

March 1999



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

Organisation
des
Nations
Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et
l'agriculture

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

E

Item 6 of the Draft Provisional Agenda

COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Eighth Regular Session

Rome, 19-23 April 1999

FINANCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

CONTENTS

	<i>Para.</i>
1. Introduction	1
2. Background	2 - 7
3. Financing needs and current expenditures	
3.1 <i>Financing needs</i>	8 - 9
3.2 <i>Current expenditures</i>	10 - 13
3.3 <i>Funding required</i>	14 - 15
4. Existing and possible new financing mechanisms, sources and channels	
4.1 <i>Funding sources and channels</i>	16 - 18
4.2 <i>Financing mechanisms of the Conventions</i>	19 - 25
5. Conclusions and guidance requested from the Commission	26 - 28

FINANCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

1. INTRODUCTION

1. In reviewing implementation of the *Global Plan of Action for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* at its Seventh Session, the Commission stressed the need for a comprehensive study of all existing and potential sources for funding for activities on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, including from national sources. This paper provides background on earlier decisions and recommendations of the Commission, Conference and the International Technical Conference, Leipzig, related to the financing of the *Global Plan of Action* (section 2), examines funding needs and current expenditures (section 3), and surveys existing financing mechanisms, sources and channels (section 4). The guidance of the Commission is sought concerning the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action* (section 5).

2. BACKGROUND

2. The Commission on Plant Genetic Resources,¹ at its Fourth Session in 1991, agreed that a scientifically sound *Global Plan of Action*, developed through the preparatory process for the Fourth International Technical Conference, should provide the basis for the implementation of Farmers' Rights² through an international fund, and "recommended that the Technical Conference be followed by a meeting to define the financial commitments needed for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*, and the terms and conditions of financing."³

3. FAO Conference expressed its full support for the development of the *Global Plan of Action*,⁴ and adopted Resolution 3/91 by which the FAO Conference agreed:⁵

- (i) "that Farmers' Rights will be implemented through an international fund on plant genetic resources which will support plant genetic conservation and utilization programmes, particularly, but not exclusively, in the developing countries;
- (ii) that the effective conservation and sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources is a pressing and permanent need, and, therefore, the resources for the international fund as well as for other funding mechanisms should be substantial, sustainable and based on the principles of equity and transparency;

¹ In 1995 the Commission became the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

² The concept of Farmers' Rights was agreed by FAO Conference in Resolution 5/89, as "rights arising from the past, present and future contributions of farmers in conserving, improving, and making available plant genetic resources" (...) "for the purpose of ensuring full benefits to farmers, and supporting the continuation of their contributions, as well as the attainment of the overall purposes of the International Undertaking". The same Resolution further defines these objectives, as being to: "- ensure that the need for conservation is globally recognized and that sufficient funds for these purposes will be available; - assist farmers and farming communities, in all regions of the world, but especially in the areas of origin/diversity of plant genetic resources, in the protection and conservation of their plant genetic resources, and of the natural biosphere; - allow farmers, their communities, and countries in all regions, to participate fully in the benefits derived, at present and in the future, from the improved use of plant genetic resources, through plant breeding and other scientific methods."

³ CPGR-4/91/REP, para. 23, recalled by the Commission at its Sixth Session. CPGR-6/95/REP, para. 70.

⁴ C91/REP, para. 113.

⁵ Conference Resolution 3/91, now Annex 3, to the International Undertaking.

- (iii) that through the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources, the donors of genetic resources, funds and technology will determine and oversee the policies, programmes and priorities of the fund and other funding mechanisms, with the advice of the appropriate bodies.”

4. The *Global Plan of Action* was adopted by 150 governments at the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources, Leipzig (June 1996). The Conference also took note of the Secretariat’s identification of existing sources of financing⁶ and of possible new sources of financing⁷ and of its estimate of the cost of implementing the *Global Plan of Action*, which it requested to be refined to reflect the changes introduced by the Conference in many of the priority areas.⁸

5. The International Technical Conference recognized “the need for financial resources for the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action* and that its full implementation would involve a significant increase in the activities currently taking place”, and “that the *Global Plan of Action* would have to be implemented progressively, and adequate financial resources commensurate with the scope of the *Global Plan of Action* should therefore be mobilized”.⁹ The Conference acknowledged that such resources would be required from both domestic and international sources. More specifically, the Conference:

- (i) recognized “the importance of the contribution of domestic sources, including both public and private sectors, [and] strongly recommended that each country make every possible effort to provide, in accordance with its capacities, financial support and incentives with respect to its national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of the *Global Plan of Action*, in accordance with its national plans, priorities and programmes.”¹⁰
- (ii) “reaffirmed that international cooperation for conservation and sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture should be strengthened”,¹¹ and “reaffirmed the commitments for the new and additional funds made under Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Under those commitments, funds should be made available to finance the implementation, by developing countries and countries with economies in transition, of the *Global Plan of Action*. Such funding should come from developed countries and/or other sources, and should, where possible, seek to facilitate the leveraging of other funding sources and mechanisms, and assist countries to implement the *Global Plan of Action*. Every effort should also be made to seek new, additional and innovative sources of funding within the process of the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*;¹² and
- (iii) agreed that “the major multilateral and bilateral funding and development institutions should also be invited to examine ways and means of supporting the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*.”¹³

6. The Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), at its Third Meeting in November 1996, adopted Decision III/11, which welcomed the contribution that the *Plan* provides to the implementation of the CBD in the field of plant genetic resources for

⁶ ITCPR/96/5 para. 347- 351.

⁷ *Ibid*, para. 352 - 360.

⁸ The revised cost estimates were provided in document CGRFA-7/97/4 Annex.

⁹ ITCPR/96/REP, para. 23.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, para. 25.

¹¹ *Ibid*, para. 26.

¹² *Ibid*, para. 27.

¹³ *Ibid*, para. 28.

food and agriculture, encouraged Parties actively to implement the *Plan*, and endorsed its priorities and policy recommendations. The COP/CBD recognized that the issues of financing and the realization of Farmers' Rights required further work, in the context of the FAO Global System, and called for effective and speedy completion of the revision of the International Undertaking and strengthening of the FAO Global System.¹⁴

7. At its Seventh Session, the Commission reviewed revised cost estimates for the *Plan*,¹⁵ and "stressed the need for a comprehensive study of all existing and potential sources for funding for activities on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, including from national sources. In this context, the Commission noted that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, through its Decision III/5, had requested the Global Environment Facility, as its interim financing mechanism, to give priority to supporting efforts for the conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity, in accordance with Decision III/11, which had endorsed the priorities and policy recommendations of the *Global Plan of Action*. Many countries stressed the need for new and additional funding to implement the *Global Plan of Action*. In this respect, some countries emphasized the importance of the international fund, and others indicated that financial support of actions should be realized through existing instruments. It was suggested that this issue be discussed in the context of the revision of the International Undertaking."¹⁶

3. FINANCING NEEDS AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES

3.1 *Financing needs*

8. There is no simple nor technically unassailable way to estimate the magnitude of financing needed for the conservation and sustainable development of plant genetic resources, globally. Secretariat estimates for the implementation of the priority activities of the *Plan*, are per annum: US\$ 150 million (Option A), US\$ 248 million (Option B), and US\$ 455 million (Option C).¹⁷ In the costing exercise those costs which might be borne by the international community were included, including a significant share of the costs of implementing activities in developing countries, but not for example, costs related to the general running costs of national programmes. Also included are activities undertaken largely for the global benefit, regardless of their location, including, for example, long-term conservation and genetic enhancement.

9. These estimates may be compared with estimates for the implementation of Agenda 21. The UNCED secretariat estimated that about US\$ 600 million would be required to implement programme area 14G, "Conservation and sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture", including US\$ 300 million from the international community on grant or concessional terms.¹⁸ If all other relevant activities in Agenda 21 are taken into account, the resources required would be much higher.¹⁹ Other estimates of the international financial assistance

¹⁴ Decision III/11, para. 19.

¹⁵ CGRFA-7/97/4 Annex.

¹⁶ CGRFA-7/97/REP, para. 17.

¹⁷ Updated estimates from CGRFA-7/97/4 Annex: option A "a basic or elementary approach". Option B, a "moderate approach"; and option C, "a more ideal or comprehensive approach."

¹⁸ At 1992 costs. At 1996 costs these estimates could be about US\$ 680 million and US\$ 340 million respectively.

¹⁹ An estimate of resources required is US\$ 4,000 million dollars each year, of which about US\$ 1,000 million would be required from the international community as grants or at concessional terms. This estimate is made up as follows: (corrected to 1996 costs): 100% of programme area 14G, plus 10% of programme area 15; 5% of the following programme areas: 11B, 13A, 14A, 14B, 14C, 16, 11B, 13A, 14A, 14B, 14C, 16; and 1% of the following programme areas: 8, 11A, 11C, 11D, 12, 13B, 14D, 14E, 14I, 17G, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40.

required to support plant genetic resources conservation range between US\$ 300 million and US\$ 500 million per annum.²⁰

3.2 Current expenditures²¹

10. It is also difficult to estimate current expenditures on plant genetic activities. In preparation for the Leipzig Conference, countries were asked to report domestic expenditure on relevant activities. In extrapolating information from the 37 countries which responded, it was estimated that about US\$ 600 million is spent annually on such activities.²² This figure, however, is subject to wide error, as the activities included in each country's assessment varied considerably: some considered only national conservation programmes, specifically *ex situ* conservation efforts; others also included aspects of *in situ* conservation and utilization (such as breeding and biotechnology).

11. Overall, the estimated US\$ 600 million is probably a moderate overestimate of expenditures on conservation activities, but certainly falls short of expenditures on utilization in the broad sense, including plant breeding, biotechnology and seed production. For instance, it has been estimated that a total expenditure of over US\$ 100 million was spent on wheat improvement alone in developing countries, in 1990. The total annual expenditure on conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture can therefore, with current information, only be guessed, at perhaps US\$ 1,000 million annually. In comparison, total public-sector investment in worldwide agricultural research is about US\$ 26,000 million, of which, US\$ 17,000 million in developed countries, US\$ 8,700 million in developing countries, and US\$ 286 million through the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). An estimated US\$ 10,000 million is spent on agricultural research and development by the private sector, mainly in developed countries.

12. Official development assistance is the best documented source of financial flows, although it is difficult to define the share related to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. Total aid flows have been falling since 1992 and, as a share of donor countries' national income, are now at an historic low. The share of agriculture in total development finance has also declined. After the food crisis in the early 1970s, annual commitments for agriculture increased to about US\$ 14,000 million, at the end of the 1980s, and then fell to around US\$ 10,000 million at present. Funding for the CGIAR, though it represents only a very small share of this total (4%), has mirrored this

²⁰ The second session of the Keystone International Dialogue, Madras, 1990, stated that, for an International Fund for Plant Genetic Resources, a "conservative estimate indicates that at least US\$ 500 million per annum should be available to meet urgent needs". The Third Session, Oslo, 1991, proposed a "Global Initiative for the Security and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources" and concluded that "a minimum of US\$ 1.5 billion of additional funds [would] be needed during 1993-2000."

²¹ This section is based on *The State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*, pp. 297-299, and ITCPR/96/Inf.1, *Current expenditures for the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture*, updated with new information from three countries.

²² This expenditure survey was updated, by incorporating additional data on Canada, Italy and Madagascar, updating international data, and recalculating overall estimations. However, it was not possible, without new questionnaires to all countries, to update the survey in the framework of the twenty activities of the *Plan*. For that purpose, a new more detailed survey would be required. As discussed in CGRFA-8/99/5, this might perhaps be best carried out as part of a comprehensive survey on implementation of the *Plan*. The following results therefore are subject to the same limitations as the first survey (see ITCPR/96/Inf. 1). It can be estimated that in 1995: domestic expenditure for 40 countries was US\$ 475 million; bi- and multilateral foreign assistance from 12 countries was US\$ 50 million; and foreign assistance received by 17 countries was US\$ 17 million. A separate survey of multilateral agencies suggests that about US\$ 140 million per year is channelled through international organizations. The global expenditure estimation suggests that the order-of-magnitude estimate of total global national domestic expenditures made in 1996 is still correct. The share of expenditures by the OECD countries is US\$ 470 million, and the estimated amount spent by all other countries about US\$ 130 million.

pattern. Funding for biodiversity conservation, on the other hand, has increased, but represents a relatively small level of expenditure. In 1997, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), for instance, spent approximately US\$ 5.4 million for activities related purely to the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture.

13. The survey of countries indicated that about US\$ 190 million are contributed each year for PGRFA-related multi- and bilateral international activities, though this is likely to be an underestimate for the same reasons quoted earlier. A separate survey of multilateral agencies suggests that about US\$ 140 million per year are channelled through international organizations, including the CGIAR. About US\$ 106 million is spent by the International Agricultural Research Centres on activities related to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, of which about US\$ 35 million for *ex situ* conservation. The World Bank, other development banks, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) are also major players in biodiversity conservation, agricultural development and capacity-building for national agricultural research systems (NARS). For instance, between 1988 to 1995, the World Bank committed US\$ 731 million to eighty-four projects with explicit biodiversity conservation objectives and US\$ 1,537 million for agricultural research and extension, but it is difficult to assess the proportion of these expenditures related to the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources.

3.3 Funding required

14. During the preparatory process for, and follow-up to, the International Technical Conference, the shortage of funding was identified as a major constraint. While many conservation and utilization activities are long-term, and require sustained funding, international funding is often short-term and insufficient. There is a clear need for funding on a planned and sustainable basis. This could be provided both by new and additional funding as well as through a reallocation of resources. It was also recognized, however, that international funding does not remove the need for domestic funding. It is widely agreed that a national commitment to provide sustainable funding for national programmes and projects, through specific funding allocations, is essential. Additionally, the documentation provided to the International Technical Conference²³ noted that the multitude of independent channels for financing plant genetic resources activities means that there is almost certainly duplication of effort and inefficiency. A significant increase in effectiveness could result from better coordinated decision-making and priority-setting.

15. The estimates of needs and current expenditures discussed in the previous section indicate uncertainties inherent in the data. While the Commission has noted the cost estimates for the implementation of the priority activities of the *Plan* (ranging from, per annum: US\$ 150 million, through US\$ 248 million to US\$ 455 million), no agreed budget has been adopted. The lack of comprehensive data on current international concessional flows, as well as an agreed budget, makes it difficult to determine the level of incremental external concessional financial flows that would be needed to implement the *Global Plan of Action*. Nevertheless, consistent with the decisions of the International Technical Conference, it might be considered that the *Plan* might be partly financed by reallocation of existing expenditures, and partly by additional funding.

4. EXISTING AND POSSIBLE NEW FINANCING MECHANISMS, SOURCES AND CHANNELS

4.1 Funding sources and channels

²³ ITC/PCR/96/5, para. 347-350, and 355-360.

16. Existing sources of funding which may be applicable to the *Global Plan of Action* include, *inter alia*:²⁴

- (a) Official bilateral development assistance (including contributions to the CGIAR system);
- (b) World Bank (including IDA, and a portion of the CGIAR system);
- (c) GEF (including funds administered in conjunction with the CBD);
- (d) FAO (including the regular programme and trust funds);
- (e) United Nations Development Programme;
- (f) United Nations Environment Programme;
- (g) Other specialized UN trust funds, including the Common Fund for Commodities;²⁵
- (h) IFAD;
- (i) Regional development banks;
- (j) Non-governmental Organizations (such as the Worldwide Fund for Nature - WWF);
- (k) Foundations;
- (l) Universities and research institutes.

17. There are also non-concessional flows to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture from the private sector as investments or loans; from governments and the World Bank group as non-concessional loans; and from governments and institutes as non-ODA technical assistance (including scholarships, fellowships, and non-ODA advisory missions).

18. At the same time as conventional bilateral aid flows have declined, new demands have arisen. Countries in transition are now applicants for aid, refugee crises have increased and there is an enlarged environmental agenda.²⁶ Increased attention is therefore being given to possible alternative sources of finance in all development fields, including funds linked to debt relief, and increased contributions from the private sector.²⁷ Each presents its own challenges however. The UN General Assembly is currently examining these questions.²⁸

4.2 Financing mechanisms of the Conventions

19. This section reviews the funding mechanism of major international conventions, that may be of relevance to the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*.

²⁴ ITCPR/96/5, para. 348-349.

²⁵ The Common Fund for Commodities is an intergovernmental financial institution set up through negotiations in UNCTAD, which supports projects promoting productivity and diversification of production and commodity exports. All project proposals have to be submitted through an International Commodity Body (such as the Intergovernmental Commodity Groups of FAO). For example, a project of about US 1 million, to support Fonio post-harvest technology, was submitted by the FAO intergovernmental group on grains.

²⁶ *New Sources of finance for development*. ODI Briefing Paper February 1996 (1). Overseas Development Institute, London.

²⁷ Organizations of the UN System are increasingly involving the private sector in mobilizing financial resources for their programmes and activities. For example, UNIDO has also developed a network of partners, including the private sector, as well as donor government and international funding agencies, to promote the flow of investment and technology to developing countries.

²⁸ For more information see: *Report of the Secretary General. Fifty-third session of the General Assembly, 9 October 1998*: United Nations A/53/479: High-level international intergovernmental consideration of financing for development work of the United Nations system. Agenda item 91 (b): Macroeconomic policy questions: financing of development, including net transfer of resources between developing and developed countries.

20. The *Convention on Biological Diversity* identifies three funding types: national or domestic resources, the Convention's financial mechanism, and other bilateral and multilateral flows.²⁹ The Convention provides that developed country parties will provide new and additional financial resources to enable developing country parties to meet the "agreed full incremental costs", necessary for implementation of the Convention, and that a financial mechanism will operate within a "democratic and transparent system of governance." The financial mechanism "shall function under the authority and guidance of, and be accountable to, the Conference of the Parties." The GEF³⁰ is the interim financing mechanism.

21. By a Memorandum of Understanding between the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Council of the GEF, "the Conference of the Parties determines the policy, strategy, programme priorities and eligibility criteria for access to and utilization of financial resources available through the financial mechanism, including monitoring and evaluation on a regular basis of such utilization. GEF, in operating the financial mechanism under the Convention, finances activities that are in full conformity with the guidance provided to it by the Conference of the Parties." The CBD Secretariat reviews each biodiversity project proposal, for conformity with the policy, strategies, programme priorities and eligibility criteria approved by the Conference of the Parties. As of June 1996, US\$ 731 million in project financing for biodiversity activities had been facilitated by the GEF, including US\$ 437 million from the GEF Trust fund, and US\$ 298 million through co-financing. Relatively few of the GEF-financed biodiversity projects have substantial components on plant genetic resources for food and agriculture.

22. The *Framework Convention on Climate Change* has also designated the GEF as its funding mechanism, on an interim basis, under arrangements similar to those under the CBD.

23. GEF also hosts the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the *Montreal Protocol* of the *Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer*. However, this fund differs from the arrangements between the GEF and the above two Conventions, in that:

- the Fund is entirely under the authority of an Executive Committee of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol;
- contributions to the fund are mandatory for industrialized countries, Parties to the Protocol, according to the UN scale of assessment; and
- the implementing agencies include UNIDO, as well as the three GEF implementing agencies (UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank). The Fund has disbursed an average of over US\$ 100 million per year, since it began its operations in 1991.³¹

²⁹ Article 20.

³⁰ The GEF, originally set up as a pilot programme in 1991, was restructured and replenished, in 1994 and 1998 to cover the agreed incremental costs of activities that benefit the global environment in four focal areas: climate change; biological diversity; international waters; and stratospheric ozone. GEF projects and programmes are managed through three implementing agencies: UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank. The GEF Secretariat, which is functionally independent from the three implementing agencies, reports to and services the Council and Assembly of the GEF. The GEF strives for universal participation. Currently 150 countries are participants. In its Decision III/5, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity decided that "the Global Environment Facility shall provide financial resources to developing countries for country-driven activities and programmes, consistent with national priorities and objectives, ... [inter alia] for supporting, as a priority, efforts for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture, in accordance with Decision III/11". Decision III/11 calls upon Parties actively to implement the *Global Plan of Action*, in accordance with their national capacities, and endorses its priorities and policy recommendations. The GEF Council subsequently adopted "A Framework for GEF activities concerning conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture". GEF now provides "Enabling Funds" for the incorporation of agrobiodiversity issues in new or ongoing National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, including, as appropriate, implementation of the *Plan* at national level.

³¹ See <http://www.unep.ch/ozone/finance.htm>.

24. The World Heritage Fund of the *Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage* is a UNESCO trust fund, comprising both mandatory and voluntary contributions, and open to private sector contributions. It supports the protection of sites on the “World Heritage List”, and is managed by a “World Heritage Committee.”

25. The *International Convention to Combat Desertification* has a multi-source and multi-channel financing mechanism. Article 21 establishes a “Global Mechanism”, hosted by IFAD, to be used “in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of existing financial mechanisms”. The Global Mechanism, *inter alia*, “identifies and draws up an inventory of relevant bi- and multilateral cooperation programs”; “provides advice, on request, to Parties on innovative methods of financing and sources of financial assistance and on improving the coordination of cooperation activities at the national level”; and “provides interested Parties and relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with information on available sources of funds and on funding patterns in order to facilitate coordination among them”. Through partnerships, the Mechanism will ensure a greater role for domestic resources and private-sector initiatives, and allow a blending of grants, concessional and other external finance.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND GUIDANCE REQUESTED FROM THE COMMISSION

26. In the current negotiations for the revision of the International Undertaking, Governments have been discussing a number of related questions hinging on the *Global Plan of Action* including its role in the implementation of Farmers’ Rights; the relationship of its funding to the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture; and possible modalities for the mobilization of funds.

27. Various proposals for the mobilization of funding have been made in the course of the negotiations, within this larger context. During the Fifth Extraordinary Session, for example, the developing countries of Asia proposed that a share of the financial benefits from the commercial and other uses of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture be paid into an International Fund, under the control of the Governing Body of the revised Undertaking,³² the European Region proposed the establishment of a mechanism to promote and better channel the flow of funds from available sources (including official bilateral and multilateral sources, as well as the private sector), to support the *Global Plan of Action*, as well as other activities of the Undertaking,³³ and the seed industry, represented by the International Association of Plant Breeders (ASSINSEL), indicated its willingness to study a system whereby the owners of patents would contribute to a fund established for collecting, evaluating and enhancing genetic resources, in recognition of the fact that patents limit access to germplasm.³⁴ This would be the fund foreseen under Conference Resolution 3/91.³⁵ Governments also considered the possibility of the use of indicators in apportioning financial responsibilities under the revised Undertaking, and requested a study of these matters, which is provided in document CGRFA-8/99/8.³⁶

28. The Commission may wish to discuss how these various matters interrelate, and how resources can be mobilized, consistent with previous agreements, towards the full implementation of the *Plan*, bearing in mind that most countries are already taking measures to implement the *Plan*,

³² CGRFA-Ex5/98/REP, para. 33.

³³ CGRFA-Ex5/98/REP, para. 16.

³⁴ ASSINSEL Position on access to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and the equitable sharing of benefits arising from their use, adopted at the General Assembly in Monte Carlo, June 5, 1998.

³⁵ See the new document, CGRFA-8/99/Inf. 9, *A multilateral agreement for plant genetic resources for food and agriculture: an ASSINSEL viewpoint*.

³⁶ *Possible formulas for the sharing of benefits based on different benefit-indicators*.

according to their capacities.³⁷ In this context, the Commission may wish to take note of the arrangements made in the context of the Conventions cited in paragraphs 19 - 25, including the role played by existing funding sources and mechanisms.

³⁷ CGRFA-7/97/REP para 16. Document CGRFA-8/99/3 provides an overview report on the implementation of the *Global Plan of Action*.