget	15
Relationship with FAO	16
Outstanding policy issues	16
IPGRI's EPMR	17
Concluding remarks	18
Annex 1	
Overview of the activities and achievements of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee, 1995 – 2002	
Annex 2	
Terms of Reference for the Executive Council Review of GRPC	
Annex 3	
Review of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC)	
Questionnaire	
Annex 4	
Summary of Responses to Questionnaire	
Annex 5	
Glossary of Acronyms	

Review of CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee

Report of the Review Panel

Summary and Recommendations

We conclude that the GRPC has fulfilled its mission in a very satisfactory manner, and that there is a need to retain such an independent mechanism within CGIAR. However, some adjustments could be made to the Committee's scope and composition in order to enhance its advisory role, particularly in relation to developments at the national level, individual Centers' needs in the field of genetic resources policies, and emerging issues in conservation and management of genetic resources relevant to CGIAR.

To this end, we make the following recommendations:

1. We support the view that there is a continuing need for a high level, independent committee to address genetics resources policy issues of relevance to CGIAR.

2. We recommend to maintain the GRPC as an independent advisory body to address genetic resources policy issues of relevance to the CGIAR, and suggest that consideration be given to possible adjustments to its operation, as indicated below.

3. CGIAR should consider ways and means to enhance the monitoring of national developments by the GRPC.

It should also consider the role of the GRPC in supporting the centers at a more operational level (trouble-shooting) as they implement genetic resources policies, as well as in assisting NARS to address genetic resources issues, taking into account resource implications.

4. We recommend that the composition of the GRPC be examined to ensure a better balance in terms of qualifications and experience in scientific, policy, legal (IP), ethical and socio-economic issues relevant to genetic resources. We also recommend:

-the inclusion of a member of the Science Council, and one of the ExCo (possibly the Chair of the proposed Program Committee) in order to ensure appropriate interaction with these Councils;

-the retention of the existing stakeholder perspective;

-the integration of the perspectives of indigenous communities through an additional member from farmers' indigenous organizations;

- incorporating the perspectives of the four regions in the developing world (Asia-Pacific, Sub-Saharan Africa, Central and West Asia and North Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean).

In any case, the size of the committee should remain as small as possible, i. e. a maximum of 15 members including the Chair and two ex-officio members, the Chair being nominated by the Chairman of CGIAR and appointed by the Members at AGM .

5. We recommend that the criteria for selecting GRPC members be clarified and made explicit, and the introduction of a system of partial renewal of membership (by half) every 2-3 years.

6. We recommend that, where appropriate, GRPC's recommendations be adopted through formal decisions of the AGM. It would be incumbent upon the Centers to heed any such recommendations in developing and implementing individual center policy. One role of the committee should be to moderate harmonization among Centers and monitor such implementation.

7. A modest budget should be allocated to the GRPC to provide a fee for Chair's activities, and for required consultancy. Funding of this budget could be raised by levy on the Centers as the primary beneficiaries of the committee's activities

8. The working relationship between the GRPC and FAO should be strengthened, particularly in relation to ethical issues.

9. We recommend that the work of IPGRI in relation to the GRPC and possible modalities to improve policy advice within the CGIAR system be examined in the EPMR

Background

CGIAR has increasingly recognized that the international policy environment for managing genetic resources has become more complex, with the increasing protection of genetic resources under intellectual property rights, growing concerns of developing countries about the appropriation of such resources and associated knowledge, and the adoption and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The essentially bilateral emphasis of the CBD on national sovereignty, prior informed consent and benefit sharing provisions significantly impinged on CGIAR Centers' germplasm collection and exchange activities.

Such activities had been undertaken pre-CBD under the aegis of the FAO International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources (IU). The IU was voluntary in nature, and promoted the free exchange of germplasm, premised on genetic resources being the common heritage of mankind. This ethos had underpinned policies associated with the international exchange of germplasm until the adoption of the CBD. Hence, it became necessary to harmonize the IU with the CBD. This process was initiated in FAO in 1994 through its Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA).

In October 1994, the CGIAR's *ex situ* collections of germplasm were placed under trustee arrangements with FAO through a series of FAO/ IARC parallel agreements. These agreements enabled the designation of Center-held germplasm as part of the international network of *ex situ* collections under the IU. This move was a major factor in CGIAR's recognition of the desirability and necessity for greater coherence regarding genetic resources policy and its implementation among the Centers.

With the adoption, in November 2001, of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), the CGIAR collections and their management became an integral component of the new system established under this treaty, and will be subject to subsidiary agreements with the Treaty's Governing Body.

In summary, the CGIAR has faced, since the 1990's, a substantial change in the scenario for its activities. A real paradigm shift took place, which called for the reconsideration of a number of crucial genetic resources policy issues within the system and, particularly, in relation to the interaction between the CGIAR and national governments, international organizations, and NGOs.

The CGIAR established the Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) by a decision at the International Centers Week in October 1994. The establishment of GRPC was timely, since it provided CGIAR a tool to operate in the dynamic policy environment associated with the implementation of CBD by national governments, the re-negotiation of the IU leading to the ITPGRFA, and the parallel developments in other international fora (UPOV, TRIPS, SPS, Cartagena Protocol) affecting genetic resources.

GRPC's mission

The purpose of the GRPC as reflected in its 1994 terms of reference (TOR) was to

“advise the CGIAR on policy matters regarding genetic resources issues and to assist the Chairman of the CGIAR in his leadership role in this area. The Committee aims to enhance the openness and transparency of discussions on genetic resources policy issues within the CGIAR community.”

At the 1999 Mid-Term Meeting (MTM), the CGIAR reviewed the Committee's TOR and agreed on the following specific tasks of the GRPC:

1. Monitor and analyse policy developments concerning genetic resources, focusing on political, legal and ethical issues, at the national level and in relevant international fora, and recommend appropriate policy positions and action to the CGIAR Centers.
2. Monitor and analyse policy, legal and ethical developments within CGIAR relating to genetic resources and recommend action as necessary to the Group.
3. Monitor the implementation of the agreements that placed the CGIAR Centers' germplasm collections within the International Network of Ex Situ Collections, under the auspices of FAO. Where necessary, the committee will also assist in the interpretation of the agreements and propose any necessary changes.
4. Keep developments in intellectual property protection under review and advise the CGIAR on the further modification and implementation of the Centers' IPR guiding principles and related policies.

These tasks have encompassed *monitoring* and *analysis* of policy, legal and ethical developments related to genetic resources internationally, nationally and within the CGIAR, and *recommending* policy positions and actions to CGIAR and the Centers. The GRPC mandate as reflected in its TOR was sufficiently wide for the Committee to cover a variety of new issues in a changing scenario. The TOR, however, did not give the Committee a mandate for direct unilateral action or direction to the Centers (nor could this have been so, as the legal responsibilities for policy setting and implementation lie with Centers' Boards).

Accomplished tasks

The GRPC has accomplished the following tasks:

- developing models for public-private interaction (e.g. MTA);
- addressing contentious issues, such as GURTs and genetic contamination;
- supporting development of the multilateral system now enshrined in the ITPGRFA;
- examining the implications of and suggesting guidelines to deal with IPRs;
- addressing ethical issues;
- raising awareness of issues related to underutilized crops;

- keeping track of developments at FAO, WTO, UPOV, WIPO in response to the CGIAR's agenda.

A comprehensive synopsis of the GRPC activities from inception in 1994 to the present, prepared for this review by IPGRI –which acted as Secretariat to the Committee– is provided in Annex 1.

Scope and methodology of the review

The review of GRPC was decided by the CGIAR Executive Council (ExCo) in March 2002, in the context of the changes that were introduced in the governance and structure of the CGIAR.

The panel was requested to evaluate “how successful the GRPC has been in achieving its mission”. For this purpose, we have considered the extent to which the GRPC has been able to perform the functions set forth in the TOR as revised in 1999. We did not intend to evaluate the appropriateness of the tasks commissioned as such. However, as noted below, a review of the TOR may be desirable in order to respond better to the changing national and international environment in the area of genetic resources.

This evaluation does not specifically address the performance of IPGRI as Secretariat to the Committee¹.

The TOR for the review, the composition of the panel and advisory group are provided as Annex 2.

Supported by the CGIAR Secretariat, the panel commenced work in May 2002, initially through email contact. IPGRI, as the Secretariat to GRPC provided comprehensive documentation on GRPC outputs at the end of May, including:

- Overview of the Activities and Achievements of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee, 1995-2002. Paper prepared by Geoff Hawtin, Director General, IPGRI and approved by the current GRPC, with annexes of all 13 reports of GRPC to CGIAR's ICW and MTM; (Annex 1)
- Excerpt of a report by Carl-Gustaf Thornstrom (a GRPC member) on the Committee's successful handling of NGO concerns about the proposed changes to CGIAR intellectual property policy, October 2000;
- Proceedings of the Ethics and Equity workshop, Foz do Iguacu Brasil, April 1997;
- Proceedings of the international consultation on the role of underutilized species, Chennai, India, February 1999;

¹ The interviews had with IPGRI management and staff and with other concerned people indicate, however, that IPGRI, with technical support from SGRP and consultants, has provided excellent support to the Committee in performing its functions, within the limits of resources made available to it.

- Booklet of CGIAR Centre Policy Instruments, Guidelines and Statements on Genetic resources, Biotechnology and Intellectual Property Rights, SGRP, 2001.

The panel prepared a questionnaire survey in order to seek the views of stakeholders and other individuals knowledgeable of genetic resources management in the CGIAR. The questionnaire was structured around the TOR of the GRPC and sought to gauge:

- how effective the GRPC has been in pursuing its mandate
- the significance of the contribution it has made
- the responsiveness of the Centers to GRPC recommendations
- alternatives models to achieve the same end
- the form the future dialogue on genetic resources policy might take
- how improvements might be made, including the scope of the issues addressed by the GRPC or other models.

The questionnaire is provided as Annex 3. It was circulated by e-mail on 23 July to some 144 people requesting responses by 5 August.

The panel convened at IPGRI (Maccarese, Italy) on 5-8 August 2002. Discussions were held with Geoff Hawtin, Director General of IPGRI and Secretary of GRPC, Jane Toll Coordinator of SGRP, Science Council Secretariat, and FAO officials including Louise Fresco, Assistant Director General, Agriculture Department, and a number of officers dealing with plant (Arturo Martinez, Chief Seed and Plant Genetic Resources Service and Agricultural Protection), animal (Irene Hoffmann, Chief Animal Production Service and Keith Hammond) and fish (Devin Bartley) genetic resources issues, and Dietrich Leihner, Director of Research Extension and Training Division. Conversations were held with Christel Palmberg-Lerche, Chief Forest Resources Development Service in Canberra on 21 August. Telephone conversations were held with Jose Esquinas-Alcazar, Secretary of FAO/CGRFA, M S Swaminathan Chair of GRPC, and three members of the Advisory Group, Wanda Collins, Jochen de Haas, and Panjab Singh. Another member of the Advisory Group, Bo Bengtsson could not be contacted at that time. However, he did send a substantial response to the questionnaire.

Survey findings

A total of 19 responses to the questionnaire were received. Although representing less than 15% of the individuals to whom the questionnaire was sent, the respondents were representative of the broad stakeholder groups in CGIAR. All were familiar with the CGIAR and had good knowledge of the GRPC and its role in the System. A summary of the individual assessments and supporting comments is provided in Annex 4. The quality of comments from this survey was very high and most helpful to the panel in assessing the activities of GRPC and in developing recommendations on the mechanisms for dealing with genetic resources policy issues. These comments are provided here to demonstrate the range and scope of opinions and to provide insights in the forthcoming debate on this matter at AGM.

With regard to the GRPC performance of its tasks, there was a high degree of support and respect for the past and current work of GRPC from all stakeholder groups. The opinion was unanimous that there is an on-going need for genetic resources policy issues to be examined at a high level in CGIAR and for advice and support to the Centers in the policy, legal and ethical aspects of genetic resources management to continue. It was strongly felt that these functions were best provided through an independent, skilled and representative body such as the GRPC.

CGIAR respondents suggested that no viable alternative existed among extant entities of CGIAR; while the functions might be carried out by SGRP/IPGRI, advice and recommendations from these sources were perceived as lacking the credibility which an independent entity brings. ExCo and Science Council were also seen as inappropriate and potentially less effective than the current arrangement of an independent committee. It was felt that ExCo lacks the necessary expertise and has primarily executive functions; it is not seen as having policy development or analytical capacity in the sense or degree demanded in carrying out the functions ascribed to the GRPC. The scope and boundaries of the Science Council have yet to be fully defined. While it undoubtedly will have a science policy context it is not seen as being wholly appropriate to carry out the specific functions of the GRPC.

While it was mentioned that FAO could cover some of the functions allocated to the GRPC, it was felt that FAO would not be fully effective in this role vis-à-vis CGIAR's specific needs, and that it would be constrained by its intergovernmental nature and its responsibilities to the ITPGRFA. The complementarity of CGIAR and FAO in this area was stressed particularly, by FAO officials and staff, whose strong preference was for an effective working relationship between CGIAR and FAO in this area. For example, FAO has established an external independent ethics committee and it is logical for CGIAR's GRPC to work closely with it. Dialogue with FAO makes sense at the global level but in addressing the specific problems of Centers, access to in-house capacity and rapid response capability are essential.

In addressing the effectiveness of GRPC as a basis for determining whether the functions it provides should continue in their present form, there was a strong consensus (but not unanimity) among respondents and discussants that the GRPC was effective in carrying out its role. Despite some reservations expressed on performance in some areas to date "on balance the GRPC has done a good job" with limited resources, ably supported by its Secretariat in IPGRI and with technical backup from SGRP. Members have been part time pro bono and there are real limitations as to what GRPC can achieve under such circumstances particularly when the rapidly changing policy environment and its increasing complexity are taken into account. As one respondent stated succinctly "without the GRPC there would have been chaos."

Effectiveness varied depending on the nature of the activity and the target for outputs, and this is reflected in the summary of effectiveness ratings provided in Annex 4. While individual perceptions on the one performance criteria varied quite markedly, there was a tendency for those most closely associated with GRPC to rate highly across almost all

criteria, while those at the operational end of the spectrum in Centers and CGIAR members tended to rate lower and with more differentiation among criteria.

Another notable trend was for the assessment of the effectiveness of GRPC in dealing with issues at the national level including with and for CGIAR members. Effectiveness in the national arena was somewhat lower than that for issues at the global level or in support of the Centers. There was a perception that the GRPC had more limited effectiveness in influencing Centers' project planning and implementation. Interestingly its role in the FAO/ITGRFA was rated uniformly high while it was seen as much weaker in addressing issues arising from the CBD and other international instruments.

Some respondents suggested a reconsideration of GRPC's approach and capacities in assisting NARS with national issues, in interacting with the CGIAR membership, and in supporting the Centers at a more operational level as they implement policies in their programming context.

A number of people considered that GRPC has placed too much emphasis on maintaining a watching brief and reporting, and that its role was inadequate on analysis and policy development. A more pro-active stance was seen as desirable with targeting of specific issues in national and international policy fora. There has been some criticism about the GRPC not informing the stakeholders sufficiently about current and emerging issues and their implications for CGIAR. Opinions have been mixed on how well the GRPC has managed to harmonize center policies and facilitate projection of a coherent CGIAR view outside the system.

Is there a continuing need for a separate CGIAR Committee or other mechanism?

No doubt, the CGIAR has faced unprecedented challenges in the policy arena, as mentioned above. While the GRPC has contributed to CGIAR's ability to address such challenges in a reasonably effective way, there are certainly outstanding issues that continue to require high level expertise, a strategic perspective, broad consultations with stakeholders, and capacity to build consensus on controversial issues.

The existence of a separate independent body permits the taking into account of different voices within and outside the CGIAR system. It gives more credibility to the analysis and recommendations made, especially with regard to complex and contentious issues where North-South perspectives and the views of the public and private sectors, and of civil society significantly diverge.

One of the main advantages of the GRPC has been, according to the inquiry made, its multi-stakeholder composition, and the fact that it was perceived as a body with an independent view despite being within the structure of the CGIAR. . The "independence" of the GRPC and the transparency of its activities have been –in the view of many of the people that we interviewed- one of the main strengths of the Committee.

Recommendation 1. We support the view that there is a continuing need for a high level, independent committee to address genetics resources policy issues of relevance to CGIAR.

GRPC or a different mechanism?

A range of mechanisms may be devised and established to undertake the advisory tasks assigned to the GRPC. We consider here three alternative models additional to the current GRPC, which remains a viable option:

(1) IPGRI might provide, with an expanded in-house capacity or by establishing a Genetics Resources Advisory Group (GRAG), the advice required in the policy areas within the competence and scope of the GRPC as currently constituted. Such an IPGRI-based option would certainly reduce the independence of advice, and have a commensurately lower credibility and influence outside the CGIAR system. Although the output of such advice may not substantively differ in some cases from what the GRPC may have delivered, the fact that certain policy orientations are endorsed by a multi-stakeholder, independent Committee is likely to make a significant difference in terms of acceptability and possible impact on the CGIAR Centers and Members.

A variant of this option would be to expand the scope of activities of SGRP to ensure that it provides technical support to IPGRI on genetic resources policy issues.

(2) Establish a sub-committee or standing panel of the Science Council. This would give the advisory function a permanent status, and would ensure independence of views. But since policy goes beyond science such a sub-committee or panel may not be able to adequately cover the full range of issues in the policy arena, nor effectively take into account the views and perceptions of stakeholders, particularly of the CGIAR Centers and Members.

(3) Transform the GRPC into a “Genetics Resources Policy Council”, reporting to the AGM through the Chairman of the CGIAR. Such a Council could be composed of experts nominated on the basis of their individual qualifications, skills and expertise. The secretariat to the Council could be provided by IPGRI backed up by a stronger policy research capability within the Institute. The independence of this body would be greater than that of the current GRPC. However, elevating the GRPC to yet another Council would have significant organizational and resource implications, and may not find the support of some CGIAR members.

The GRPC seems to have performed its tasks in a very reasonable manner. The GRPC has been especially successful when it has been proactive, for example, with the workshops and publication of proceedings on ethics and underutilized crops. The former, in particular, provided useful and highly regarded policy advice and guidelines very much appreciated by Centers as reflected in their response to the questionnaire and importantly, by the uptake of these ethical issues into their own policy frameworks.

Policy positions, recommendations and guidelines emanating from the GRPC for endorsement by CGIAR membership, do so with a high degree of acceptability by the Centers. This is likely to lead to more harmonized policy positions and implementation processes. Adoption by CGIAR of all recommendations included in the GRPC reports to date is a measure of the relevance of the Committee's work to the System.

There are several advantages to the way in which the GRPC has been set up and operates. Some of the weaknesses that may be identified, may be addressed by further consideration of its scope and method of working and by some organizational adjustments with regard to composition, accountability and budget.

Recommendation 2. We recommend to maintain the GRPC as an independent advisory body to address genetic resources policy issues of relevance to the CGIAR, and suggest that consideration be given to possible adjustments to its operation, as indicated below.

Scope of policy advice

It has been noted that the Committee has been more effective in dealing with international issues than with those emerging from changes in national legislation and practices, such as those relating to the exchange of germplasm under national access laws under the CBD. Related issues will arise in the future under implementation of the ITPGRFA.

In addition, it has been pointed out that the Committee has not been able to provide the assistance needed to deal with complex policy issues affecting individual Centers. The Committee has lacked the capacity to mobilize the necessary expertise to respond or advise in a timely manner. Enhancing the capacity of Centers to operate in changing national regulatory and policy environments has resource implications which might require a closer working relationship between the Committee and Centers for their effective deployment. Addressing genetic resources policy issues at the national level would also require increased interaction with NARs. This, however, should not mean a change to GRPC's essentially advisory role. A service unit similar to the Central Advisory Service (CAS) may be an option to provide specific legal and other services to the Centers, but this would be beyond the remit of a policy-centered Committee serving the CGIAR system as a whole.

Recommendation 3. CGIAR should consider ways and means to enhance the monitoring of national developments by the GRPC.

It should also consider the role of the GRPC in supporting the centers at a more operational level (trouble-shooting) as they implement genetic resources policies, as well as in assisting NARS to address genetic resources issues, taking into account resource implications.

Composition of the GRPC

The multi-stakeholder composition of the GRPC has been a positive element, as stressed unanimously by interlocutors to this review, in providing credibility to and enhancing the relevance and quality of the Committee's policy recommendations. We recommend the retention of the broad stakeholder representation as decided at International Centers Week (ICW) 1997.

GRPC provided the CGIAR with a valuable mechanism whereby inter-Center policies could be largely harmonized. In particular, the participation of the Centers through CDC and CBC in the GRPC, the technical support provided by SGRP and the role of IPGRI as GRPC Secretariat, has enabled the Centers to contribute to GRPC policy development and the formulation of its recommendations.

It has been noted, however, that undue emphasis on stakeholders' representation may have two shortcomings: (1) it may not ensure sufficient independence of opinion and (2) it may not provide the range of expertise necessary to cover complex issues. Several of the persons interviewed mentioned the lack of specific competencies in the existing Committee in some sectors of biodiversity (animals, fish, forestry, microorganisms) and in legal and ethical matters.

A *combination* of both expertise in diverse fields and stakeholders' perspective is highly desirable. Where possible individuals capable of bringing to the committee a multiple perspective (e.g. a plant genetics resources expert from an Asian developing country member of CGIAR, an IP expert from Latin America, an ethicist from an industrialized country member, an indigenous farmer from Africa) should be sought to serve in order to keep the committee to manageable levels but importantly to contribute wider and more integrated experience.

An alternative to this proposal that would require a marginal increase in the number of members would be to establish a smaller Committee availing of the expertise of ad hoc expert panels to address particular issues (similar to the model that has been proposed for the Science Council). This is an attractive proposition. However, a disadvantage of this model is that the Committee would not be able to include perspectives from different stakeholders to deal with the various issues under its consideration in a systemic way. As mentioned earlier, the fact that the GRPC included different perspectives has been an important element for its satisfactory operation.

Recommendation 4. We recommend that the composition of the GRPC be examined to ensure a better balance in terms of qualifications and experience in scientific, policy, legal (IP), ethical and socio-economic issues relevant to genetic resources. We also recommend:

-the inclusion of a member of the Science Council, and one of the ExCo (possibly the Chair of the proposed Program Committee) in order to ensure appropriate interaction with these Councils;

-the retention of the existing stakeholder perspective;

-the integration of the perspectives of indigenous communities through an additional member from farmers' indigenous organizations;

- incorporating the perspectives of the four regions in the developing world (Asia-Pacific, Sub-Saharan Africa, Central and West Asia and North Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean).

In any case, the size of the committee should remain as small as possible, i. e. a maximum of 15 members including the Chair and two ex-officio members, the Chair being nominated by the Chairman of CGIAR and appointed by the Members at AGM .

Nomination and selection of members

The selection of candidates for integrating the committee should be as open and transparent as possible, based on qualifications and expertise in relevant disciplines (as mentioned above) and balanced by the stakeholder approach so far followed in the current GRPC. The committee may seek advice from Centers' staff and other experts in order to deal with issues for which sufficient competence is not available within the committee.

The criteria for nominating members should be clarified. They should ensure some familiarity with the workings of CGIAR among a significant number of members (not necessarily all), and might include the following perspectives:

- Expertise in genetic resources conservation, research and management in key areas of biodiversity – crop plants, forest trees, domestic animals, fish
- Development of science policy and experience in addressing issues arising from international agreements relevant to genetic resources/biodiversity (CBD, ITPGRFA, UPOV, WTO/TRIPS)
- Legal/IP management including expertise and familiarity with international agreements
- Ethics

- Indigenous and traditional (farmers) knowledge
- It would also be important that all developing regions – Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia-Pacific, Central and West Asia and North Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean be represented.

Another issue for consideration is the term of appointments of the committee. Members should be renewed periodically, without affecting the coherence and continuity of GRPC work.

Recommendation 5. We recommend that the criteria for selecting GRPC members be clarified and made explicit, and the introduction of a system of partial renewal of membership (by half) every 2-3 years.

Reporting and decision making

The committee should continue to directly report to the AGM (or the ExCo in between AGMs), and do it in a detailed, clear and precise manner so as to facilitate the adoption of decisions by the AGM and their subsequent effective implementation. Reports should be available well in advance of the AGM meetings.

While the GRPC guidance in critical matters seems to have been accepted to a large extent by the Centers, on a voluntary basis, questions have been raised about the effective *implementation* of the committee’s recommendations and on the follow up mechanisms. Mechanisms should be established by the Committee to improve the monitoring of the effective implementation of its recommendations by the Centers. The effectiveness of the committee’s recommendations may be enhanced if they were adopted as formal decisions of the AGM.

Recommendation 6. We recommend that, where appropriate, GRPC’s recommendations be adopted through formal decisions of the AGM. It would be incumbent upon the Centers to heed any such recommendations in developing and implementing individual center policy. One role of the Committee should be to moderate harmonization among Centers and monitor such implementation.

Budget

The GRPC has worked on a voluntary basis, without remuneration to its Chair and other members. As the number and complexity of policy issues increase, the time required to deal with the Committee’s business will correspondingly rise, particularly for

the Chair. In addition, in some cases the Committee will have to get expert advice, either on a pro-bono basis or under fee-based consultancy agreements.

Recommendation 7. A modest budget should be allocated to the GRPC to provide a fee for Chair's activities, and for required consultancy. Funding of this budget could be raised by levy on the Centers as the primary beneficiaries of the committee's activities.

Relationship with FAO

The relationship of the GRPC with FAO (which has expressed a positive view on the effectiveness of the Committee and has also stressed the complementary nature of CGIAR and FAO) has been articulated through the presence on the GRPC of the Secretary of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. This link should be retained and further strengthened in the area of ethics by establishing working relationships with both FAO's newly established independent Eminent Persons Ethics Committee and the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA when it is constituted.

Recommendation 8. The working relationship between the GRPC and FAO should be strengthened, particularly in relation to ethical issues.

Outstanding policy issues

A large number of issues of current and emerging strategic importance need consideration from the policy angle, with an interdisciplinary approach and integrated perspectives of different stakeholders. The Committee, within its broad mandate, should establish its own program of work and set the priorities for which it would seek endorsement from AGM.

The following list has been elaborated on the basis of issues raised by the interlocutors to this review – those interviewed in Rome, respondents to the questionnaire and others in telephone interviews. The list does not pretend to present issues in a logical and exhaustive manner, nor to suggest that all of them should be dealt with by the Committee. The list provides a menu from which CGIAR and the Committee might develop a future program of work and set priorities.

- Implementation of the ITPGRFA (adoption of MTAs, implementation of Farmers Rights, and of benefit sharing provisions through training, technology transfer, exchange of information, etc.).
- Gene-flows and genetic “contamination” of farmers’ varieties and organic farming systems.
- Relationship between CBD and TRIPS, and development of a *sui generis* regime for plants varieties
- Seed legislation

- Implications for future structure of agriculture and small farmers of increasing privatization of agriculture R&D and concentration of seed and biotech industries.
- Policies on GMOs, including development and diffusion of transgenic varieties possibly crop by crop relevant to poor farmers (e.g. biotic stress), relationship with food security, application of the precautionary approach to transborder transfer of materials (Cartagena Protocol), implications of GURTs, etc.
- Protection under IP of plant varieties, genetic materials, research tools, etc and implications of IP on R&D and technology transfer to developing countries.
- Ethical issues
- Traditional/indigenous knowledge
- Public-private partnerships on genetic resources research , conservation and utilization
- Strengthening food security
- Developments in WTO (particularly with regard to review of article 27.3 (b) and traditional knowledge, WIPO (in particular, work by the Committee on GR and Traditional Knowledge), and UPOV.
- Follow up of Global Plan of Action
- Animal genetic resources (genetic erosion, exchange of materials, animal trade, gene-flows, etc.)²
- Forest genetic resources (domestication, genetic erosion, in situ conservation, long term tenure)
- Global Conservation Trust
- Introduction of alien species and genetically altered organisms (e.g. reintroduction of improved fish)
- Intellectual property in information systems
- Interaction between natural and farm ecosystems on genetic resources conservation
- Development of a holistic policy approach for different sectors of biodiversity

IPGRI's EPMR

The forthcoming EPMR of IPGRI would provide an opportunity to examine IPGRI's work in the area of genetic resources policy and its role in servicing the GRPC. This review would also provide an opportunity for the on-going committee to consider any recommendations from the EPMR in the context of their own priority setting.

Recommendation 9. We recommend that the work of IPGRI in relation to the GRPC and possible modalities to improve policy advice within the CGIAR system be examined in the EPMR.

² Several interlocutors pointed out that animal and forest GRs issues had been relatively neglected in GRPC activities in the past.

Concluding remarks

In summary, we conclude that the GRPC has fulfilled its mission in a very satisfactory manner, and that there is a need to retain such an independent mechanism within CGIAR. However, some adjustments could be made to the Committee's scope and capacity in order to enhance its advisory role, particularly in relation to national developments, individual Centers' needs in the field of genetic resources policies, and emerging issues in conservation and management of genetic resources relevant to CGIAR.

Overview of the activities and achievements of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee, 1995 – 2002

Paper prepared for the External Review of the GRPC

GRPC Terms of Reference:

The CGIAR established the Genetic Resources and Policy Committee (GRPC) at International Centres' Week in 1994 (ICW'94). The Committee's Terms of Reference were as follows:

The purpose of the Committee is to advise the CGIAR on policy matters regarding genetic resources issues and to assist the Chairman of the CGIAR in his leadership role in this area. The Committee aims to enhance the openness and transparency of discussions on genetic resources policy issues within the CGIAR community.

More specifically, the Committee has as its tasks to:

- 1. Examine policy, legal and ethical issues regarding genetic resources and recommend CGIAR action as and when necessary.*
- 2. Monitor the Convention on Biological Diversity and the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources processes as they relate to the CGIAR and recommend CGIAR policies or mechanisms as necessary.*
- 3. Monitor the implementation of the CGIAR agreement with FAO regarding the placement of ex situ plant genetic resources collections of the Centres under the auspices of FAO and recommend CGIAR action, if necessary.*

The Committee reviewed these TORs at its first meeting in January 1995 and agreed that they were both adequate and appropriate.

In 1999 the terms of reference of the committee and its membership were again reviewed. New terms were adopted at MTM'99, under which the GRPC was to:

- 1. monitor and analyze policy developments concerning genetic resources, focusing on political, legal and ethical issues, at the national level and in relevant international fora, and recommend appropriate policy positions and action to the CGIAR Centres.*
- 2. monitor and analyze policy, legal and ethical developments within the CGIAR relating to genetic resources and recommend action as necessary to the Group;*

3. *monitor the implementation of the agreements that placed the CGIAR Centres' germplasm collections within the International Network of Ex Situ Collections, under the auspices of FAO. Where necessary, the committee will also assist in the interpretation of the agreements and propose any necessary changes;*
4. *keep developments in intellectual property protection under review and advise the CGIAR on the further modification and implementation of the Centres' IPR guiding principles and related policies.*

GRPC Composition:

The original Committee comprised:

M.S. Swaminathan, Chair
Bo Bengtsson, Sweden
Jürg Benz, Switzerland
Robert Bertram, USA
Adel El-Beltagy, ICARDA
Geoffrey Hawtin, IPGRI, Secretary of the Committee
George Rothschild, IRRI
Maria Zimmerman, TAC

In 1996 two additional members were co-opted onto the Committee: Norah Olembo, Kenya, and Setijati Sastrapradja, Indonesia

In 1997 Timothy Reeves, CIMMYT and Chairman of the Centre Directors IPR Committee, replaced George Rothschild, and in 1999 Usha Barwale-Zehr replaced Maria Zimmermann as the TAC representative

At ICW'99 it was decided to reformulate the Committee to be more representative of the various stakeholder groups, while also allowing for continuity. The following were appointed/reappointed:

M.S. Swaminathan, Chair
Robert Bertram, USA
Stein Bie, CDC
José Esquinas-Alcázar, FAO
Marcio de Miranda Santos, CBC
Carmen Felipe Morales, NGO Committee
Christine Grieder, Switzerland
Geoffrey Hawtin, IPGRI, Secretary of the Committee
Bernard Le Buanec, Private Sector Committee
Usha Barwale-Zehr, TAC
Godwin Mkamanga, NARS
Timothy Reeves, CDC
Carl-Gustaf Thornström, Sweden

In September, 2000 Ronald Cantrell, the new Chair of the Centre Directors' Committee on IPR, replaced Stein Bie. In February 2001, Rene Salazar was nominated by the NGO Committee to replace Carmen Morales.

The Committee has also benefited from the presence of numerous observers at its meetings – as listed in the individual meeting reports. A number of observers have attended several meetings of the Committee. These have included:

Frank Begemann, Germany, Susan Bragdon, IPGRI, Barry Greengrass, UPOV, Victoria Henson-Apolonio CGIAR-Central Advisory Service on IPR, Sirkka Immonen, TAC Secretariat, Manny Lantin, CGIAR Secretariat, Gerald Moore, IPGRI, and Gabrielle Persley, Australia.

Cary Fowler, IPGRI, attended most of the GRPC meetings as a resource person and assisted the GRPC secretariat in preparing many of the meeting documents and reports.

Sheilah Ebel, IPGRI, was responsible for organizing many of the logistical and other arrangements for the Committee meetings.

GRPC Meetings:

The Committee has held 14 meetings as follows:

- 1) Chennai, India, 26 – 28 January, 1995
- 2) Washington, D.C. USA, 22 – 23 October, 1995
- 3) Rolle, Switzerland, 14 – 16 February, 1996
- 4) Stockholm, Sweden, 2 – 4 October, 1996
- 5) Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 25 – 26 April, 1997
- 6) London, U.K., 1 - 3 September, 1997
- 7) Aleppo, Syria, 2 – 4 May, 1998
- 8) Washington, D.C., USA, 20 October, 1998
- 9) Chennai, India, 19 February, 1999
- 10) Rome, Italy, 1 – 3 March, 2000
- 11) The Hague, Netherlands, 6 – 8 September, 2000
- 12) Aurangabad, India, 20 – 23 February, 2001
- 13) Rome, Italy, 3 – 5 September, 2001
- 14) Los Banos, Philippines, 21 – 22 February, 2002

Topics addressed by the Committee:

Throughout the seven years of its existence, the GRPC has taken a very broad view of genetic resources policy. It has addressed a wide range of issues as can be seen from the agendas of the meetings and meeting reports. Major topics have included:

- Maintaining an overview, and providing advice regarding the implementation of the Agreements signed by the Centres and FAO in 1994, placing the in-trust germplasm collections maintained by the Centres within the International Network of *Ex Situ* Collections under the auspices of FAO. This has involved inputting to a wide range of strategies and procedures and endorsing a number of statements issued jointly by the

Centres and FAO. These have addressed the practical implementation of the agreements and measures to be adopted in cases of suspected violations.

- Advising the CGIAR of developments in the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) and more specifically in the renegotiation of the FAO International Undertaking. The Committee has on several occasions recommended specific action to be taken by the Centres and/or CGIAR members.
- Maintaining an overview of developments in other international fora concerned with genetic resources policy matters including the Conference of Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), UPOV, WIPO, and the World Trade Agreements/WTO. The Committee has made specific recommendations to the Centres and CGIAR members as and when it felt this to be appropriate. A significant concern of the Committee has been to promote greater harmony among the positions adopted by individual governments in the different fora concerned with genetic resources.
- Reviewing, inputting to and endorsing guidelines and working principles for the Centres concerning their management of intellectual property.
- Addressing issues of biosafety, genetic use-restriction technology and, more recently, concerns relating to the Centres' involvement with GMOs.
- Advising CGIAR members and the Centres on the development and implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources.
- Keeping abreast of, and providing advice on, developments in the CGIAR, the individual Centres, and in particular in the Systemwide Genetic Resources Programme (SGRP), the Systemwide Information Network on Genetic Resources (SINGER), and the Central Advisory Service on IPR (CAS-IPR)
- Advising on ethical concerns and farmers' rights
- Promoting further action within the CGIAR on neglected and underused species, and
- Providing input to the establishment of the Global Conservation Trust and making recommendations to CGIAR members regarding the financing of genetic resources work of the Centres.

Special meetings sponsored by the GRPC:

The Committee has cosponsored three workshops to address specific issues of importance to the work of the CGIAR:

Ethics and Equity:

The GRPC, together with the Governments of Brazil, Sweden, Switzerland and USA, sponsored a workshop on Ethics and Equity in the CGIAR's Use of Genetic Resources for Sustainable Food Security. The meeting was held in Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 22–25 April, 1997. About 50 people attended the meeting representing all major stakeholder groups. The meeting formulated ethical principles for the CGIAR in three main areas:

- biotechnology, biosafety and partnerships with the private sector
- sharing the benefits of genetic resources and plant improvement, including the CGIAR's trusteeship role for ex situ collections, and
- partnership with farmers and rural communities

A professional ethicist and the GRPC worked further on the ethical principles formulated at the workshop. They were then presented to, and adopted by, the CGIAR at ICW'97. In adopting the principles, the CGIAR called on the Centres to use them as a basis for the development of their own guiding ethical principles.

Underutilized Crops:

The Committee discussed the need to explore further the potential role of the Centres in undertaking research on underutilized species. In many cases these species are extremely important to the food security of the most disadvantaged sectors of society, which often live in remote and harsh environments. The GRPC thus sponsored, together with the M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation (MSSRF), IFAD and USAID, a meeting to explore the issues involved and develop action recommendations. The meeting, entitled "Enlarging the Basis of Food Security, the Role of Underutilized Crops", was held at the MSSRF headquarters in Chennai, India, from 17-19 February 1999. 53 participants attended the meeting, representing a broad range of stakeholders from 12 countries, including 9 Centres and TAC.

The workshop developed a series of recommendations for the Centers and donors. It led to the creation of a broad, multi-donor 'global' initiative on neglected and underutilized crops, coordinated by IPGRI.

International Treaty:

With the adoption of the International Treaty by the FAO Conference in November 2001, the GRPC considered it timely and necessary to hold a high level inter-Centre meeting to explore the Treaty's implications for the CGIAR System. The GRPC, together with SGRP, CAS-IP, the CGIAR System Office and IRRI, thus convened an inter-Centre workshop at Los Banos from 18 – 20 February 2002. Representatives from 10 Centres, including 6 DGs, several Board members, GRPC members and resource people, participated in the workshop. A draft negotiating text was prepared for the new agreement to be signed by the Centres with the Governing Body of the Treaty, after the treaty comes into force. This new agreement, once agreed to by all parties, will replace the current agreements with FAO. The workshop also drafted a revised interim MTA for discussion with FAO, and to present to the next meeting of the FAO Commission in October 2002. The GRPC meeting following the workshop endorsed the text of the draft interim MTA.

GRPC Reports and Statements:

In addition to the 14 reports of its meetings the GRPC has issued, from time to time, specific statements for the use of CGIAR members and/or as an input to statements by the CGIAR Chair to various important international meetings. These are included within, or as annexes to the 14 meeting reports and have included:

- The CGIAR, Biodiversity and Sustainable Food Security: a statement by GRPC1 for the CGIAR Lucerne Ministerial-Level meeting, March 1995
- The CGIAR and the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Genetic Resources: elements provided by GRPC2 for the CGIAR Chairman's Statement to

the Second Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Indonesia, November 1995

- Stockholm Statement on Genetic Resources for Sustainable Food Security: a statement by GRPC4 to the CGIAR members at ICW'96
- The CGIAR and the Renegotiation of the International Undertaking: recommendations of GRPC12 to CGIAR members in relation to the April 2002 negotiating session of the International Undertaking
- Statement by GRPC 14 as a contribution to the CGIAR Chair's statements to the World Food Summit: Five Years Later, Rome, June, 2002, and the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, September, 2002.

In addition to these statements, the GRPC has co-published:

- The proceedings of the Foz do Iguaçu workshop on Ethics and Equity
- the proceedings of the workshop on underutilized species, and
- a compendium of policies, guidelines and position statements concerning genetic resources in the CGIAR.

GRPC Review:

GRPC6, in September 1997, discussed the future of the Committee and prepared a brief paper on the topic for the consideration of ICW'97. The paper, provided here as Attachment 1, considered 5 questions:

- 1) Is there a continuing need?
- 2) What could we do better?
- 3) What should our functions be?
- 4) How should we operate? and
- 5) What should our membership be?

GRPC14 discussed the proposed external review of the Committee and made the following observations:

The Committee welcomed the review of its work, and noted the appropriate timing for this in view of the new International Treaty having recently been adopted. It discussed the challenge facing the review team, especially in assessing the GRPC's contribution to helping resolve issues before they assumed major proportions. The Committee believes its pro-active efforts have helped to resolve a number of politically sensitive situations by responding to concerns among a range of stakeholders. Its nature as a stakeholder-based committee has been particularly valuable in this respect. Dr Thornström offered to make available text (extracted from a report to a Parliamentary commission on Swedish Policy for Global Development), concerning events (or rather "non-events") that had occurred at ICW-2000 in relation to the CGIAR's IPR policies. Dr Lantin offered CG Secretariat support to assist in its translation into English.

The text of the report by Carl-Gustaf Thornström will be made available separately to the GRPC Review Panel.

Conclusions:

This paper only attempts to give a brief overview of the GRPC, covering the seven years of its existence. Much more detail about its activities, recommendations and outputs are to be found in the following sections that contain the individual reports of all the Committee meetings. The published proceedings of the two special workshops sponsored by the Committee (on ethics and equity, and underutilized species) as well as the compendium of genetic resources policies, guidelines and statements, are available separately.

Attachment 1

Discussion Note: Future of the Genetic Resources Policy Committee¹

I. Is there a continuing need?

The CGIAR is one of the largest and most important institutions involved in both the conservation and development of genetic resources. International policies and policy debates can and do have a profound impact on the CGIAR's programs, priorities, and day-to-day work. Likewise the CGIAR can, in some circumstances, play an influential role in contributing to the development of international policies concerning genetic resources for food and agriculture, and in helping provide information and expertise to its partners that supports them in policy formulation.

Among the outstanding issues currently under consideration at the national and international levels are:

- ownership
- access
- benefit sharing
- farmers' rights
- intellectual property

The CGIAR's ability to understand and analyze the implications, and develop and implement appropriate policy in a coherent manner affects:

- status of the collections
- exchange of genetic materials
- ability to collaborate with NARS and farmers
- research partnerships with private sector and AROs

This situation warrants the continuation of a multi-perspective group at the System level.

II. What could we do better?

We did well in:

- monitoring a range of policy fora
- summarizing developments
- bringing policy matters to the attention of the CGIAR

¹ Statement prepared at GRPC6, London, UK, September 1997

- responding to initiatives from the centers (e.g. IPR Guidelines)
- supporting the Chairman of the CGIAR in his ambassador role (e.g. Stockholm Statement)

We could do better in:

- providing in-depth analysis of pressing policy issues
- examining their operational implications and proposing action
- developing focused reports
- availing ourselves of diverse perspectives (inside and outside the CGIAR)

III. What should our functions be?

- Monitoring policy developments
 - emphasize consequences for CGIAR
 - targeted reporting
- In-depth and selective policy analysis, and derived recommendations
- Oversee implementation of CGIAR Policy
 - ensure coherence
 - accountability
- Convener
 - access a range of viewpoints
 - facilitate system interaction with outside partners (e.g. the Ethics and Equity Workshop)
- Advocacy and outreach

IV. How should we operate?

- In addition to standing items, we should focus each meeting on one or two key issues and structure our reports accordingly
- We should prepare for in-depth treatment of these issues
- Invite on an *ad hoc* basis expertise and diverse perspectives - in line with principal agenda items
- We should prepare a rolling work program (1-2 years in advance) - stepped-up preparation may be required
- Our work should be supported by the IPGRI Policy Unit
- We should have a clearer plan for consulting within the CGIAR (e.g. NGO and PS Committees)
- Less frequent, longer (3-day) meetings not held in conjunction with CGIAR meetings.

VI. What should our membership be?

The following composition is proposed:

- Chairperson
 - 2 donor members
 - 2 developing country members (above 5 members to be appointed by CGIAR Chairman)
 - 2 Center Directors (appointed by CDC)
 - DG of IPGRI
 - 1 TAC member (appointed by TAC)
 - 1 Board Chair (appointed by CBC)
- within this membership, we should strive for gender, regional and stakeholder diversity
 - members serve in their individual capacity
 - 3 to 4 year term with rolling replacement

Annex 2

Terms of Reference for the Executive Council Review of GRPC

Overall, this would be a forward-looking review, focused more on the future than in the past.

Terms-of-Reference

- How successful has the Committee been in achieving its mission? Assessment should clearly include centers'/members' views as well as views of the Science Council, the NGOs, the private sector, and Southern "client" countries (if policy recommendation of the Committee impacted them).
- Is there continuing need for a separate CGIAR Committee (or other mechanism) addressing genetic resource policy issues? Rationale and purpose. Willingness of centers to share the costs of a new Committee or other mechanism.
- If yes, what kind of mechanism? The Review team should develop a draft TOR for such a mechanism, including type of mechanism, objectives, working procedures, budget, and accountability.

Timetable

ExCo comments on TOR and suggestion of potential panel members	February 22
Panel appointed	ExCo 2 (April 16-17)
Review conducted	May-August
Report due	end August
Review discussed by ExCo3	early September
CGIAR approval of ExCo recommendations	early October (or at AGM)
Implementation	starting Jan 2003

Panel Composition

- Small (2-person)
- N/S balanced (1-1)
- Backstopped by the System Office
- Qualifications sought: strong biodiversity experience (at least one panelist); evaluation experience; organizational design; arms-length relationship to the CGIAR System
- Members: Carlos Correa (Chair) and Ian Bevege; Secretariat: Manuel Lantin

Advisory Group

- Bo Bengtsson, Wanda Collins, Jochen de Haas, Panjab Singh

Annex 3

Review of the CGIAR Genetic Resources Policy Committee (GRPC) Questionnaire

Please indicate role:

<input type="checkbox"/> CGIAR Member <input type="checkbox"/> ExCo Member <input type="checkbox"/> Center DG <input type="checkbox"/> Center Board Chair <input type="checkbox"/> GRPC Member <input type="checkbox"/> Member of Advisory Group to the GRPC Review	<input type="checkbox"/> iSC Member <input type="checkbox"/> NGOC Member <input type="checkbox"/> PSC Member <input type="checkbox"/> SGRP Working Group <input type="checkbox"/> NARS Leader <input type="checkbox"/> Others (Please specify)
--	---

Please type an “x” in the parentheses indicating your response to each question, where:
 1 = ineffective
 2 = somewhat effective
 3 = moderately/fairly effective
 4 = quite effective
 5 = highly effective.

Also indicate any supplementary comments relevant to the questions asked.

**Please send the completed questionnaire by e-mail to the following address:
grpc-review@cgiar.org no later than August 5, 2002.**

1. How effectively has the GRPC monitored policy developments and implementation of agreements on GR

	1	2	3	4	5
a) at the national level?	()	()	()	()	()
b) in the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources?	()	()	()	()	()
c) in the framework of CBD?	()	()	()	()	()
d) within CGIAR?	()	()	()	()	()
e) in relation to the agreements that placed CGIAR germplasm within the FAO Network of Ex-Situ Collections?	()	()	()	()	()
f) in relation to developments in intellectual property rights?	()	()	()	()	()

Comments:

2. How has the monitoring and policy analysis done by the GRPC helped to

	1	2	3	4	5
a) improve information for decision-making by the Centers?	0	0	0	0	0
b) introduce changes in policies by the Centers?	0	0	0	0	0
c) create awareness about GR policy, legal and ethical issues?	0	0	0	0	0
d) improve the relationship with stake-holders (governments, industry, etc)?	0	0	0	0	0
e) improve project planning?	0	0	0	0	0
f) improve project implementation?	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

3. To what extent the monitoring and policy analysis done by the GRPC helped the Centers, individually and as a group, to make their viewpoints known [to influence developments]

	1	2	3	4	5
a) in the framework of the CBD?	0	0	0	0	0
b) in the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources?	0	0	0	0	0
c) in other international fora?	0	0	0	0	0
d) at the national level?	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

4. To what extent the policy analysis by the GRPC influenced the CGIAR members and flowed through to their individual organization/country policy positions

	1	2	3	4	5
a) in the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources?	0	0	0	0	0
b) vis a vis implementation of relevant CBD provisions?	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

5. How has the work done by the GRPC helped the Centers to address legal issues relating to

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) the status of collections? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b) the distribution of samples? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c) compliance with national access laws? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| d) benefit sharing? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c) intellectual property protection of materials held in collections? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| d) intellectual property protection of Centers developments? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Comments:

6. How has the work done by the GRPC helped the Centers to address ethical issues relevant to GR?

	1	2	3	4	5
	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

7. Which has been the most significant contribution of the GRPC in relation to

a) Policy issues?

b) Legal issues?

c) Ethical issues?

Comments:

8. How effectively have the Centers implemented the policy recommendations issued by the GRPC?

1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

9. In the absence of the GRPC, who could have played its role within the CGIAR?
Please explain briefly.

10. Do you have an idea of other form whereby the policy dialogue might take place most effectively in future? Please describe it briefly.

11. How could the work of the GRPC be improved? Please describe it briefly.

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire

A. Ranked responses

Ratings:

- 1 ineffective
- 2 somewhat effective
- 3 moderately effective
- 4 quite effective
- 5 highly effective

Note: There are up to 6 subsidiary questions under each heading. See Annex 3 for details.

Respondent groups: Number of respondents in ()

GRPC	SGRP	CDC/ CBC DDG	Sponsor	iSC	DevCty Donor member	PSC
(6)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(2) (2)	(1)
<i>Q1. How effectively has GRPC monitored policy developments and implementation of agreements on genetic resources?</i>						
4.3	4.3	3.4	3.0	4.5	4.7	3.1 3.1 4.1
<i>Q2. How has the monitoring and policy analysis helped genetic resources management in CGIAR?</i>						
3.9	4.1	2.8	3.0	3.7	4.0	3.2 2.4 4.0
<i>Q3. To what extent has the monitoring and policy analysis by GRPC helped the Centers, individually and as a group, to make their viewpoints known in order to influence developments in international agreements and at the national level?</i>						
3.6	4.2	2.9	3.4	3.5	4.4	2.6 1.2 n/a
<i>Q4. To what extent has policy analysis by GRPC influenced CGIAR members and flowed through to their individual organization/country policy positions?</i>						
3.7	n/a	2.2	3.2	4.5	4.0	3.2 1.0 n/a
<i>Q5. How has the work of GRPC helped the Centers to address legal issues relevant to genetic resources?</i>						

4.1	4.2	3.4	2.7	4.5	4.7	3.1	1.3	n/a
GRPC	SGRP	CDC/ CDC/ DDG	CBC	Sponsor	iSC	DevCty	Donor member	PSC
(6)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(1)

Q6. How has the work of the GRPC helped the centers to address ethical issues relevant to genetic resources?

4.3	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	n/a
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q8. How effectively have the Centers implemented the policy recommendations of the GRPC?

3.8	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	n/a	n/a
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

B. Qualitative responses

Q1. How effectively has GRPC monitored policy developments and implementation of agreements on genetic resources?

- *The GRPC placed too much emphasis in its reports on watching brief issues, it should have produced more targeted reports focused on specific issues, with more analysis, less reporting.*
- *GRPC probably did not have resources to monitor policy developments more closely at the national level; this would have been very helpful to individual centers and might have prevented some problems or provided more insights. GRPC has been most effective at the global, overall level than at the more specific country level.*
- *In many aspects, the viewpoints of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture [CGRFA] have guided GRPC policy development; less attention has been given to relevant aspects of the WTO agreements and to animal genetic resources, fisheries and forestry. Most CGIAR members are also members of the FAO Commission where representatives come from their ministries of agriculture. This is also the case for CGIAR members from the South whereas CGIAR members from the North come from ministries of development cooperation. The latter have less influence on the FAO Commission. On the whole, the CGIAR members have, in my experience, refrained from taking any strategic decisions at the CGIAR annual meetings – usually referring to “other international bodies”.*
- *On balance, I think they have done a good job.*

Q2. How has the monitoring and policy analysis helped genetic resources management in CGIAR?

- *Many things the GRPC did help to avoid or diffuse problems that stemmed from Centers making individual decisions and steps that did not take into account policy issues.*
- *The Committee was in several instances crucial in solving problems related to IPR before they turned into major issues. The impact of such precautionary measures is difficult to measure. The question is not so much “what did the GRPC achieve” but “what would have happened had there not been a GRPC or similar body”.*
- *Centers did need the GRPC to help both advocate for their concern and to impose discipline on various issues and operations eg MTAs.*
- *In many case it was the SGRP and not the GRPC who was most effective in these areas. The inter-relatedness of the two sometimes confuses the picture of who did what most effectively. I can’t say that the GRPC improved project planning at all, but SGRP did and GRPC might have had a great influence on SGRP in doing so.*
- *I have no details on if/how project planning and implementation at Center level have improved as a result of GRPC recommendations. But I doubt this since “donors” fund those genetic resources projects they want to finance. Thus their views on projects are more important – if Centers are not in agreement with the funding agency, then no funds are made available.*

Q3. To what extent has the monitoring and policy analysis by GRPC helped the Centers, individually and as a group, to make their viewpoints known in order to influence developments in international agreements and at the national level?

- *The GRPC got better, as a system, over time, especially through IPGRI’s engagement of technical support through Cary Fowler to follow these issues.*
- *[Interaction with] international NGOs also is lacking. Individual Centers ought to have stressed their independent viewpoints on genetic resources. Centers have more competence on GR than the “CGIAR System”. Since the GRPC was composed of representatives of all categories, and decisions based on consensus, the GRPC has had difficulties in supporting the Centers and tried to find acceptable compromises through consensus. This has given it a much too defensive role.*
- *This question should be divided. GRPC helped the Centers as a group tremendously, but did little for individual Centers. Individual Centers were not supposed to have individual viewpoints or to express them if they varied from the Centers’ group position. GRPC did not particularly provide an avenue to have individual Center positions considered, nor would it have been easy for any Center to have a position other than the Board’s position.*

Q4. To what extent has policy analysis by GRPC influenced CGIAR members and flowed through to their individual organization/country policy positions?

- *The constraints in terms of flow to country policy positions are constraints within national systems.*

- *This is not easy to do as governments, NGOs etc are not very unified in their operations.*
- *I don't think the GRPC itself had much to do with any flow through. IPGRI and SGRP had whatever influence there was to be had. It was erratic at best but probably noteworthy.*
- *I honestly do not know. I doubt that the reports of the GRPC added "new thoughts" to those who were responsible at the national level; reports are seldom read by many people unless they are "forced to read" them - the CGIAR is seen as a small component of the global GR issues [ie GRPC reports marginal to thinking of policy makers outside of CGIAR?]*

Q5. How has the work of GRPC helped the Centers to address legal issues relevant to genetic resources?

- *GRPC helped keep the Centers' genetics resources efforts operational throughout a turbulent period. It was most effective in respect to MTAs and coherence in Center policy. IPGRI could not do this alone.*
- *GRPC had little effect in addressing legal issues other than providing guidelines as to how the status of collections could be considered and providing an overarching framework of what might not be protected. The day to day help was given by SGRP but even then legal issues were usually beyond the realm of GRPC or SGRP. In fact, the Center itself is the legal body and the GRPC can't do much about that if legalities are involved. However credit should be given to GRPC for providing the paradigm in which the issues could be addressed, even if not at a legal level.*
- *The GRPC has tried to work exclusively "within the existing political boundaries" (mainly set by the FAO Commission) rather than also searching for more innovative approaches to support the Centers and better involve the private sector. The new research tools of gene technology have been less at the forefront; too much focus has been given to the conventional gene banks within the CGIAR system.*

Q6. How has the work of the GRPC helped the centers to address ethical issues relevant to genetic resources?

- *The key ethical issue is balancing ownership – from countries, groups and private sector – with the need for sharing to underpin/strengthen food security. This tradeoff is implicit in most of what GRPC did.*
- *The Brazil workshop sponsored by GRPC on ethical issues, I believe, was a benchmark for the entire ethics question. It provided a stated set of opinions and promises by CGIAR and was respected by those who knew it.*
- *Ethical rules have been worked out and accepted by the Centers and the System for a few years now. However these ground rules may not be sufficient in the future to get fruitful cooperation with the private sector.*

Q7. Which have been the most significant GRPC contributions in relation to:

(a) Policy issues

- *I believe the GRPC contribution to be positive and substantial.*
- *Awareness of new and emerging GR issues for the CGIAR system to discuss.*
- *The GRPC was a trusted and informed source of information and advice for these three issues.*
- *GRPC has been very effective in overseeing and monitoring, for CGIAR, the International Agreements signed by FAO and the Centers regarding the ex situ collections they hold in trust under the auspices of FAO and its CGRFA. It has also provided useful advice to CGIAR and Centers on policy and legal issues that have arisen concerning these agreements.*
- *The Committee has played an important role in addressing important questions such as ITPGRFA, CBD, MTAs etc on a CGIAR system level.*
- *Introducing the concept of proprietary biology [into CGIAR]*
- *These three issues are interlinked; the most significant contributions are in helping the Centers to define their positions regarding genetic resources and the handling of genebanks, and in liaising with NGOs thus avoiding clashes – this is essential.*
- *It was effective in raising awareness among Centers about the importance of the ITPGRFA, providing advice as needed during the negotiations.*
- *Keeping the Centers and their respective Boards informed as to issues and trade-offs involved.*
- *Formulating and guiding CGIAR policy development in an unbiased and politically sensitive manner without endangering CGIAR Centers or putting them at risk in their home countries; interpreting policy changes and predicting impact on CGIAR collections and activities.*
- *Policies for managing the in-trust collections and advice on dealing with perceived violations of agreements.*
- *Helped to shelter the Centers from the storms on genetic resources policy.*

- *Dealing with NGOs, helping diffuse potentially explosive issues and frame the debate more constructively.*
- *GRPC serves as a lightning rod for dialogue with outside groups interested in genetic resource issues.*
- *GRPC served as the body that prevented problems affecting CGIAR from arising and served as a lightning rod for the Centers.*
- *GRPC has been very effective in providing information to FAO in their deliberations for the ITPGRFA.*
- *It has created awareness on the importance of germplasm collections for national and international policy issues.*

(b) Legal issues

- *GRPC has been used by the CGIAR Chairman to provide credible information on legal and ethical issues related to PGR. The GRPC has been very responsive to questions raised.*
- *Providing the framework for thinking about how genetic resources might be treated. Raising awareness of potential legal issues that might have been lost in the details and might have had serious implications for the CGIAR. Interpreting legal pitfalls.*
- *It has promoted discussion on legal aspects that relate to germplasm collections and IPR.*
- *IPR issues have been given more prominence in CGIAR discussions.*
- *[raised awareness that] new legal boundaries will restrict free flow and use of genetic commons.*
- *Primarily alerting the Centers as to the seriousness, nature and magnitude of the problems.*
- *GRPC helped get the standard MTA adopted among the Centers and to continue to distribute germplasm.*
- *Agreements governing the in-trust collections.*

(c) Ethical Issues

- *These did not get a lot of explicit attention but were implicit in most of what the GRPC did.*
- *Insight for CGIAR that ethical issues must be considered in GR work; ethical rules also accepted [by the system].*
- *Respecting intellectual innovation outside western legal frameworks.*
- *Sponsoring the Brazil workshop which led to a publication including CGIAR positions on ethical issues.*
- *GRPC held a workshop on ethics and developed ethical guidelines which were then endorsed by CGIAR; these provide useful orientation/guidelines to the Centers.*

Q8. How effectively have the Centers implemented the policy recommendations of the GRPC?

- *By and large, Centers appreciated guidance and cover provided by GRPC. In most cases, donors could not provide this in a timely manner.*
- *Once agreed as a group, the Centers individually moved almost unanimously forward with policy recommendations, to their lasting benefit, and they did it quickly.*
- *Policy decisions are ultimately the responsibility of Boards – for setting them, and management – for implementation.*
- *Most policy recommendations have not been very dramatic, since they have been formulated by consensus. In the first years, “burning issues” were not handled with the intention of formulating more precise recommendations.*
- *This highlights the problem of independent Boards versus the CGIAR System. The Boards have the legal power to act. Some have taken action, a few have given less attention. But the system wants to be seen as one system of IARCs.*
- *The degree of effective implementation varies with the center. IPGRI has been the leading Center in implementing the GRPC’s policy recommendations.*
- *It is difficult to know what other Centers have done.*

Q9. In the absence of the GRPC who could have played its role within the CGIAR?

- *There is no other body within CGIAR which can play this role.*
- *Initially, the idea of setting up a special committee was a good attempt. With the existing set-up of CGIAR committees, this approach was the most viable one.*
- *One could think of this as a task of a strong and competent CGIAR Secretariat; in the past there was one staff member who was a specialist on GR. He could have formed a working group with independent scientists and policy people to work out alternative scenarios for decision making etc. It would have been more cost effective, much more oriented towards strengthening the CGIAR, could have offered more specific recommendations and could have allowed the CGIAR to lead the debate, not to follow it.*
- *Everyone for themselves and it would have been chaos.*
- *The CGIAR Chairman would have to organize ad hoc committees when policy issues arise concerning genetic resources.*
- *Presumably this would have been left to the Center DGs and individual Board programme committees but the latter are rather poorly qualified and prepared to deal with such matters.*
- *Maybe the Centers Directors Committee*
- *Possibly TAC/Science Council or a subcommittee of it.*
- *The Science Council, the CDC or ExCO but in all instances less effectively than the GRPC.*
- *Each Center and ICW meetings but work would not be as systematic.*

- *IPGRI-SGRP could have sought input from various stakeholder groups but the process would have been inevitably more time consuming and less efficient than using a committee.*
- *SGRP would have had to play the role. IPGRI could have played it through a number of modalities (convening a high level GR Advisory (not policy) Committee) had the other Centers been able to cast aside their distrust and their feeling that they would not share the monetary benefits or that they would somehow lose control. There probably was no way that anyone could have made that happen, but when you have a trusted DG in place who knew how to make things happen, in retrospect it seems wasteful not to have tried that route. But the GRPC was a good idea and there is probably no other way to have done it within the CGIAR with people who understood the peculiarities and uniqueness of the CGIAR. FAO might have done it, but probably would have been mired in controversy very quickly.*
- *In theory TAC and IPGRI could have, but in practice they would have faced great difficulties, since they do not represent the same kind of stakeholders or have the kind of expertise that is necessary to deal with the policy issues that the GRPC handles.*
- *FAO appears to be almost the only available alternative.*

Q9bis. What alternative structures might be desirable for any future entity to carry out the function of GRPC? [note: this question has been interposed to accommodate specific comments from respondents on this issue]

- *I don't think this would work – GRPC was diverse and stakeholder based. CGIAR has real obstacles on legal/policy/IPR issues and members representing governments are constrained in what they can do.*
- *The area of genetic resources and their utilization will be even more complicated in future and the CGIAR system will need competent advice that includes all stakeholders from NGOs to the private sector. Here we have a group which speaks for the CGIAR as a whole.*
- *CGIAR needs a specialized stakeholder based committee on these issues because they are so complicated. The issues do not lend themselves to a large group and the role of stakeholders is crucial. However it is possible that in view of the ITPGRFA, the difficulties facing the centers might lessen in future.*
- *CGIAR system may need an independent standing committee with broad stakeholder representation, including civil society, the private sector and farmers organizations, with a balance between developed and developing countries, with members whose expertise is specifically tailored to the kind of policy issues to be addressed. This Committee should report directly to the new CGIAR ExCo.*
- *Free standing committee reporting to CGIAR/ExCo is best, but it could also function – perhaps in a straightjacket – as a standing committee of the Science Council, but constituted in a similar way as currently.*
- *A subcommittee under ExCo; the composition should be rather similar to the present GRPC.*

- *A future body should be small in numbers of members, diverse in representing the different stakeholders, flexible in addressing policy issues as they come up and proactive in identifying and if possible solving future problems.*
- *No donors as members. They were not seen as credible [ie by some in the centers]. The makeup of GRPC, to many, reflected business as usual in CGIAR. It could be totally independent if it continues, but might be looked at as an advisory council to the Chairman and to the Members. The name “ Policy Committee” perhaps connotes an authority that is threatening to some, ie, that whatever policy derives from the GRPC must be accepted. An Advisory Council which might be much more independent and free-ranging in its thinking, but without the expectation that it would define policy, might actually accomplish more.*

Q10bis. What should be the directions and emphases of the policy dialogue in the future? [note: this question is interposed to accommodate responses which addressed this issue].

- *There are areas where increasing dialogue is increasingly needed. These include biosafety (GMOs and alien/ invasive species), livestock aquatic and microbial genetic resources, traditional knowledge and information sharing. In all cases they are of multi-Center concern and relevant to Center specific and multi Center work; therefore system level mechanisms such as SGRP, CAS, INRM TF etc are best placed to handle practical policy (system) development, implementation and monitoring as well as policy guidance to NARS. Specific research into policy issues can be undertaken in the agendas of Centers and CPs. But there is a need for CGIAR system level coordination and stakeholder advice/input to assure that the practical work is harmonized (within and outside the system) and respective roles and responsibilities for it, are clear. This is the role of the GRPC.*
- *The policy dialogue will need to address a number of interrelated problems, of importance both to the work of the centers and generally, including*
 - *potential conflicts of interests between private and public sectors, given the current tendency for an increasing concentration of power, including through IPR, in private hands*
 - *the need to develop national sui generis systems that cover both plant breeders rights and farmers rights in harmony with the ITPGRFA, CBD and Article 27.3(b) of the WTO/TRIPS Agreement*
 - *technical assistance for the implementation of the provisions of the ITPGRFA especially in the areas of access, benefit sharing and farmers rights*
 - *ethical, legal and policy implications of GMO gene flow and its potential implications for health, the environment and germplasm integrity of landraces and areas of organic farming*
 - *genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs)(so called terminator technology) and their implications for the future structure of agriculture, and for small farmers in developing countries*

- *the increasing number of conflicts arising within IPR systems derived from the application of over-broad patents, such as those over a species characteristic (ie yellow beans) or those that appear to give rights over names of local origin with existing market value (ie Basmati rice)*
- *the implications of IPRs on research and development including on public research and transfer of technology, especially in developing countries and for poor farmers.*

Q11. How could the work of GRPC be improved?

- *Reporting to CGIAR wants some strengthening – it needs to be detailed enough and to contain all relevant messages, it is to precise and clear enough to be digestible even to the less informed stakeholders, it ought to be available well in advance of an AGM or other important meetings, since it often has to be circulated among other Government institutions/organizations with responsibility and a keen interest in the subject matter well in advance and especially for decision making. This will become more and more important.*
- *Decisions should still be taken by the CGIAR but all stakeholders may have ample time to react to recommendations before a final decision is taken. This raises the issue again whether the CGIAR as a system can make a decision, in contrast to the Boards of the Centers. This issue will become more critical on future matters such as IPR, gene libraries etc.*
- *GRPC should have more precise TOR in order to strengthen the future work of the CGIAR within the political context.*
- *The present GRPC has functioned very well and with a balanced composition. Implementation of recommendations is always up to centers and CGIAR donor/member countries. GRPC has few legal/political means to force customers/stakeholders to observe and implement recommended actions. The GRPC has always to balance North/South highly political issues on IPR. In fact in the future it may most probably be the ExCo/committee of the whole/plenary [AGM] that has the muscles to enforce recommendations by the GRPC.*
- *Improve its interaction with the new CGIAR Science Council; the latter needs to restore its expertise on genetics resources policy.*
- *Greater ability(ie funding) for analytical work, especially in relation to international fora additional to CBD and FAO/CGRFA/GBofITPGRFA, and national programmes.*
- *The discussions on GR based on recommendations of GRPC have too seldom led to a proactive stance by CGIAR. The recommendations have been “too soft” to lead to changes and allow the CGIAR Centers to lead the debate, rather than wait for the collective views expressed through the FAO Commission. Recommendations should be more proactive, forward looking and supportive of the [public?] good things CGIAR does regarding GR.*
- *Proactive participation and communication to international and national policy fora.*
- *Monitor and be proactive regarding the ITPGRFA, developments in TRIPS, CBD-Bonn guidelines on agricultural biosafety etc.*

- *A particular area of activities for a future body will be assistance to the planned Global Conservation trust and other follow up to the Global Plan of Action (Leipzig Conference).*
- *More dialogue and communication.*
- *More consultation with member countries and FAO CGRFA is necessary in future.*
- *More in accord with national policies on germplasm resources so as to facilitate policy implementation.*
- *Solicit and bring on board views and concerns of the developing countries, including through existing mechanisms, and forums for genetic resources for food and agriculture.*
- *Be more proactive in alerting groups such as SGRP to areas/issues in need of attention, and guiding SGRP in their work.*
- *The GRPC as it is constituted now, could be of more value in helping to quickly articulate, support or change responses of individual centers in certain situations. An interpretation of the center's response or position could add weight to the center's action, especially if unpopular. Several such situations have occurred over the past 5-7 years including with ICARDA, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRISAT and CIP.*
- *Focus on ethical issues including questions regarding health, the environment, sustainability and IPR, and a consequently increasing need for ethical expertise in these areas.*
- *Promote solutions to a variety of problems that begin from and articulate the special nature of agricultural biodiversity, its distinctive features and problems needing distinctive solutions.*

Q10. Do you have an idea of other forms whereby the policy dialogue might take place most effectively in future?

- *From the experience of the Brazil Ethics Workshop, this could possibly be a route given that it would be regular and sustainable (somewhat like the Keystone Dialogue, but with some fundamental givens that reflect the uniqueness of CGIAR and knowledge of the CGIAR system). It would need to be structured so that it would not turn out like the Crucible Group which really did very little over the long term to make the dialogue effective.*
- *The ITPGRFA which specifically recognizes the importance of the CGIAR Collections, through its Governing Body, will provide the main forum for policy dialogue on the transfer of, and access to plant genetic materials.*
- *Perhaps more specialized meetings or sessions for CGIAR stakeholders would be worthwhile.*
- *More reflection is needed on this question.*

Q10bis. What should be the directions and emphases of the policy dialogue in the future? [note: this question is interposed to accommodate responses which addressed this issue].

- *There are areas where increasing dialogue is increasingly needed. These include biosafety (GMOs and alien/ invasive species), livestock aquatic and microbial genetic resources, traditional knowledge and information sharing. In all cases they are of multi-Center concern and relevant to Center specific and multi Center work; therefore system level mechanisms such as SGRP, CAS, INRM TF etc are best placed to handle practical policy (system) development, implementation and monitoring as well as policy guidance to NARS. Specific research into policy issues can be undertaken in the agendas of Centers and CPs. But there is a need for CGIAR system level coordination and stakeholder advice/input to assure that the practical work is harmonized (within and outside the system) and respective roles and responsibilities for it, are clear. This is the role of the GRPC.*
- *The policy dialogue will need to address a number of interrelated problems, of importance both to the work of the centers and generally, including*
 - *potential conflicts of interests between private and public sectors, given the current tendency for an increasing concentration of power, including through IPR, in private hands*
 - *the need to develop national sui generis systems that cover both plant breeders rights and farmers rights in harmony with the ITPGRFA, CBD and Article 27.3(b) of the WTO/TRIPS Agreement*
 - *technical assistance for the implementation of the provisions of the ITPGRFA especially in the areas of access, benefit sharing and farmers rights*
 - *ethical, legal and policy implications of GMO geneflow and its potential implications for health, the environment and germplasm integrity of landraces and areas of organic farming*
 - *genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs)(so called terminator technology) and their implications for the future structure of agriculture, and for small farmers in developing countries*
 - *the increasing number of conflicts arising within IPR systems derived from the application of over-broad patents, such as those over a species characteristic (ie yellow beans) or those that appear to give rights over names of local origin with existing market value (ie Basmati rice)*
 - *the implications of IPRs on research and development including on public research and transfer of technology, especially in developing countries and for poor farmers.*

Q11. How could the work of GRPC be improved?

- *Reporting to CGIAR wants some strengthening – it needs to be detailed enough and to contain all relevant messages, it is to precise and clear enough to be digestible even to the less informed stakeholders, it ought to be available well in advance of an AGM or other important meetings, since it often has to be circulated among other Government institutions/organizations with responsibility and a keen interest in the subject matter well in advance and especially for decision making. This will become more and more important.*

- *Decisions should still be taken by the CGIAR but all stakeholders may have ample time to react to recommendations before a final decision is taken. This raises the issue again whether the CGIAR as a system can make a decision, in contrast to the Boards of the Centers. This issue will become more critical on future matters such as IPR, gene libraries etc.*
- *GRPC should have more precise TOR in order to strengthen the future work of the CGIAR within the political context.*
- *The present GRPC has functioned very well and with a balanced composition. Implementation of recommendations is always up to centers and CGIAR donor/member countries. GRPC has few legal/political means to force customers/stakeholders to observe and implement recommended actions. The GRPC has always to balance North/South highly political issues on IPR. In fact in the future it may most probably be the ExCo/committee of the whole/plenary [AGM] that has the muscles to enforce recommendations by the GRPC.*
- *Improve its interaction with the new CGIAR Science Council; the latter needs to restore its expertise on genetics resources policy.*
- *Greater ability(ie funding) for analytical work, especially in relation to international fora additional to CBD and FAO/CGRFA/GBofITPGRFA, and national programmes.*
- *The discussions on GR based on recommendations of GRPC have too seldom led to a proactive stance by CGIAR. The recommendations have been “too soft” to lead to changes and allow the CGIAR Centers to lead the debate, rather than wait for the collective views expressed through the FAO Commission. Recommendations should be more proactive, forward looking and supportive of the [public?] good things CGIAR does regarding GR.*
- *Proactive participation and communication to international and national policy fora.*
- *Monitor and be proactive regarding the ITPGRFA, developments in TRIPS, CBD-Bonn guidelines on agricultural biosafety etc.*
- *A particular area of activities for a future body will be assistance to the planned Global Conservation trust and other follow up to the Global Plan of Action (Leipzig Conference).*
- *More dialogue and communication.*
- *More consultation with member countries and FAO CGRFA is necessary in future.*
- *More in accord with national policies on germplasm resources so as to facilitate policy implementation.*
- *Solicit and bring on board views and concerns of the developing countries, including through existing mechanisms, and forums for genetic resources for food and agriculture.*
- *Be more proactive in alerting groups such as SGRP to areas/issues in need of attention, and guiding SGRP in their work.*
- *The GRPC as it is constituted now, could be of more value in helping to quickly articulate, support or change responses of individual centers in certain situations. An interpretation of the center’s response or position could add weight to the center’s action, especially if unpopular. Several such situations have occurred*

over the past 5-7 years including with ICARDA, CIAT, CIMMYT, ICRISAT and CIP.

- *Focus on ethical issues including questions regarding health, the environment, sustainability and IPR, and a consequently increasing need for ethical expertise in these areas.*
- *Promote solutions to a variety of problems that begin from and articulate the special nature of agricultural biodiversity, its distinctive features and problems needing distinctive solutions.*

Glossary of Acronyms

CBC	Committee of Board Chairs
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDC	Centre Directors Committee
CGRFA	Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
EPMR	External Program and Management Review
ExCo	Executive Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GRPC	Genetic Resources Policy Committee
GURT	Genetic Use Restriction Technology
IPGRI	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
MTA	Material Transfer Agreement
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
SGRP	Systemwide Genetic Resources Program
TRIPS	Trade-Related Intellectual Property System
UPOV	International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization