

UPDATING THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION: REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION IN THE EUROPEAN REGION

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (Commission), at its Twelfth Regular Session considered updating of the *Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (GPA). It agreed to update the GPA in accordance with the Strategic Plan 2010-2017 for the implementation of the Multi-Year Programme of Work. The Commission requested FAO to prepare the updated GPA based primarily on the *Second Report on the State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (SOW-2), and in particular, on the identified gaps and needs, taking into account further contributions from Governments, as well as inputs received from regional meetings and consultations. It further decided that the updated GPA would be considered at its Thirteenth Regular Session.
2. A regional consultation for Europe was convened in Tirana, Albania, 19 to 20 May, 2010 to consider updating of the GPA. The consultation was organized by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); in collaboration with Bioversity International; SEEDNet; and the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Agricultural University of Tirana. The *Agenda* is provided in *Appendix A*. The list of participants is provided in *Appendix B*.
3. The consultation began with welcoming remarks from Mr Stefano Diulgheroff, FAO; Mr Ardian Maci, Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, University of Tirana; Mr Dan Leskien, FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; Mr. Mario Marino, International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; Mr Lorenzo Maggioni, Bioversity International; and Ms Eva Thorn, SEEDNet.

II. INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS

4. Ms Barbara Pick, FAO, noted the need to gather inputs and recommendations from all regions in order to update the GPA. She indicated that the objective for the European consultation was to receive inputs and recommendations from representatives of the region on both the content and structure as inputs to updating the GPA. It was noted that while common positions would be helpful in providing advice to FAO, there was no need to achieve consensus among all representatives, and various options would be recorded.
5. Mr Stefano Diulgheroff, first reviewed the process and timeline for preparing the updated GPA. He then provided an overview of the significant changes and challenges in PGRFA conservation and use, as well as gaps and needs identified in the SOW-2 that would be considered in updating the GPA based upon advice received during the regional consultations.
6. Ms Thorn provided a summary overview of gaps and needs for updating of the GPA from the European region perspective. The overview was prepared based on country reports from European countries as part of the process for preparing the SOW-2.

7. During the consultation, participants considered the document, "Updating the *Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*", which *verbatim*, included the current *Global Plan of Action* as well as sections of the SOW-2 that identified changes since the *First Report on the State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* and gaps and needs. A document containing all sections of the existing GPA except the Priorities Activity areas was also available to assist participants, in particular, to review and comment on the Introduction, Rationale, Aims and Strategies, Structure and Organizations, and Implementation and Financing sections of the current GPA.
8. Participants reviewed and commented on all sections of the current GPA, and the results of discussions were recorded by an assigned *Rapporteur*.

III. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A. Review of the Leipzig Declaration and Introduction

9. The Leipzig Declaration was briefly considered by the consultation, as the primary responsibility for replacement of the Declaration rests with the Commission.
10. The consultation suggested that the Bureaus of the Commission and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (International Treaty) consider the best approach to replacing the Leipzig Declaration, including consideration of a joint draft resolution between the Commission and the Governing Body of the International Treaty.
11. The consultation reviewed the Introduction section of the current GPA (paragraphs 1-6), and provided a number of suggestions for consideration by FAO in updating the GPA, building on the current text. The consultation suggested that in updating the introduction the following be considered in preparing this section:
 - The importance of conveying a sense of the urgency and growing need to achieve global food security and the role of plant genetic resources in attaining this global goal;
 - The need to indicate that rapid changes in production conditions are occurring and the need for farmers to have options for mitigation and adaptation, particularly in light of climate change;
 - The need to highlight the coming into force of the International Treaty since the first GPA, and to indicate the areas for contribution of the GPA in the implementation of the International Treaty as a supporting component;
 - The need to note that the GPA has, and will continue to make a significant contribution to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its programme of work on Agriculture Biological Diversity. Updating should take note of relevant decisions under the CBD; and
 - The need to indicate the many advancements in science and technology that are increasing the potential to use and conserve plant genetic resources.

12. The consultation indicated the importance of the introduction indicating the changes since the first SOW-2, and the identified gaps and needs. The continuing erosion of plant genetic resources in many regions was suggested to be highlighted, as well as action taken and progress made in the implementation of the GPA - both gaps and needs and progress made. It was stressed that the message of urgency needed to be emphasized, and that the GPA was even more important today and would be in future, than in the past.
13. While in general participants agreed on the need to indicate the essential role of plant genetic resource in providing farmers with options (adaptation and mitigation) in light of climatic changes, some participants noted the need for balance in highlighting climate change, so as not to result in loss of attention to as important other conditions and factors, such as the need to increase production and the need for healthy food. Some participants suggested that the linkages among food security, climate change and biodiversity could provide a useful framework.
14. The consultation suggested a section on the need for and role of the GPA, and the need for its updating, be included in the introductory section. The consultation suggested keeping the current text that describes the process for preparing the GPA, and additional text be added to describe the updating process.
15. Overall, the consultation stressed that the introductory section of the current GPA needed significant improvement, to convey a sense of urgency for action, to make a strong case for having and implementing a GPA, and the important roles of PGR in food and agriculture. It was noted that needs and opportunities and progress made in implementation should be highlighted.
16. Closing discussions led to suggestions that perhaps additional GPA communication products would be useful. An updated detailed GPA would act as it has in past, as an operational planning tool. A shorter version, aimed at high level decision-makers should also be considered aimed at more of a communication product than a planning guide, with key messages to motivate and gain understanding of the essential roles of plant genetic resources and the role of the GPA among senior decision-makers and non-experts, which would assist national, regional and global efforts to conserve and utilize PGR, including mobilization of financial resources.

B. Review of the Rationale section of the *Global Plan of Action*

17. The consultation reviewed the Rationale section of the current GPA (paragraphs 7(a) – 7(g)) and provided the following suggestions for consideration in updating it.
18. Some participants suggested the need to start with a higher-order rationale statement before the detailed rationale statements contained in paragraphs 7a-7g. Some of the elements of a higher-order rationale statement might include:
 - Plants are the starting point for nearly all food production, capturing of organic matter;
 - Food insecurity and poverty are increasing and PGR can make a greater contribution to their alleviation;
 - The overall rationale for the GPA is to produce more and higher quality food;

- The urgency to address the loss of PGR has increased as erosion continues reducing options for the agricultural sector; and
 - Science and technologies are resulting in innovations that could potentially improve effects to conserve, use and develop PGR, and these potential applications need further attention and consideration.
19. There was general agreement that most of the existing rationale text should remain but that FAO needed to review it carefully to ensure all text remains current. The consultation provided the following suggestions to modify current text:
- 7(e) (*PGR for food and agriculture are under-conserved and under-utilized*) should be rewritten to improve clarity and context. Highlight the potential of PGR and rewrite it in a positive manner rather than current negative construct.
 - The last sentence of 7(g) should be rewritten to be stronger (current text: *An agreed GPA could help to focus resources on the priorities, which have been identified at various levels, and increase the overall effectiveness of global efforts.*) (Changed text: *An agreed GPA would ~~could help to~~ focus resources on the priorities, which have been identified at various levels, and increase the overall effectiveness of national, regional and global efforts.*)
 - In 7(b) reference to especially to “food crops”, should be changed to, especially to “*food and feed crops*”. In general when reference is made to food crops it should be **food and feed crops**.
20. The consultation suggested that an additional rationale statement be included to indicate that in part, updating of the GPA is necessary as the GPA is an important supporting component of the International Treaty, and this now needs to be reflected.

C. Review of the Aims and Strategies of the *Global Plan of Action*

21. The consultation reviewed the following main Aims of the GPA (paragraph 9):
- (i) to ensure the conservation of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) as a basis for food security;
 - (ii) to promote sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, in order to foster development and to reduce hunger and poverty particularly in developing countries;
 - (iii) to promote a fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, recognizing the desirability of sharing equitably benefits arising from the use of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices relevant to the conservation of PGRFA and their sustainable use.
 - Confirming the needs and individual rights of farmers and, collectively, where recognized by national law, to have non-discriminatory access to germplasm, information, technologies, financial resources and research and marketing systems necessary for them to continue to manage and improve genetic resources.
 - Developing and/or strengthening policies and legislative measures, as appropriate, to promote fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of PGRFA in their exchange between communities and within the international community.
 - (iv) to assist countries and institutions responsible for conserving and using PGRFA to identify priorities for action.

- (v) to strengthen, in particular, national programmes, as well as regional and international programmes, including education and training, for the conservation and utilization of PGRFA and to enhance institutional capacity.

22. The consultation suggested:

- With respect to the first aim, participants noted that it should be broadened beyond as “a basis for food security”. One proposal was for the aim to end with: “*as a basis for food security, sustainable agriculture and poverty reduction*”. Some participants felt this was not yet a fully comprehensive list and provided a more generic suggestion rather than a list, with the aim ending with: “*as a basis for current and future use*”.
- With respect to the second aim, participants in general suggested that it be retained as currently worded: (to promote sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, in order to foster development and achieve food security to reduce hunger and poverty, particularly in developing countries). It was also suggested that the following could be added to the end of this aim (“*as well to provide options for adaptation to and mitigation of climate change*”).
- With respect to the third aim, participants suggested it be deleted as currently worded and be replaced by the appropriate text of the International Treaty that address access and benefit sharing in relation to plant genetic resources.
- With respect to the fourth aim, participants suggested it be retained as is.
- With respect to the fifth aim, participants suggested it be retained with one addition, research be added to the middle line referring to education and training, to read “*research, education and training*”. Participants requested FAO to consider adding research when education and training is mentioned in other sections in updating the GPA.
- It was observed by some participants that the fourth and fifth aims appear to be lower order aims. Others saw that the difference was that the first three aims had a more global focus, while the latter two were more focussed at the nation level.

23. The consultation reviewed the strategies of the GPA (paragraph 10) and suggested two options:

- One option would be to delete all of paragraph 10a-10f, as many participants did not see the need for this section, especially with an enhanced introduction section already suggested during the consultation.
- Option two would be to retain the text with the following changes:
 - Rewrite current para. 10 as it is currently not clear as to the role of the strategies.
 - Include in the strategies the need to enhance linkages between science and technology innovation and application to the conservation and use of PGR (possibly adding this notion to 10c); also this could be considered in the aim section.
 - Emphasizing that *ex situ* storage has occurred over several decades to 10a, i.e. it is not new.

- Adding the need for “*standard operating procedures for regeneration of accessions*” (possibly to the end of 10a).
- Adding the need to enhance mobilization of global human and financial resources, building on 10c, to achieve a truly global system for PGR.
- Enhancing reference to farmers and farmer involvement within the current strategies as well as plant breeders. In general use inclusive terminology as much as much as possible.
- Updating statistics throughout the GPA, e.g. one million accessions need of updating in 10a.
- Rewriting 10 d, not clear as currently worded, and in doing so, highlight the need for plant breeding in the strategy section.

D. Review of the Structure and Organization of the *Global Plan of Action*

24. The consultation reviewed the Structure and Organization of the GPA and provided the following suggestions for consideration in updating.
25. As indicated in paragraph 20 of the current GPA, the GPA has 20 priority activity areas (PAAs) organized around into four main groups. The consultation suggested retaining the four main groups: ***In Situ Conservation and Development***; ***Ex Situ Conservation***; ***Utilization of PGR***; and ***Institutions and Capacity Building***, but made suggestions to change some of the titles as indicated below in Section E. Some participants suggested a fifth group be added, called, Research and Technology Innovation and Opportunities, with a view to enhance the importance of advancing the application of the results of research and technology to improve the utilization and conservation of PGR. Some suggested elements under this new group would include:
- A science agenda for PGR;
 - Advanced Education – PHD and M.Sc. Training;
 - Attracting scientists to PGR research.

26. Other participants, while agreeing with the need to add the importance of advancing the application of the results of research and technology, suggested this could be achieved by adding a PAA under the current heading of Institutions and Capacity. A third option discussed was to add the notion of enhancing the results of research and technology innovation within a number of existing PAAs.

E. Review of the Priority Activity Areas of the *Global Plan of Action*

27. The consultation undertook a review of the 20 Priority Activity Areas and provided suggestions to be considered in updating the GPA, as indicated below:

In Situ Conservation and Development

28. The consultation proposed retaining the title of this group of Priority Activity Areas as it is, or to consider changing it to “*In Situ Conservation and Management*”.

PAA 1. Surveying and inventorying plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

29. The title of PAA 1 to remain as is. To the **Assessment** section, the consultation proposed adding accomplishments and events since first SOW, e.g. advancement of networks, major new initiatives, etc. and the need for partnership with the environmental sector.
30. No agreement to merge **Objectives**. It was noted that under the **Objectives**, the importance of *in situ* conservation be stressed and issues such as biodiversity hotspots and identification of genetic reserves should be addressed. It was suggested that the importance of maintaining traditional knowledge be included in the current objective 15. Specific wording changes were proposed, as well as additions and deletions movement of text to other sections were provided: **Long-term objectives 15:** To identify, locate, inventory, and as feasible assess any threats to those species, ecotypes, cultivars and populations of plants relevant to food and agriculture, especially those that are of anticipated use. Change the last part into “any threats to *any useful genetic diversity in situ and maintained on-farm*” (to avoid a list). **Intermediate objectives 17:** To develop useful methodologies for surveying and inventorying plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. To develop “*and apply*” useful methodologies
31. In the review of the changes, gaps and needs, the consultation emphasized the potential resulting from advancements in molecular genetics techniques. The notion of standard definitions and means of assessing genetic vulnerability and erosion was stressed as important, as was the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Programme.
32. **A new PAA:** The issue of the previously cultivated fields that have been abandoned and rich species and genotypes disappearing was discussed as important to conduct conservation activities. This is not on-farm, nor *in situ* because not in protected areas, so it is falling between these areas. Some participants thought a new PAA could be added under *in situ* conservation, or under an existing PAA to address previously cultivated fields. This was not seen as necessary by some participants.

PAA 2. Supporting on-farm management and improvement of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

33. Some participants suggested to modify the title to keep only “on-farm management” in the title and move “improvement of PGRFA” under the group Utilization of PGRFA. No agreement on this suggestion resulted. The following title was also proposed without full agreement among participants: “*Supporting on-farm management and on-farm improvement of PGRFA*”.
34. Specific wording change options were proposed to the objectives. Suggestions for movement of text to other sections were provided: **Long-term objectives 32:** To better understand and improve the effectiveness of existing on-farm conservation, management, improvement, and use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. To achieve a better balance between *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation. To realize Farmers’ Rights as defined in FAO Resolution 5/89 at the international, regional, and national levels. To promote the equitable sharing of benefits from plant genetic resources for food and agriculture as called for in the Convention on Biological Diversity. To foster the future emergence of public or private seed companies and cooperative

enterprises as an outgrowth of successful on-farm selection and breeding. To encourage traditional seed exchange and supply systems.

35. Some participant indicated that the first sentence of the objective (To better understand and improve the effectiveness of existing on-farm conservation, management, improvement, and use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture”) could be the objective and most of the remaining text moved to Intermediate objective. It was agreed that it is no longer necessary to mention Farmers’ Rights (FAO Resolution 5/89 outdated). To improve the objective, it was suggested to remove administrative measures from the objectives and focus on what are really the objectives, and add the context of the International Treaty and importance of local markets.
36. In **Policy/Strategy** section, some participants thought adding the notion of “primary and secondary centres of diversity, hotspots and specific climatic areas”, would be helpful, as would the importance of local markets. In the review of the changes, gaps and needs, the consultation provided some specific suggestions to change text. Legislation in accordance with national rules, ecosystem services and utilization of PGR, not only improvement, were emphasized. Suggestions were provided to move plant breeding to utilization. It was suggested that the entire section on **Coordination and Administration** could be deleted.

PAA 3. Assisting farmers in disaster situations to restore agricultural systems

37. Most participants accepted the title as it is. Others suggested to replace *agriculture systems* with “*restore crop diversity*” or “*restore PGRFA*”. Participants suggested this PAA be moved to Institutions and Capacity Building or under Utilization of PGRFA.
38. Some specific wording changes were proposed to the objectives: **Intermediate objectives 52:** To establish capacity to deliver seed of adapted local varieties as needed to help re-establish indigenous agricultural systems in areas affected by natural disasters, war, and civil strife. Some participant suggested to delete: “*indigenous* agricultural systems.” Intermediate objectives 53: To establish institutional responsibilities and mechanisms for the identification, acquisition, multiplication, and re-introduction of appropriate genetic materials. To be added under Objective 53: some text on the implementation – systems and mechanisms that would allow this assistance - suggestion that a focal point be nominated to coordinate this task.

PAA 4. Promoting *in situ* conservation of wild crop relatives and wild plants for food production

39. Some participants suggested that the title remains as it is. Other indicated the need to revise it to reflect the problem of *in situ* conservation of wild species. As well, instead of promoting - strengthening or supporting was suggested. Also, it was suggested to change wild crop relative to crop wild relative. There was a suggestion to move PAA 4 after current PAA 1, and it was suggested not to focus only on protected areas.
40. In the **Assessment** section, the consultation proposed adding accomplishments and events since the first SOW. Some additional background text on wild plants for food production was suggested as the section in focused on crop wild relatives. Reference to the Global Plant Conservation Strategy was suggested. Less focus on protected areas would a consideration and

add increasing threats of climate change should be considered. The issue of abandoned cultivated fields was raised in terms of where this should be addressed in the GPA.

41. Some specific wording changes were proposed to the objectives. Some participants supported adding the notions of hotspots; genetic reserves of WCR and wild plants for food; the increased threats due to climate change and linked with wild species. **Long-term objectives 66.:** To promote conservation of genetic resources of wild crop relatives and wild plants for food production in protected areas and on other lands not explicitly listed as protected areas. Some participants supported the following change: “To promote conservation *and sustainable use* of genetic resources of wild crop relatives. **Intermediate objective 68:** To create a better understanding of the contributions of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture to local economies, food security, and environmental health. To improve management and planning and promote complementarity between conservation and sustainable use in parks and protected areas by inter alia broadening the participation of local communities in these processes. Some participants supported deleting the first sentence in paragraph 68. **Intermediate objective 69:** To establish better communication and coordination between various institutes and organizations engaged in *in situ* conservation and land use management, nationally and regionally. To conserve genetic diversity for these species to complement other conservation approaches. Some participants supported the following change: “*To establish better communication and coordination between various institutes and organizations engaged in in situ conservation and land use management, provincially, nationally and regionally.*” Some participants supported changing paragraph 69 to be more proactive and specific to mention more partnerships, and include a link with *ex situ*.

42. Specific suggestions were provided on text in the **policy/strategy** section 70: Add: text on wild plants for food production: most of the bullets are related to CWR. Change: “wild crop relatives” to “crop wild relatives”.

70 (d) support the creation of advisory panels at the appropriate levels, that where appropriate, involve farmers, indigenous communities, plant genetic resources scientists, local government officials, and community leaders, to guide management of protected areas, according to national rules and regulations. Change - wording to be changed: support the creation of advisory panels at the appropriate levels, that where appropriate, involve farmers, indigenous “*and local communities, breeders,*” plant genetic resources scientists.

70 (e) recognize the rights of indigenous communities to PGRFA in protected areas. Change: recognize the rights of indigenous communities to PGRFA in protected areas “*according to national legislation*” or to delete the whole bullet.

71. Governments with the cooperation of the relevant UN bodies and regional, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the farming, indigenous and local communities living in non-protected areas, should seek, where possible and appropriate, to: Add to paragraph 71: Global Strategy on Plant Conservation/CBD.

(a) Establish conservation of wild crop-relatives and wild plants for food production as an integral component of land-use planning;

(b) Encourage local communities to conserve and manage wild crop relatives and wild plants for food production, and provide for their participation in decisions relating to such local conservation and management. Change for 71 (b): Encourage “*indigenous*” and local communities.

***Ex situ* Conservation**

PAA 5. Sustaining existing *ex situ* collections

43. Various options for merging the title as indicated at the end of this section below.
44. In terms of merging of the objectives, agreement was not reached among participants. some suggested the “Long-term objective” should indicate a point to be reached at the horizon and “Intermediate objectives” should refer to the necessary steps to reach that point. Others suggested to eliminate the distinction between “long-term” and “intermediate” and just have: “Objectives.” Suggestions were also made to improve the **objectives** as follows: **Long-term Objective 79** To delete the word “high”; add “*regional*” to Develop and strengthen cooperation; Add the concept of importance to safety-duplicate the material, both as long-term and as intermediary objective; Add an element of national sustainability; Add the importance of “sharing responsibilities.” Participants indicated that the core objective (of 5+6 together) is to *develop an efficient goal-oriented, economically efficient sustainable system of ex situ conservation*, the rest of the objective could be deleted. With respect to the **Intermediate objectives**, the consultation suggested to: Describe the intermediary steps to reach the core objective (5+6 together); include the need to ensure quality of conservation.
45. Suggestions were also provided to improve the **Policy/strategy** section: include “national” and “regional” levels regarding the need for greater rationalization; include reference to minor crops, neglected crops; specify that documentation is “of the accessions” of the collections; and include additional strategy elements - defining quality standards and ensuring quality conservation via a Quality System.

PAA 6. Regenerating threatened *ex situ* accessions

46. In regard to the title, the need for the word “threatened” was questioned.
47. The following specific wording changes were proposed for the objectives: **Long-term objectives 96**: “Establish the infrastructure” is not an objective, but an operational element; the word “periodic” is not necessary. The objective is not long-term, rather intermediate. **Intermediate objective 97**: The last sentence is the core part of the objective (to be used for the merged objectives of PAAs 5 and 6) and “world-wide regeneration of accessions” needs clarification. Some participant indicated that it would be useful to add a recommendation to facilitate (in legal terms) the process of regeneration of drug plants (poppy, hemp, etc.).

PAA 7. Supporting planned and targeted collecting of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

48. The need for having both *planned and targeted* in the title was questioned - seems redundant to some participants. Missions could be added: *collecting missions*. One suggestion for a new title: “*Expanding ex situ collections through targeted collecting*”.
49. Specific wording changes were proposed to the objectives: **Long-term objectives** 118. “To collect those species...” is not an objective, the objective should be “to secure conservation of what is threatened” “anticipated” use. Replace with “potential” use. If PAA 7 and PAA 8 are merged, long-term objective would be: “*Ensure complete coverage of genetic diversity through collecting the diversity that is missing in ex situ collections*”. Also include the concepts that “*redundancies should be minimized*” and that “*collecting should not exclude difficult material that requires special methodologies of conservation*” and that “*the alternative option of in situ conservation should be kept in mind where it is more appropriate*”. **Intermediate objectives** 119: “To begin” can be removed. Include “*gap analysis, monitoring and collecting missing accessions*” (objective of combined PAA 7 and PAA 8).
50. In the **policy/strategy**, there was a reminder not to ignore wild plants for food, but need to keep within scope of GPA. It was suggested to add the need for information on geographic distribution and genetic composition of material in genebanks and in the field, in order to inform the gap analysis.

PAA 8. Expanding ex situ conservation activities

51. With respect to the title, some participants proposed replacing “Expanding” with “*Improvement of*”.
52. Specific wording changes were proposed to the objectives. **Long-term objectives** 132: The imbalance in *ex situ* collection should be indicated, since some species are completely under-represented (link with PAA 7). **Intermediate objectives** 133: Very general text that does not explain well the specificity of this PAA. It is not appropriate to list here the type of plants such as vegetatively propagated or recalcitrant seed plants, etc., but to mention in general all the plants that are under-represented in *ex situ* collections. Needs to be reformulated to make it clear what is this activity about. Botanic gardens should not be singled out or add other institutions.
53. In the **Assessment** section, the consultation provided some specific suggestions to change text. **Assessment**: “export crops” is not a category of genetic resources. They are “import crops” from the European perspective. In the **Policy/strategy**: include reference to the baseline strategies of the GCDT and the need for “Sharing responsibilities”. **Capacity**: inappropriate to single out “*in vitro*”, need to add “cryo” and “other technologies.” **Research/technology**: the entire grey box is about *in situ* conservation. Move to “*in situ*” section, except line 1507-1509: (studies of dynamic balance between *in situ* and *ex situ* are important and should be reflected somewhere). **Coordination/administration**: 1531-1533: Move to “Use” section.

Merging of PAAs in the Section:

54. The consultation considered options for merging PAAs within this group and suggested the following options:
- Merge PAAs 5 and 8;
 - Merge PAAs 5, 6 and 8;
 - Merge PAAs 5 and 6; 7 and 8 (most participants favoured this option)
 - Merge PAAs 5 and 6 and reformulate 8
55. The following titles were proposed for merged PAAs 5 and 6, and for merged PAAs 7 and 8:
- Ensuring proper management of *ex situ* collections and sustaining related conservation activities
 - Improving coverage of the genetic diversity that is not represented in *ex situ* collections
56. The need to be consistent in specifying or not using the abbreviation PGRFA in titles was noted. As well it was noted that in PAA 5 sustaining “collections” is used while in PAA 8 expanding “activities” is used. Both “collections” and “activities” may need to be both “sustained” and “expanded”.

Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources

PAA 9. Expanding the Characterization, Evaluation and Number of Core Collections to Facilitate Use

57. With respect to the title, the consultation suggested the following changes: “Core Collections” should not be specified in the title. Possible new titles: *Characterisation, evaluation and phenotyping of collections to facilitate use*; or *Expanding, characterization, evaluation and improving access to information and results to facilitate use*.
58. With respect to the **objectives** the consultation suggested to delete the objective referring to core collections under the Long-term objectives in para. 149. All other reference to core collections should be deleted. Objective 149 would be more relevant in the *ex situ* part. Change: Users and user’s priorities should be better reflected in the objectives. Climate change and food security needs to be addressed in the objectives. Rewrite Objective 151, (the word “valuable” appears three times). Add an objective which relates to information, documentation and access of PGR; and an objective reflecting on research and new technologies related to trait mining, genomics etc. **Intermediate objectives** 152: Delete: “To establish international core collections.....” (152) or delete entire objective 152. Change: Climate change should be better addressed in the objectives and add a reference to the International Treaty. In addition the importance of information and documentation should be stressed. Include the word “*regional*” in addition to national and international, where appropriate. In Objective 151: include “*identifying*” and also “*phenotypic characteristics*”. Consider merging of the long-term and intermediate and have shorter more crisp objectives.

59. In the review of the **changes, gaps and needs**, the consultation provided some specific suggestions to change text: Page 32 move bullet 1 to *ex situ*; move bullet 2 to *in situ*, and bullet 4 should be more general when addressing collections. With respect to **Research/technology**; participants indicated the importance of bridging the data available through the documentation systems. This is important element for the research infrastructure and should be highlighted.

PAA 10. Increasing Genetic Enhancement and Base-Broadening Efforts

60. With respect to the title the some participant suggested the following changes. Plant breeding should be addressed in the title: "*breeding research and plant breeding*" Other proposed a new title: *Facilitate the use of wild and exotic material in breeding*.

61. With respect to the objectives the following suggestions were provided: **Long-term objectives** 170: delete last sentence: "To increase sustainability of agricultural systems". This should be moved as it has a more general text suited to the introductory section. Others suggestions included: Change: "To increase food security....." as there should be a broader concept expressed, not only food security (food, feed industrial use); the word "better" (plant varieties) should be deleted; "To reduce genetic uniformity" should be reworded more positively ("*to increase genetic diversity*"). Overall, long term objectives 170 should be reworded to be more concise. Add to the objective: "development of technology" and "research component" should be included in a new objective. **Intermediate objectives** 171: Change *To increase the genetic diversity available in breeders' material* and delete the rest. Consider merging of the long-term and intermediate objectives.

62. With regard to the **Assessment** section some participants suggested to: highlight the importance of wild plants for food and the need for semi-domestication. In the **Policy/strategy**; the issue of patenting of varieties is not reflected and is a matter of concern and a reference to the MLS (to use the material) should be added. In the **Capacity section**: highlight the need for strengthening breeding capacity. The value of breeders' exemption should not be forgotten. In the **Research/technology**: a reference to gene pools should be made. Plant breeding should be reflected in the text "facilitate the use of PGR to strengthen breeding research to show continuity." In the review of the changes, gaps and needs, the consultation provided some specific suggestions to change text. Delete: second box under assessment Bullet 1 "Overall global plant breeding....." (not correct). Bullet 4 under policy (not valid only for PPB). Move bullet 3 & 5 to Capacity Building.

63. **New PAAs**: Participants suggested considering revising all the PAAs in this group to more fully consider the new breeding element, including such as the whole chain from screening to variety testing, methodology etc. A new PAA on breeding with relevant issues connected should also be considered and it should promote public breeding, as both major and minor crops will need public support. A new PAA, on farmers' contribution to diversification of PGR (take bits and pieces from other areas) could also be considered.

PAA 11. Promoting Sustainable Agriculture through Diversification of Crop Production and Broader Diversity in Crops

64. Participants accepted the title but indicated it could be shorter and made clearer so that the aim is diversification of production systems.
65. With respect to the objective, participants suggested: **Long-term objectives** 179 is considered valid. **Intermediate objective** 181 should be deleted. Change intermediate objective 180: Include also “*regional*” in the text. Intermediate objective 181: Broaden the scope with farmers, consumers, industry etc., and link with gene banks. Consider merging of the long-term and intermediate objectives.
66. With regard to the **Assessment** section participants suggested to broaden the scope, and to highlight bullet 3 “lack of national strategies”. In the **policy/strategy**: bullet 3 should be highlighted as well as the need for legislation. In the **Capacity** section, the requirement of legislation should be addressed. Other suggestions provided include: “Awareness” is stated in many places and could be minimized in the text and several bullets can be moved to other sections.
67. Merging of PAAs in this section was considered without agreements. Suggestions include: Merging PAAs 11 and 12; Merging of PAAs 11, 12 and 14; and a new title “Diversification of crop production and crop use”.

PAA 12 Promoting Development and Commercialization of Under-utilized Crops and Species

68. The title was indicated as being valid as it is.
69. With respect to the Objectives participant provided the following suggestions: the **Long-term objectives** 190 is accepted. Consider merging the Objectives in PAA 12 and PAA 14. **Intermediate objectives** Changes: Intermediate objective 191: breeding needs to be included in the text and replacing the word “improve” was suggested. Merging of the long-term and intermediate objectives should be considered.
70. With regards to **Policy/strategy** section bullet 6 should be highlighted. In the **Capacity** section, bullet 2 should be highlighted. In the **Research/technology** section, bullet 3 legislation should be addressed. Some other specific suggestions provided by participants include: bullet 1 Assessment delete; bullet 3 Assessment move to breeding; bullet 4 Assessment move to PAA 15; Policy section: non food crops deleted; Policy bullet 3 delete; Policy bullet 4 move to plant breeding; Policy bullet 5 move to PAA 15; Policy bullet 6 delete part on major crops; Policy bullet 7 only address the underutilized crops, Policy bullets 8, 9, 10 move to other relevant parts; Capacity bullets 1 and 2 move to other relevant parts; Research bullet 1 move to *in situ*; and Coordination bullet 1 move to PAA 16.

PAA 13. Supporting Seed Production and Distribution

71. The title was indicated as being valid as it is.

72. With respect to the Objectives participant provided the following suggestions: **Long-term objectives** 198: General comment that when rewriting the text it should be considered that seed supply system are important. Change: Address the issue of legislation - legislation which benefits farmers and does not cause impediments. In **Long-term Objective** 199. Add something about diversification specifically addressed to food. A more diverse sector including private breeders, SMEs would be better than a general addressing to seed production systems. Add: Consider a global initiative to strengthen seed production and distribution. **Intermediate objectives:** The issue of legislation should be addressed. Add: A new objective taking legislation into consideration. Participant expressed mixed views on the merging of the long-term and intermediate objectives.
73. With regards to **Policy/strategy** section: bullet 1 very important should be highlighted and the value of breeders exemptions should be stressed in the text. In the **Capacity** section bullet 1 addressing researchers, breeders and curators is not necessary.

PAA 14. Developing New Markets for Local Varieties and Diversity-Rich Products

74. The title was indicated as being valid as it is.
75. With respect to the objectives participant provided the following suggestions: **Long-term objectives** 210: Remains valid however could be reworded taking into consideration the findings in the SOW-2; Change: market mechanisms could be deleted; the term “diversity rich products” is not clear. Merging of the long-term and intermediate objectives could be considered.
76. With regards to **Assessment** section, bullet 7 is important and the last sentence could be transformed into a need, and bullets 1 and 2 (covered in PAA 12), and bullet 3 could be deleted. In the **Policy/strategy** section, bullet 1 should be highlighted.
77. Some participants suggested PAAs 12 and 14 could be merged as they are very much related, while other preferred retaining all of them as they are.

Institutions and Capacity Building

PAA 15. Building Strong National Programs

78. The title was indicated as being valid as it is.
79. With respect to the **objectives** participant provided the following suggestions: sections of the long-term and intermediate objectives could be merged. Participants suggested the main objectives for this PAA are: “*To ensure adequate national implementation remain a building block for the implementation of the GPA*”; and “*To make use synergies between the different national actors could be a priority to build up national programmes*”.
80. With respect to the **Policy/Strategy** section, participants suggested to re-write the first bullet replacing “major centers of diversity” with “*all primary and secondary centers of origin*”; and to include in the second bullet a specific reference to breeders. Under **Capacity**: it was noted that there are a lot of elements that are already includes in the other parts of the document, and this

deletion of the entire box could be considered. Reference to Farmers' Rights should be underlined in the national programme in line with the decisions of the Governing Body of the International Treaty. With respect to the **Coordination/administration** section, most participants suggested deleting Coordination/administration from all 6 PAAs, while some participants expressed a preference to keep this section but reduce it in size.

PAA 16. Promoting networks for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

81. The title was accepted as it is.
82. With respect to the **objectives**, participants provided the following suggestions: maintain the regional network as the first objective; some considered that it would be useful to include an inter-regional and sub-regional approach; delete in the para. "5 to 15 international crop".
83. With respect to the **Policy/Strategy** section, participants suggested: to delete the box at page 58, except the last bullet point and make with reference to the ITPGRFA. The global crop conservation strategy could be used as guidelines to support the networks. Under **Capacity**: clarification of the second bullet point in the grey box at page 59 was suggested as needed; the third bullet could be moved to training; re-writing of the last part of page 59 to take into account that some of the regional networks already exist – in addition to include a reference to Interregional Approach; the grey box at page 60, concerning "South-South cooperation" could be moved to para. 242 on page 56.

PAA 17. Constructing comprehensive information systems for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

84. Participant suggested modifying the title as follows: "Constructing and strengthening comprehensive information systems for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture".
85. With respect to the **objectives**, participants provided the following suggestions: The objectives should encourage the countries to have a high quality information system; all objectives should be revised. Add: facility to objective 261 "development of expertise and infrastructure at the global, regional, national and facility levels"). With respect to the **Policy/Strategy** section: participants underlined the need for more accurate and reliable indicators (grey box page 62); and Under **Assessment**: it could include a reference to a Vision Paper on the Global Information System that was asked by the Governing Body of the International Treaty.

PAA 18. Developing monitoring and early warning system for loss of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture

86. The consultation suggested deletion of PAA 18. The development of an "early warning system for loss of PGRFA" was considered to be a rather unrealistic task. Countries have the role to monitor the trends of PGRFA within their own territories. They may develop mechanisms, as appropriate, to respond to a decline of particular PGRFA, in order to stop the trends and even reverse them. However, these activities would be very different from country to country and most likely not justify a term "early warning system".

PAA 19. Expanding and improving education and training

87. Some participant suggested modifying the title as follows: “Expanding and improving research, education and training.” Other did not support the change.
88. With respect to the **objectives**, participants provided the following suggestions: Change: para 295 needs revision to better understand the meaning of training. Add: Some participants suggested an additional **intermediate objective**: “*To develop and implement a proper research agenda to bridge the gap between the science and PGRFA management/gene bank activities*”. With respect to the **Policy/Strategy** section, include reference to PGRFA in the last bullet box 68-69; and Under **Capacity**: move the entire grey box on page 69 to in-situ and plant breeding.

PAA 20. Promoting public awareness of the value of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture conservation and use

89. The consultation suggested a change to paragraph 315: “To support mechanisms, particularly in developing countries, for coordinated public awareness at all levels”. Some question if this is an objective.

General comments on structure and content within each Priority Activity Area

90. The consultation considered the structure and contents within each PAA and provided a number of suggestions to add, modify and delete text, and to move text to more appropriate sections of the GPA. Suggested changes to structure are provided below.

Coordination/administration

91. With respect to the sub-section on “*Coordination/administration*” the consultation in general, indicated this sub-section was not necessary and could be omitted from the updated GPA, with the existing text moved to other relevant sections within the PAAs as appropriate. Some wished to retain it but suggested the need to reduce the text significantly.

This activity is closely linked with

92. With respect to the sub-section on “*This activity is closely linked with*” the consultation indicated this section was not necessary and could be omitted from the updated GPA. If it is to be retained, it was suggested that only the number of the PAA be indicated, rather than the full title of the PAA, to shorten the section.

Summary of review of the Long-term objectives and Intermediate objectives

93. The consultation reviewed the Long-term objectives and Intermediate objectives and provided the following general comments on the objectives:
- In general, the consultation found most of long-term and intermediate objectives as remaining valid.

- A few objectives were suggested for deletion or parts of several objectives were suggested to be deleted, as the information is no longer current.
- Additional text is required to update a number of the objectives, in light of emerging issues and challenges, such as those indicated above to be added to the introductory section of the updated GPA.
- Some objectives should be reviewed for clarity.

94. The consultation considered the potential of merging the currently separate sub-heading of Long-term objectives and Intermediate objectives, to a single sub-heading called objectives. Some participants indicated that merging of the sub-titles was desirable, and that some of the objectives themselves could also be merged. Other participants indicated a preference to retain both sub-headings. However, in doing so, they indicated that the distinction between the long-term and intermediate objectives needed to be clear, in order to retain both sub-headings.

Other general suggestions

95. The consultation indicated the need to be consistent in the use of terms (e.g. indigenous and local communities, crop wild relatives, not wild crop relatives, food and feed production not only food production, etc.).
96. The consultation indicated the need to use strong language as much as possible (e.g. change promote to strengthen).
97. When referring to the various levels the activities are aimed at, the consultation indicated the need to indicate all levels as appropriate (global, regional, national and sub-national levels).
98. The consultation suggested the need to reference new initiatives such as the International Treaty and Global Crop Conservation Strategy appropriately throughout the updated GPA.
99. The consultation suggested highlighting areas for collaboration with environmental sector such as the LifeWeb protected areas initiative, and the Global Plant Conservation Strategy, and to refer to the importance of ecosystem services were appropriate.
100. The consultation suggested greater emphasis be given to plant breeding throughout the updated GPA.
101. Some participants suggested considering a review of the impacts of patenting on PGRFA in updating the GPA, and the impacts of recent legislation in terms of access to PGRFA.
102. The consultation suggested the use of terms such as Farmers rights and Access and Benefit Sharing should be use in a manner consistent with the language of the International Treaty.
103. The consultation suggested ensuring appropriate reference to the better application of the results of science and technology throughout the updated GPA.

104. Some participants saw advantages to addressing public awareness in one section of the GPA. The role of private sector was seen as useful here, as well as the role of civil society. In the review of changes, gaps and needs, suggestions were provided for deleting and moving sections.

Implementation and Financing of the Global Plan of Action

105. The need for a section on Implementation and Financing in the updated GPA was briefly considered by participants. Most participants indicated that the updated GPA would include an updated implementation and financing section. It was noted that financing of the GPA is a priority of the Funding Strategy for the Implementation of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and this needed to be fully taken into account in preparing the Implementation and Financing section of the GPA.

APPENDIX A



**The Plant Production and Protection Division,
Food and Agriculture Organization**
in collaboration with
**the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment,
Agricultural University of Tirana,
Bioversity International and SEEDNet**



European Consultation for the Update of the Global Plan of Action on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of PGRFA

19-20 May 2010, Tirana International Hotel, Albania

Agenda

Monday 19 May 2010

8.00 - 9.00	Registration	
9.00 - 9.40	Welcome ceremony Faculty of Agriculture and Environment Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture International Treaty on PGRFA Bioversity International SEEDnet	Stefano Diulgheroff, FAO Ardian Maci, Dean Dan Leskien, FAO Mario Marino, FAO Lorenzo Maggioni Eva Thorn
9.50 - 10.00	Introduction of participants	
10.00 - 10.10	Agenda and Objectives	Barbara Pick, FAO
10.10 - 10.30	GPA updating process	Stefano Diulgheroff
10.30 - 10.50	Coffee break	
10.50 - 11.20	Changes in PGRFA conservation and use: Challenges for the new GPA	Stefano Diulgheroff
11.20 - 11.40	Regional Summary	Eva Thorn, SEEDNet
11.40 - 12.20	Dynamics of working group discussion	Richard Laing, FAO
12.20 - 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 15.40	Working Group session	
15.40 - 16.00	Coffee break	
16.00 - 17.40	Working Group session	
17.40 - 19.20	Working Group session	

Tuesday 20 May 2010

8.30 - 10.10	Working Group session	
10.10 - 10.30	Coffee break	
10.30 - 12.10	Working Group session	
12.10 - 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 14.30	Wrap up Sec.I (Introduction and other sections)	Richard Laing
14.30 - 15.00	Wrap up Sec.II (<i>In situ</i> and on farm management)	Barbara Pick
15.00 - 15.30	Wrap up Sec.III (<i>Ex situ</i> conservation)	Lorenzo Maggioni
15.30 - 16.00	Wrap up Sec.IV (Use of PGRFA)	Eva Thorn
16.00 - 16.30	Coffee break	
16.30 - 17.00	Wrap up Sec.V (Institutions and capacity building)	Mario Marino
17.00 - 17.30	Closure	

APPENDIX B

List of Participants

Country	Name	Email
Albania	Mr Ndoc FASLIA	ndoef@icc-al.org
Armenia	Ms Alvina AVAGYAN	alvinaav@mail.ru
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ms Marina Radun	marinabl14@gmail.com
Bulgaria	Ms Lili Krasteva	krasteva_ipgr@abv.bg
Croatia	Mr Stanislav Volenik	s.volenik@zsr.hr
Czech Republic	Mr Karel Jan Stolc	Karel.Stolc@mze.cz
France	Ms Isabelle Clement Nissou Mr Ygor Gibelind	isabelle.clement-nissou@gnis.fr ygor.gibelind@agriculture.gouv.fr
Georgia	Mr Guram Aleksidze	guram_aleksidze@yahoo.com
Germany	Mr Frank Begemann	Frank.Begemann@ble.de
Italy	Ms Petra Engel	petra.engel@gmail.com
Latvia	Mr Gints Lanka	Gints.Lanka@zm.gov.lv
Lithuania	Mr Bronislovas Gelvonauskis	b.gelvonauskis@agb.lt
Montenegro	Mr Zoran Jovovic	jovovic@t-com.me
Netherlands	Mr Theo Van Hintum	theo.vanhintum@wur.nl
Norway	Mr Åsmund Asdal	aasmund.asdal@bioforsk.no
Poland	Ms Zofia Bulinska-Radomska	z.bulinska@ihar.edu.pl
Romania	Ms Silvia Strajeru	genebank@suceava.astral.ro
Serbia	Ms Milena Savic Ivanov	milena.savicianov@minpolj.gov.rs
Slovakia	Ms Daniela Benediková	benedikova@vurv.sk
Spain	Mr Juan Fajardo	fajardo.juan@inia.es
Sweden	Mr Jens Weibull	jens.weibull@cbm.slu.se
Ukraine	Mr Viktor Ryabchun	ncpgru@gmail.com
Russian Federation	Mr Sergey Migranovich Alexanian	s.alexanian@vir.nw.ru
FAO	Mr Stefano Diulgheroff	stefano.diulgheroff@fao.org
FAO	Ms Barbara Pick	barbara.pick@fao.org
FAO	Mr Dan Leskien	dan.leskien@fao.org
FAO	Mr Mario Marino	mario.marino@fao.org
FAO	Mr Richard Laing	ips.laing@shaw.ca
Biodiversity	Mr Lorenzo Maggioni	l.maggioni@cgiar.org