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INTRODUCTION

1. The Fifth Session of the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources (hereafter referred to as "The Commission") was held in Rome from 19 to 23 April 1993. A list of delegates and observers attending is attached as Appendix I.

2. The Session was opened by Mr. Parviz Karbasi (Islamic Republic of Iran), second Vice-Chairman of the Commission, who welcomed delegates. Mr. Karbasi stated that the meeting was being held on the 10th Anniversary of its establishment, and that he was pleased to look back at progress achieved during those ten years.

ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

3. The Commission elected Mr. Rashad Ahmed Abo Elenein (Egypt) as Chairman of the Commission, who then took the Chair.

4. The Commission elected Mr. Brad Fraleigh (Canada) as first Vice-Chairman and Mr. R.S. Rana (India) as second Vice-Chairman.

5. The Commission appointed the following members to serve on the Drafting Committee: Belgium, Brazil, Congo, France, Germany, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Malta, Peru, Sweden, Tunisia, and the United States of America. Mr. Michel Chauvet of France was elected to Chair the Drafting Committee.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

6. The Agenda, as adopted, is set out in Appendix B. The list of documents appears as Appendix C.

7. The Commission discussed the provisional draft timetable and decided to modify it in order to allow more time for discussion of the items that were considered to be more complex, in particular those dealing with the proposed Code of Conduct on Biotechnology, and the Network of ex situ collections (Items 8.1 and 8.2).

8. Mr. Hartig de Haen, Assistant Director-General, Department of Agriculture, welcomed delegates to the Commission and extended a special welcome to the new members of the Commission: Estonia, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Lithuania, Romania and Trinidad & Tobago. A list of members of the Commission and of countries that have adhered to the International Undertaking is attached as Appendix H. Mr. de Haen noted that the Session was being held on the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Commission, and the adoption of its companion International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources. In creating the Commission in 1983, governments, for the first time, had determined that it was necessary to
have a permanent forum for debate and discussion on the technical, social, economic and political issues which inevitably surround the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources. Mr. de Haen summarized the important achievements of the Commission during its first ten years, and drew attention to some items on the Agenda of the Commission.

REPORTS OF THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH SESSIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP

9. Mr. José Miguel Bolivar (Spain), who had chaired the Eighth Session of the Working Group, reported on the two meetings of the Working Group that had been held in FAO, Rome, since the Fourth Session of the Commission, in April 1991. The Seventh Session had been held from 22 to 23 October 1992, and the Eighth Session from 15 to 16 April 1993.

10. The Working Group at its Seventh Session had discussed two main documents:
(i) Preparation for the Fourth International Technical Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of the Plant Genetic Resources (CPGR/WG/92/3); and
(ii) Implications of UNCED for the Global System on PGR (CPGR/WG/92/4).

The Report of the Seventh Session is attached as Appendix D.

11. The Working Group, at its Eighth Session, had selected from the Provisional Agenda of the Fifth Session of the Commission those topics which it thought might facilitate the work of the Commission. The Working Group discussed the following documents in some detail: Draft International Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer (CPGR/93/8); Towards a Code of Conduct on Biotechnology as it affects Plant Genetic Resources (CPGR/93/9); and International Network of Ex Situ Base Collections under the Auspices and/or Jurisdiction of FAO: Model Agreement for the International Research Centres (CPGR/93/11). The Working Group also reviewed other matters concerning ex situ collections and the implications of UNCED (documents CPGR/93/5 and CPGR/93/7), and discussed possible changes in the terms of reference of the Working Group, and election procedures for its members and Chairman. The Report of the Eighth Session of the Working Group is attached as Appendix E.

12. The Commission was appreciative of the Working Group, and of its efforts in paving the way for the deliberations of the Commission during its various Sessions. The Commission expressed its appreciation for the excellent work and personal commitment of Mr. Carlo di Mottola (Costa Rica), as Chairman of its Working Group since 1986, and accepted his resignation. It also thanked Mr. Melaku Worede (Ethiopia) and Mr. José Miguel Bolivar (Spain), who had chaired the Seventh and Eighth Sessions of the Working Group respectively.
PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL SYSTEM

Overview of Global System on Plant Genetic Resources

13. The Commission noted the recommendations of UNCED's Agenda 21, to strengthen the Global System for the Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, and to take further steps to realize Farmers' Rights. It also noted that Resolution 3 of the Nairobi Final Act identified access to ex situ collections not acquired in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the question of Farmers' Rights, as "outstanding matters", on which solutions should be sought, within the context of the FAO Global System.

14. The Commission also recognized that the future development of the Global System would allow the Commission to exercise its role in coordination and assessment at a world level, through:
   (i) reviewing the state of the world's plant genetic resources, through regular reports;
   (ii) determining priorities and needs within a rolling Global Plan of Action to be financed, inter alia, through the funding mechanism foreseen in Conference Resolution 3/91, to realize Farmers' Rights.

15. The Commission recognized the progress made in the development of the Global System and its defined components (see Appendix F), and concentrated its discussions, under this item, on Farmers' Rights, the World Information and Early Warning System, and the network of in situ conservation areas (these matters were covered in CPGR/93/5), since the other components of the system were to be discussed under other agenda items.

Farmers' Rights and International Funding Mechanisms

16. With respect to Farmers' Rights, the Commission reviewed the progress made and considered what remained to be done. In reviewing previous activities, it noted that the concept of Farmers' Rights was developed in Conference Resolution 5/89, and ways and means for its implementation were further developed in Conference Resolution 3/91. It also noted that both resolutions that had been negotiated by the Commission had been unanimously endorsed by the FAO Conference, and were now annexed to the Undertaking. Resolution 3/91 specified that Farmers' Rights would be implemented through an international fund, and other funding mechanisms to support plant genetic resources conservation and utilization programmes, and that the Commission would determine and oversee the policies, programmes and priorities of the fund, and other funding mechanisms, with the advice of appropriate bodies.
17. The Commission noted further that the nature of contributions to the fund, and the other funding mechanisms referred to in Resolution 3/91, had been extensively discussed, but that no agreement had been reached in previous discussions of the Commission. However, it noted that the technical and financial needs to ensure conservation, and to promote the sustainable use of the world's plant genetic resources, had to be determined and quantified. The Commission had agreed that this should be done through a country-driven process, whereby the first report on the State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources and the Global Plan of Action on Plant Genetic Resources would be developed, as part of this participatory process, for the International Conference and Programme on PGR. It agreed that the Global Plan of Action would identify the activities, projects and programmes needed to overcome present constraints, in line with the relevant parts of Agenda 21. By financing the Global Plan of Action, through the international fund, and other funding mechanisms, as foreseen in Resolution 3/91, the international community would contribute to the practical realization of Farmers' Rights.

18. The Commission agreed, however, that a number of questions remain open and would need to be addressed. These include the nature of the funding (voluntary or mandatory); the question of linkage between the financial responsibilities and the benefits derived from the use of PGR, and the question of who should bear financial responsibilities (countries, users or consumers). It also remained to be determined how the relative needs and entitlements of beneficiaries, especially developing countries, were to be estimated, and how farmers and local communities would benefit from the funding. The Commission recognized that, since its last meeting, there had been significant debates on these and related issues in FAO, UNEP and UNCED, as well as in a number of NGO fora. Consensus was already emerging, as reflected in Agenda 21, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Nonetheless, more conceptual thinking was required, to answer these questions, and to determine appropriate mechanisms for the realization of Farmers' Rights. The Commission considered that such thinking should be developed during the next two years, drawing as appropriate upon the preparation for the International Conference on PGR. It requested that the Secretariat prepare a progress report on the subject for its next session.

World Information and Early Warning System on Plant Genetic Resources

19. The Commission was informed of the steps aiming at development of the World Information and Early Warning System (PGR/WIS), and its role to collect and disseminate data which would facilitate the exchange of information on PGR and related technologies. It agreed that the PGR/WIS should be a dynamic, constantly updated database of databases, and other important information sources, on all potential areas of interest to the scientific community. Although an early warning mechanism had not been fully developed, the Commission noted its potential importance in drawing attention to hazards threatening the operation of genebanks holding base collections, and to the loss of genetic diversity throughout the world.
20. The Commission noted that the development of the PGR/WIS would contribute to the implementation of Agenda 21 of UNCED, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Commission welcomed the FAO's offer to cooperate in the UNEP-sponsored Biodiversity Country Case Studies, which would provide useful information PGR/WIS.

21. One of the major objectives of the PGR/WIS is to provide detailed information on which to base the report on the State of the World's Plant Genetic Resources, the first of which would be elaborated as part of the preparatory process of the Fourth International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources.

22. The Commission noted with satisfaction that, in line with its request, endorsed by the FAO Conference, FAO had integrated the existing Seed Information System into the PGR/WIS, established the Plant Information and Exchange Unit, and filled the position of Information Systems Officer.

23. The Commission reviewed progress in developing the PGR/WIS. Information for the PGR/WIS was being solicited from Member Countries of the Commission, principally through a national plant genetic resources programme questionnaire. This questionnaire listed the data currently maintained in the system, and requested the relevant authorities to confirm, update and complement the existing information. At the start of this Commission, 52 countries had provided information in response, and four others had made preliminary replies. A follow-up letter, together with the questionnaire, had been sent to the leading individuals (mainly National Coordinators) in the field of PGR in other member countries. The Commission urged countries that had not yet completed the questionnaire to do so.

24. A complementary questionnaire related to forest genetic resources had been sent, in March 1993, by FAO's Forestry Department to heads of national forest services. A third questionnaire had been sent requesting information from organizations about existing PGR information systems and databases. The Commission urged all countries and organizations concerned to reply as soon as possible.

25. The Commission agreed with the recommendations of the Secretariat, that the World Information and Early Warning System should provide, as a service to member nations, facts and figures on the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources such as:
   (i) a description of national programmes on PGR in each country;
   (ii) a register of institutions involved in PGR activities, plant breeding and seed production;
   (iii) a register of ex situ collections;
   (iv) variety lists;
   (v) information on in situ conservation of plant genetic resources, within and outside protected areas; and a
   (vi) description of other activities on PGR at country level.
The Network of In Situ Conservation Areas

26. The Commission noted, with satisfaction progress in this field, as outlined in Section VI of CPGR/93/5, and reiterated its earlier support to in situ conservation, which it considered an important element in a global strategy for the conservation of plant genetic resources. It requested that aspects related to the in situ conservation of plant genetic resources be given due attention in the future work of the Commission, and in the development of the Global Plan of Action on Plant Genetic Resources.

27. The Commission stressed that the development of internationally coordinated networks of in situ conservation areas, as recommended at its earlier Sessions, must be underpinned by strong national commitment, and adequate international support, and must be based on national level priorities and action. It requested FAO to strengthen its programmes aimed at assisting Governments to build up local institutions, infrastructures and expertise in this regard, and to assist them in the implementation of the recommendations of Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

28. The Commission noted the complementarity of Protected Area management, on the one hand, and the conservation in situ of plant genetic resources on the other. While the former was mainly focused on the conservation of landscapes, ecosystems and species, the latter implied the active management of the intra-specific diversity of specified target species, including on-farm management of landraces and the management of wild populations of actual or potential socio-economic value. In situ conservation, aimed at meeting present-day, as well as future human needs, was thus closely related to the sustainable utilization of the resources being conserved, and was, by definition, carried out both within and outside Protected Areas.

29. Noting the considerable number of organizations involved in various aspects of the sustainable management of natural renewable resources, and the conservation of ecosystems, species and genetic resources at the global level, the Commission requested FAO to further strengthen its collaboration with other international agencies and bodies concerned, with special reference to UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme, and bodies concerned with coordination of follow-up to the UNCED Conference. The Commission likewise stressed the need to develop research and scientific assessment linked to in situ conservation programmes.

Genebank Standards

30. The Commission considered the Genebank Standards (CPGR/93/5 Annex) that had been prepared by a FAO/IBPGR expert group in response to a previous request of the
Commission. The Commission endorsed the standards, in order that they might acquire universal value and be more easily adopted by countries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

31. The Commission expressed its appreciation to all the organizations and institutions which had provided reports on their programmes and activities to the Commission, recognizing it as the appropriate intergovernmental forum dealing with the conservation and use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. The Commission reviewed the document CPGR/93/6, which contained an account of FAO activities, and reports from UNEP, UNESCO, UNIDO, ICARDA, ICRAF, CIAT, CIMMYT, IBPGR, ICRISAT, IITA, ILCA, CIP, IRRI, WARDA, IUCN, WWF. Brief oral reports on activities and programmes were presented by UNEP, the Commonwealth Secretariat, IBPGR, ICRISAT, IRRI, IUCN, WWF, GRAIN and RAFI to complement the written reports contained in CPGR/93/6.

32. The Commission, recognizing that FAO, and many of its member nations, had close working relations with UN agencies, International Agricultural Research Centres, and other inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations, welcomed the opportunity to discuss relevant issues, and to promote cooperation.

33. The Commission took note of the current and proposed activities of both FAO's Regular and Field Programmes related to policies, and legal and technical issues regarding the conservation and sustainable utilization of PGR for food and agriculture. The Commission requested more detailed information on FAO's programmes and activities, including human and financial resource allocations relevant to the Commission's interest in conservation, training, seed activities, etc. FAO agreed to furnish this information to the Commission, and to include it in subsequent reports to the Commission.

34. The Commission recognized the importance of close cooperation with the Governing Body of the Convention on Biological Diversity in the follow-up to the Convention, and, before it entered into force, with the Intergovernmental Committee for a Convention on Biological Diversity. It recommended that this cooperation should include mutual reporting under specific agenda items in their respective Regular Sessions. The Commission also recognized the importance of close cooperation between FAO, UNEP and UNESCO in establishing and operating both the interim, and the regular Secretariats of the Convention.

35. The Commission expressed its satisfaction with the closer and effective programmatic working relationships between FAO and IBPGR, and encouraged both parties to continue such cooperation and the complementarity of their functions. The Commission also stressed the importance of continued cooperation with the International Agricultural Research Centres dealing with plant genetic resources, on matters related to crops under their specific mandate.
36. The Commission encouraged organizations which had submitted reports to this Session to continue to do so. It also requested that the Secretariat invite other governments and non-governmental international and regional organizations which had programmes or projects that affected the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, including relevant multilateral financial institutions (including the World Bank, IFAD and Regional Development Banks), GEF, UNDP and other UN organizations to submit reports to future Sessions. It was also suggested that future reports might include a synthesis of bilateral programmes, and of the activities of grassroots NGOs. The Commission took note of the relevant information provided by the NGOs present at the Session.

IMPLICATIONS OF UNCED FOR THE GLOBAL SYSTEM ON PGR

37. The Commission recognized the relevance of Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity for its work. It reviewed document CPGR/93/7, and agreed that it provided a useful and clear summary of the issues under consideration.

38. The Commission noted that Agenda 21 is a comprehensive programme of action agreed by about 180 countries. Its Chapter 14 recognizes the identity and special character of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA), giving them the status of a comprehensive "programme area". Agenda 21 recommends the strengthening of the Global System and its components, as well as actions at the national and international level. It makes specific reference to a number of components of the Global System. These include the World Information and Early Warning System, the in situ network, the report on the State of the World's PGR, and the Global Plan of Action. Furthermore, Agenda 21 supports the convening of the Fourth International Technical Conference on PGR. It also recommends taking further steps to realize Farmers' Rights.

39. The Commission recognized that the Convention on Biological Diversity, once operative, will play a central role in determining policy on PGR in the future. The Commission noted that the main implications of the Convention are at the policy, legal and institutional levels, and include issues which need to be addressed within the Global System, not only those already covered by the Convention, but also those identified as outstanding matters in Resolution 3 of the Nairobi Final Act of the Convention on Biological Diversity: access to ex situ collections not acquired in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the question of Farmers' Rights.

40. The Commission noted that the Convention had not yet entered into force, but would likely do so in 1993 or 1994. It also noted that the Convention may adopt protocols. The Commission also indicated that this possibility could be applied to the PGR sector, and, if so, it should play the major role in developing any proposed protocol, in full cooperation with the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its precursor, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Convention on Biological Diversity. It was stated that a
A protocol on PGR may be served by its own governing body, secretariat, and a financial mechanism subject to the governing body of the Convention.

**Review of the International Undertaking**

41. The Commission recognized that the concepts contained in the Global System had evolved, and that the Undertaking included three annexes recognizing the sovereign rights of countries over their plant genetic resources, and plant breeders' rights and Farmers' Rights.

42. The Commission *agreed* that the process of adjusting the Undertaking should address several questions: consolidation of annexes into the Undertaking, and its harmonization with the relevant provisions of the Convention; issues such as access to samples of genetic resources for food and agriculture, for breeding and research purposes, especially those in *ex situ* collections not acquired in accordance with the Convention; realization of Farmers' Rights, and the funding of activities pertaining to the conservation and sustainable use of PGR. The revision of the Undertaking should be conducted carefully, as a gradual pragmatic and step-by-step process, building on the consensus already achieved through the Commission's previous discussions, as embodied in the Undertaking and its annexes.

43. The Commission recognized that the negotiations should be carried out at the intergovernmental level. It suggested that, while using the Commission, and its Working Group, as the forum, negotiations must proceed in cooperation with the Governing Body of the international Convention on Biological Diversity.

44. The Commission *recommended* that FAO should collaborate with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as proposed in Resolution 2 of the Nairobi Final Act. The Commission noted that, at a later stage, FAO might, if it were requested, convert the revised Undertaking into a binding legal instrument, and that this might take the form of a protocol to the Convention. The Commission emphasized that the decision whether or not to transform the Undertaking into a protocol to the Convention would have to be taken at a later stage, by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, and that the first steps of the process of revising the Undertaking should not pre-empt this later decision.

45. The Commission also emphasized that efforts to realize Farmers' Rights through the fund envisaged in Conference Resolution 91/3 should continue, and that the need for a separate funding mechanism would be especially important in the event that the addition of the revised Undertaking to the Convention on Biological Diversity as a legally binding protocol was not achieved. It was also suggested that the Commission carefully monitor developments with respect to Intellectual Property Rights legislation, and assess their implications for the Undertaking.
46. The Commission emphasized that a revision of the Undertaking should not imply any slowing down of the efforts to develop and implement the Global Plan of Action, in line with its decisions, as endorsed by UNCED in Rio de Janeiro. The revision process, and the development of the Global Plan of Action, should be an integral part of the preparatory process for the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources. The Commission recommended that the Director-General inform the Commission on Sustainable Development, and the Intergovernmental Committee of the Convention on Biological Diversity, on the process of revising the Undertaking. The Commission further recommended that extra-budgetary financial resources be mobilized to secure the full participation of developing countries in the negotiating process in the Commission and its Working Group.

47. The Commission agreed to recommend a tentative timetable for the revision, which included a Session of the Working Group in October 1993, followed by an extraordinary meeting of the Commission early in 1994. The intention was to conclude negotiations at the 1995 Session of the Commission, with the results presented at the International Technical Conference on PGR.

48. With the aim of revising the Undertaking, the Commission prepared and agreed the Resolution found in Appendix A.

Institutional

49. At the institutional level, the Commission agreed that:
   (i) the FAO Conference could provide recommendations to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, on matters related to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, and through this, to the financial mechanism of the Convention, on the funding of programme areas related to PGR for Food and Agriculture; and that
   (ii) the UN Commission on Sustainable Development should be periodically informed of the progress made by the Commission in the implementation of aspects of the Agenda 21 programme areas related to PGR for Food and Agriculture.

50. The possibility of establishing a joint CPGR and IGC/CBD task force was suggested, so as to facilitate complementarity between the Global System (including the Undertaking) and the Convention.

Access to Existing Ex Situ Collections

51. The Commission recognized that the Convention did not address the question of access to ex situ collections not acquired in accordance with the Convention on Biological
Diversity. The Commission took note of the following possible interpretations of this question submitted in Document CPGR/93/7:

(i) that these genetic resources were outside the Convention, and, since most of them were collected on the general understanding that PGR were the heritage of mankind, these resources should continue to be freely available, with a global compensatory mechanism;

(ii) that these genetic resources were outside the Convention, and therefore that the host country could legislate on ownership and conditions of access; and

(iii) that, since Parties to the Convention can provide only those genetic resources originating in their own countries, or acquired under the terms of the Convention, that the permission of the country of origin is required for the release of genetic resources from pre-existing collections. It was noted, however, that, in many cases, countries of origin cannot be identified, and that the collections are widely dispersed.

The Commission recognized that these interpretations needed further discussion before a conclusion could be reached.

52. The Commission suggested that a number of options that were not mutually exclusive might be explored within the Global System, including:

(i) the facilitation of bilateral agreements between countries of origin, when they can be identified, and countries holding \textit{ex situ} collections, for the sharing of the benefits;

(ii) the establishment of agreements between FAO and the owners of genebanks, including on access, along the lines of the "model basic agreements", as agreed at the Fourth Session of the Commission, and

(iii) the facilitation of a comprehensive multilateral agreement concerning access to \textit{ex situ} collections, including mechanisms to compensate countries of origin, possibly in the context of the proposed revision of the Undertaking.

53. However, the Commission agreed that there was a need to develop solutions to the issue of access to \textit{ex situ} collections not acquired in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as to the related issues of sharing the benefits, and the realization of Farmers' Rights. The Commission recommended that these matters be dealt with in close consultation with the IGC/CBD.

54. It was suggested that FAO collaborate with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Member Nations, UNEP, the CGIAR and other governmental and non-governmental organizations, to examine these issues regarding \textit{ex situ} collections.

\textbf{DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PLANT GERMPLASM COLLECTION AND TRANSFER}
55. The Commission considered the Draft International Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer (CPGR/93/8), as well as the minor modifications to the Code proposed by the Eighth Session of the Working Group (Appendix E). Further modifications were proposed, discussed and agreed during the session including modifications of the changes suggested by the Working Group (the agreed text is in Annex 1, a separate volume).

56. The Commission noted that the document was the result of the numerous consultations and difficult compromises that had followed the request by the Commission, in 1989, for the elaboration of a draft Code. The present draft incorporated comments received from several member countries, since the discussion of the previous version by the Commission in 1991. It was consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

57. The Commission noted the voluntary nature of the draft Code, and that one of its primary functions would be to serve as a reference document, to help individual countries establish their own codes or regulations, especially until the Convention on Biological Diversity enters into forces.

58. The Commission reaffirmed the need for the International Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer to become effective. It would allow countries to exercise sovereignty over, and to benefit from, their plant genetic resources, while at the same time creating conditions to facilitate access to genetic resources for environmentally sound uses. The concern was expressed that while discussions and negotiations went on in various international fora, genetic erosion was continuing. Potentially harmful and insidious collecting activities might also take place.

59. The Commission further recognised that the Code would need to be adaptable to changing needs and circumstances. It was noted that the Code could be updated, amended or modified, when appropriate, through the Commission.

60. With these considerations, the Commission endorsed the Draft International Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer. The Commission requested the Director-General to submit the draft Code and draft Resolution, through the Council, to the next Session of the FAO Conference, for its decision. The Commission proposed that the text of the Draft Resolution become the preamble to the Code, once adopted by the Conference.

TOWARDS AN INTERNATIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY AS IT AFFECTS THE CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

61. The Commission considered document CPGR/93/9, Towards an International Code of Conduct for Plant Biotechnology as it affects the Conservation and Utilization of Plant
Genetic Resources, which included a preliminary draft Code of Conduct, as had been requested by the Third and Fourth Sessions of the Commission. The Commission noted that this draft Code was presented for discussion as a preliminary draft only, and not for endorsement.

62. The Commission recalled that, at its Fourth Session, it had concluded that the Code of Conduct should, among other things, promote:

(i) the sustainable use of biotechnology in the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources;
(ii) access to plant genetic resources;
(iii) biosafety to minimize environmental risks throughout the world; and
(iv) the equitable sharing of the benefits of biotechnology between the owners of the technology, and the donors of the germplasm.

63. The Commission expressed satisfaction that, together with the draft Code, the document provided information on recent developments that may influence policy matters related to biotechnology, as it affects the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources, particularly as a result of UNCED's Agenda 21, and the Convention on Biological Diversity and associated resolutions.

64. The Commission reasserted the importance of the new biotechnologies as tools leading to increased food production and sustainable agriculture. It recognized the great potential of biotechnology for the conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources. It highlighted the urgency of meeting the challenges posed by applications of biotechnologies which might lead to possible trade and economic distortions, and the neglect of crops of local importance, and of commodities most needed by the developing countries and resource-poor farmers. It also expressed its concern with potentially unsafe applications of biotechnology. The Commission noted that the preliminary draft Code of Conduct addressed these major issues.

65. The Commission considered a number of questions addressed to it by the Secretariat in view of the recent developments in various international fora (especially UNCED Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity, WIPO and GATT). These included:

(i) whether a code of conduct on biotechnology was the most appropriate way of treating the various issues presently covered by the preliminary draft or whether some of them may be better treated as guidelines or in other ways;
(ii) whether the various matters (maximizing benefits; minimizing potential negative effects, intellectual property rights, biosafety, etc.) should all be addressed by a single code on biotechnology, or whether they should be separated.

66. The Commission agreed that the biotechnological developments concerning the sustained, equitable, and efficient conservation and use of PGR for food and agriculture
should be critically examined by the Commission, so that appropriate policy advice, and other support, could be provided to the Member Countries. It recommended that the implications of biotechnological developments for the availability of PGR, access to PGR, genetic erosion, technology transfer, and positive or negative socio-economic development, should be reviewed and analyzed by the Commission.

67. The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Eighth Session of the Working Group, to deal with the various major issues separately, rather than to maintain them under a single Code. The Commission noted that the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity (IGC/CBD), in accordance with Convention Articles 19(3) and 19(4), would consider the option of developing a biosafety protocol to the Convention. It recommended that, in order to avoid duplication and inconsistencies, the "biosafety and other environmental concerns" component of the preliminary draft Code would constitute an input to the work of the IGC/CBD on this matter. The Commission recommended that FAO participate in this work, in order to ensure that the aspects of biosafety in relation to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture are appropriately covered.

68. It was suggested that FAO further develop the remaining components of the draft Code. This should be done in close collaboration with the Commission on Sustainable Development, the Governing Body of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and other relevant international and national programmes, drawing, as appropriate, upon the preparatory process of the International Technical Conference. The objectives should be to help maximise the positive effects of biotechnology which applies to PGR for food and agriculture, and to minimise any potential negative effects, especially in developing countries. It should promote access to germplasm, as well as to biotechnology and related information. The Working Group should advise the Secretariat whether a revised draft Code should be prepared for presentation to the 1995 Session of the Commission.

69. The Commission recognized that, while several agencies and institutions are active in the area of biotechnology and related policy issues, the Commission was the only international forum for considering issues related specifically to biotechnology, in the context of the improved and sustained conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture. It recognised the need for further studies and discussions on the issues of access to genetic resources, intellectual property rights, and the equitable sharing of the benefits, in the context of biotechnology as it affects plant genetic resources. These should take into account the relevant provisions already included in the Convention, and the UNCED follow-up process. It recognized that related studies are being carried out by FAO, CGIAR, the interim Secretariat of the Convention, and other international and national programmes, and suggested that close links be maintained between these initiatives. The outcome of such studies and analyses would provide a good background for the further development of the draft Code. It further recommended that this subject, and results of the studies, be discussed at one of its next sessions, and at the Fourth International Technical Conference.
70. The Commission recognised that some of the other technical aspects covered in the draft Code could be incorporated into the Biotechnology Programme being developed by FAO, and that the Commission should be informed of the progress made in its development and implementation, at one of its future sessions. The Commission recommended that the Programme put particular emphasis on training scientists and technicians, as well as on increasing the understanding of policy makers - especially in the developing countries - of the need to develop and adopt appropriate biotechnologies. Emphasis should also be placed on increasing national capabilities for the assessment and transfer of the technologies, including the establishment and management of linkages among the sectors concerned.

INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF EX SITU BASE COLLECTIONS UNDER THE AUSPICES OR JURISDICTION OF FAO

71. The Commission reviewed developments regarding the International Network of Ex Situ Base Collections under the Auspices and/or Jurisdiction of FAO, and confirmed its endorsement of activities with respect to the establishment of this network (part V of document CPGR/93/5, and document CPGR/93/11).

72. The Commission welcomed the offer made by the CGIAR Centres to place their base and active collections under the auspices of FAO, and to receive policy guidance from the Commission on these collections, this being an important step towards the further development of the International Network. Clarification of certain specific points was sought, in view of the complexity of these matters, particularly concerning "ownership" of the resources held in these collections, and the implication of the concept, "trusteeship".

73. The Commission noted the explanations provided by representatives of the IARCs and the CGIAR, who stated that they did not regard themselves as "owners", but as "trustees" for these collections, which were the result of international cooperation. They managed them on behalf of the beneficiaries, in particular the developing countries, and they had the obligation to conserve the material to the highest technical standards, to duplicate it for safety reasons, to make it available without restrictions, and not to seek any intellectual property right over it. This last obligation would include, where possible, a transfer mechanism to avoid another party subsequently making the collections unavailable for research and breeding. The Commission requested that the draft proposal reflect these obligations.

74. The Commission recognised that the concept of the trusteeship of plant genetic resources needed to be clarified, in particular as it related to the concept of ownership. It recommended that these concepts, and that of "beneficiary", needed to be studied further by the Working Group, which would then report back to the Commission.

75. The Commission considered that, given its status as the only permanent intergovernmental forum dealing with plant genetic resources for food and agriculture, it
should play a role in the development of policy related to the collections. In line with this, the Commission suggested that the wording of Article 5 in the draft model agreement (Appendix 1 to document CPGR/93/11), be modified, and that the Centres be responsible for "developing", rather than "determining", policies related to the designated germplasm.

76. With these considerations, the Commission accepted the proposed model as a basis for negotiations between FAO and the CGIAR centres. The Commission requested the Director-General to negotiate and, if satisfied, to conclude agreements with the CGIAR Centres, taking into account the concerns it had expressed, and that the agreement reached would be reviewed by the Commission every four years.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL CONFERENCE, AND PROGRAMME ON THE CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

77. The Commission discussed document CPGR/93/10, and endorsed the Working Group's support for the aims and strategy of the proposed Fourth International Technical Conference, and Programme on the Conservation and Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources (ICPGR). It noted, in particular, that the ICPGR would:
   (i) transform the relevant parts of the UNCED process (including Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity) into a costed Global Plan of Action, based on the Report on the State of the World's Genetic Resources; and
   (ii) make the Global System for the Conservation and Use of Plant Genetic Resources fully operational.

78. The Commission stressed the importance of the work of the ICPGR for the related activities of FAO and other agencies, as well as a follow-up to the recommendations of Agenda 21, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. It strongly emphasized the urgent need to initiate the ICPGR, as soon as funding is identified, and extra-budgetary resources are pledged. It noted the risks involved in delaying the process and observed that use of Regular Programme funds to initiate the process, could be considered.

79. The Commission welcomed the offer of Germany to host the Conference, and thanked governments that had already pledged contributions, or expressed their intention to provide financial support.¹ The Commission also urged other donors to provide the needed funds and noted the offer of some countries to provide support through other means.

80. The Commission emphasized that the preparatory process must be participatory and country-driven, and that it should ensure the participation of all relevant organizations and

¹ During this Session the following countries have pledged: Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden.
institutions dealing with *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation, as well as the sustainable utilization of plant genetic resources, especially CGIAR, UNEP, the Governing Body of the Convention on Biodiversity, and NGOs. In relation to the costing of the Global Plan of Action and its identified projects, the need for cooperation with the World Bank, other multilateral funding agencies, and the GEF, was stressed. It was noted that the process of ICPGR is likely to be discussed at the proposed Intergovernmental Committee of the Convention on Biological Diversity. UNEP offered cooperation with FAO in this matter.

81. The Commission emphasized that the ICPGR should aim to develop consensus, and commitment from countries to the Global Plan of Action, and in accordance with the recommendations of Agenda 21. The Commission stated, in endorsing the view of the Working Group, that the Commission and its Working Group would provide policy guidance. It was stated that the 1995 session of the Commission would review the Global Plan of Action. There was agreement that the Global Plan of Action and revised Undertaking be presented to the Fourth International Technical Conference, attended at a high level.

82. The Commission agreed that ICPGR would play a major role in implementing Agenda 21, in the further implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and in making the Global System fully operational.

83. The Commission *agreed* on the need to facilitate the participation of developing countries, including both technical experts and policy makers, at the Conference.

84. To facilitate the preparatory process, the Commission *urged* that a Secretariat be appointed, according to the rules of FAO, as soon as possible.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE AND PROCEDURES FOR THE WORKING GROUP**

85. The Commission reviewed the terms of reference, and procedures of its Working Group. With respect to the terms of reference of the Working Group, the Commission agreed that they should be broad, in order to permit sufficient flexibility for the Commission to assign specific tasks to the Working Group. It was suggested that the Working Group take an active role reviewing the preliminary agenda of the Commission.

86. The Commission reaffirmed the present composition of the Working Group, stressing the need to provide for the participation, upon invitation, in an observer capacity, of members of the Commission that are not members of the Working Group, and experts, as well as representatives of specialized international organizations.

87. The Commission confirmed by acclamation Mr. Bolivar (Spain) for the Chair of the Working Group, to serve in this position until the next session of the Commission.

88. The Commission agreed that the members of the Working Group should be nominated by the Chairman of the Working Group, according to the regional distribution agreed by the
Commission in 1985, on the advice of each regional group. The regional groups should communicate to the Secretariat their nominations prior to 1 June 1993, according to the present procedures.

89. The Commission requested the Secretariat to prepare, for its next session, draft statutes for the Working Group which would include the mandate, the composition of the Group, and the frequency of meetings.

AGENDA, TIME AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION

90. The Secretary of the Commission presented the draft agenda of the Sixth Session of the Commission. The agreed draft agenda is attached in Appendix G. It was agreed that final decisions on the agenda, date and place of the Sixth Session would be determined by the Director-General, in consultation with the Chairman.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

91. The report was adopted by the Commission on 23 April, 1993.
RESOLUTION CPGR 93/1
REVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNDERTAKING ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

The Commission on Plant Genetic Resources

noting that:

- the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), in Chapter 14 of its programme of action, Agenda 21, recommended that the Global System on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Sustainable Agriculture be strengthened, and that the System should be adjusted to be in line with the outcome of the negotiations of a convention on biological diversity;

- the Convention on Biological Diversity, signed at UNCED by 156 governments and the European Communities, covers plant genetic resources, and recognizes that the authority to determine access to genetic resources rests with the national governments, that access to genetic resources shall be subject to the prior informed consent of the Contracting Party providing such resources, and shall be on mutually agreed terms;

- the Final Act of the Nairobi Conference for the adoption of the agreed text of the Convention on Biological Diversity, in a resolution on the interrelationship between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the promotion of sustainable agriculture, urged that ways and means should be explored to develop complementarity and cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global System for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Plant Genetic Resources for food and sustainable agriculture, and recognized the need to seek solutions to outstanding matters concerning plant genetic resources;

- the Fourth Session of the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources agreed that conditions of access to plant genetic resources needed further clarification;

recognizing:

- the importance and urgency of revising the International Undertaking, in harmony with the Convention on Biological Diversity, on a step-by-step basis, starting with the integration of the Undertaking and its annexes;

- the need to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits with the countries providing plant genetic resources;

- the need to consider agreement on the terms of access to samples of plant genetic resources, including those preserved in ex situ collections, and not addressed by the Convention on Biological Diversity;

- the need to realize Farmers’ Rights;

- the importance of close collaboration, including mutual reporting, in these matters, between the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources and the Governing Body of the Convention on
Biological Diversity, and before the entry into force of the Convention, the
Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as the
Commission on Sustainable Development;

The Commission:

recommends to the Conference that the Director-General be requested to provide a forum for
negotiations among governments:

- for the adaptation of the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, in harmony
  with the Convention on Biological Diversity;

- for consideration of the issue of access on mutually agreed terms to plant genetic resources,
  including *ex situ* collections not addressed by the Convention; as well as

- for the issue of realization of Farmers' Rights;

urges that the process be carried out through regular and extraordinary Sessions of the Commission
on Plant Genetic Resources, convened, if necessary, with extra-budgetary financing, and with the help
of its subsidiary body, in close collaboration with the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention
on Biological Diversity, and, after the entry into force of the Convention, with its Governing Body;

expresses the hope that the process be concluded in time for the FAO International Technical
Conference on Plant Genetic Resources; and

suggests that the outcome be submitted to the International Technical Conference, and to the
Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.
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Appendix D

REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

I. Introduction

1. The 7th Session of the Working Group was attended by Cape Verde, Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Libya, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, USA and Venezuela, and was chaired by Mr M. Worede (Ethiopia). The Working Group discussed two main documents: CPGR/WG/92/3 - Preparations for the 4th International Technical Conference on the Conservation and Use of Plant Genetic Resources (ICPGR), and CPGR/WG/92/4 - Implications of UNCED for the Global System on PGR.

II. The International Conference and Programme on PGR

2. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the International Technical Conference had been requested by both FAO Conference and Agenda 21 of UNCED. It also informed that the modifications introduced in the project document to meet the recommendations of an Expert Consultation held in June 1992 on this subject had raised the estimated cost of the project from about US$ 7 million to almost US$ 10 million and expressed concern for the budgetary implication it may have for the Organization, asking the Group to identify areas where the cost could be reduced.

3. The Group agreed that major aims of the Conference and its preparatory process would be:

   (i) to transform the relevant parts of Agenda 21 (especially area G of Chapter 14) into a costed Global Plan of Action; and

   (ii) to make the Global System for the Conservation and Use of PGR fully operational.

4. It was underlined that some of the activities envisaged at national, regional and global level during the two-and-a-half years of preparatory process would enhance record-keeping of existing PGR, raise public awareness and promote effective dialogue and coordination between all parties concerned with PGR and that these activities should be considered as concrete steps towards the implementation of Agenda 21. The Working Group also emphasized that the ICPGR should give similar importance to the conservation (in situ and "on-farm" - especially the Vavilov areas - and ex situ) and utilization (including plant breeding, biotechnology and seed production) aspects of PGR. It finally stressed the need to address economic aspects of PGR and to quantify genetic erosion.

5. The Group emphasized that the project document CPGR/WG/92/3 envisaged a full "programme" and not just a "conference". Given the need to raise awareness and forge commitment for action, the Group observed that the process involved more than the simple production of a number of documents. Indeed, the conference should be seen as a step in the process of developing consensus and commitment for a Global Plan of Action. The Group stressed the importance of the bottom-up country-driven approach and suggested that this approach be given prominence in the project document. It was thought that, with such a clarification, potential donors would understand that the budget includes far more than the holding of a conference.
6. While some delegations thought that the cost of the project reflected in the draft project document, circa $10m, was fully justified, other delegations thought that there were possibilities for reducing the cost. The Working Group recognized that the budget for the ICPGR may have to be reduced, and expressed its hope that such reductions, if necessary, should compromise neither the scientific integrity nor the bottom-up country driven approach of the process currently reflected in the draft project document. Amongst the items cited for possible budget reductions were: reducing the size of the core secretariat; reducing the amount allocated for financing travel by developing country representatives to various meetings; reducing general administrative and servicing costs; reducing the amount of documentation; reducing the number of sub-regional meetings; reducing the number of country reports; and/or reducing the number of theme papers and case studies.

7. On the question of funding, the Group noted the recommendation of the Commission and the Conference that funds should be extra-budgetary. However, some countries encourage the idea of exploring that some resources be made available from the FAO Programme of Work and Budget for 94/95. Other sources such as the GEF were also mentioned. During the discussion, some countries expressed their intention to provide extra-budgetary funds for the ICPGR, following the reception of the project proposal.

8. The Group considered that, given the constraints on time and the need to get the least concrete financial commitments, the project document should be sent to potential donors as soon as possible. Work on the preparatory process should be well underway before the meeting of the Commission in April. The Commission then will have the opportunity to review the process in the light of the donors’ financial commitments made and provide appropriate Terms of Reference of the ICPGR.

9. The Working Group discussed its possible role and that of the proposed "Advisory Committee" during the preparatory process of the ICPGR. A suggested solution for which there seemed to be agreement was:

(i) that a "Group of Experts" provides technical and scientific expert advice to the Secretariat. FAO would have responsibility for appointing the Group of Experts, recognizing that the primary concern is competence, but with regard to the need for regional balance;

(ii) that the Commission provides guidance at a political and policy level and that it decides - in its regular session in April 1993 - the precise role and mandate of its Working Group in the preparatory process;

(iii) additionally, the Commission might wish to function, at its 6th Regular Session in April 1995, as a preparatory body to review and negotiate the draft Global Plan of Action.

In this context one country observed that the meetings of the Commission and its Working Group discussing the ICPGR should be regarded as part of the FAO contribution.

10. With regard to the question of whether or not there should be a meeting of the Commission immediately after the ICPGR, an alternative suggestion to be also proposed to the Commission in April is that the ICPGR be attended by both technical experts and policy-makers and that it will effectively become a "summit meeting" for its last two days - for adoption and signing of the Global Plan of Action - during which attendance at a high level will be encouraged.

11. The Group agreed on the need to facilitate participation of developing countries at the Conference if funding is available. In order that both technical experts and policy-makers can attend, a minimum of two participants per country was found desirable. Funding might possibly come from bilateral donors, but efforts should be made to allow multilateral funding of at least one participant
from each interested developing country. The country suggested that the establishment of a separate trust fund might facilitate financing participation of developing countries representatives.

12. There was general support for the proposal of using the FAO regional conferences in the consultation process, and some countries supported the idea of extending these regional conferences in order to allow time for discussions related to the ICPGR.

13. The Group agreed that although "country reports" are part of the project proposal, full-scale "country studies", which may or may not be undertaken in parallel, are outside the proposal. However, the preparatory process should draw upon any relevant information arising from the latter. In this context the Group encouraged the full and active involvement of FAO in the country studies on biodiversity, which are being coordinated by UNEP.

14. The Group considered that the preparatory process of the Conference to be led by FAO should ensure the participation of relevant organizations dealing with ex situ and in situ conservation as well as utilization of PGR. IBPGR, the IARCs and the Secretariat of the Biodiversity Convention as well as the World Bank, GEF and other multilateral financial institutions were singled out.

III. Other Implications of UNCED

15. It was recognized that there were many complex issues under this item and that further discussion would be required at the Commission. Some delegations expressed disappointment that an extraordinary session of the Commission to consider the implications of UNCED had not been convened due to lack of funding. A delegation member considered that the ICPGR would be a suitable forum to address some of these issues.

16. The Group noted that Agenda 21 has recommended the strengthening of the Global System and its different components making special reference to the need to take further steps to develop Farmers’ Rights. The Group supported the strengthening of the Global System and the need to realizing Farmers’ Rights by implementing Resolution C 91/3. Some countries suggested that the International Fund and mechanism envisaged in this resolution can be a window of the fund for the Convention on Biodiversity, and maybe of GEF during the interim period.

17. The Group noted that the Resolution 3, "The Interrelationship between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Promotion of Sustainable Agriculture" approved without reservation by the Diplomatic Conference for the Adoption of the Convention on Biological Diversity, considered that there should be complementarity between the Convention and the FAO Global System on PGR and the "outstanding matters" such as access to existing ex situ collections and the development of Farmers’ Rights should seek solutions within the Global System.

18. While some delegations did not express a view on the interpretation of the Convention on Biodiversity with regard to the issues of access to existing ex situ collections, those which did express a view favoured the interpretation that these genetic resources are excluded from the Convention and since most of them were collected on the general understanding that PGR were the heritage of mankind, these resources should continue to be freely available, possibly with a global compensatory mechanism. The problem (in some cases impossibility) of identifying the country/ies of origin for much of the material stored in genebanks was noted and recognized as an handicap for developing bilateral agreements with each country of origin. It was further noted that much of the material stored in ex situ collections has been widely distributed to many genebanks and breeders and consequently the country of origin, when known, and even if bilateral agreements were granted to it, might have real difficulties to exercise any kind of control on these collections. It was suggested that the
implementation of Farmers Rights, as envisaged in FAO Conference Resolution 3/91, might provide a suitable compensation mechanism.

19. The hope was expressed that the Code of Conduct for Germplasm Collection and Transfer should be finalized and agreed at the next meeting of the Commission.

20. The issue of "on-farm" conservation was discussed, and it was noted that this would be an important and complementary method for conserving PGR for food and agriculture productive importance, particularly in Vavilov centres of diversity.

21. There was general agreement that consideration should be given to a possible review of the International Undertaking. While some delegations thought that this should be limited to revising the Undertaking in order to integrate the three annexes with the main text of the Undertaking in order to improve internal consistency, others thought that the Undertaking should be renegotiated to become a legally binding instrument, possibly as a protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity with its own funding, Secretariat and Governing Body. In this context, it was emphasized that the agreements embodied in the Undertaking and its annexes were the result of many years of careful and painstaking work and negotiation that must be preserved and form the basis of any further negotiations. It was agreed that any revision or renegotiation of the Undertaking should be a step-by-step process in the FAO Commission on Plant Genetic Resources, and that while ensuring the maintenance of the current adherence, it should aim at attracting the countries which did not yet adhere to it. It was suggested that the Secretariat might prepare a note for the next meeting of the Commission on this idea. A country expressed its hope that a reviewed International Undertaking could be ready for endorsement during the ICPGR.

22. The need for full cooperation and interaction between the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources and the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and in the interim period, the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as between both Secretariats was recognized.

23. Several countries stressed the special nature of Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) and the differences on methodologies and strategies between the conservation and sustainable use of general biodiversity and that of PGRFA, including the different emphasis needed on intra-species diversity. Based on these considerations, there was general agreement that the CPGR should keep its role as the primary intergovernmental forum for discussions and negotiations of technical and policy matters related to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, including the development of possible protocols for the Convention on Biodiversity related to PGRFA. In this context the Group suggested that ways and means for cooperation and distribution of responsibilities between the CPGR and the interim Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity should be developed.

24. Support was expressed for the ideas that at the institutional level: (i) the Commission should provide policy advice to the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on matters related to PGRFA, and to the Participants’ Assembly of the GEF on funding of PGRFA projects; (ii) the Commission should report to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development on the implementation of the Agenda 21 programme area on PGRFA.

IV. Other matters

25. The Working Group was informed that Mr C. di Mottola Balestra has presented his resignation as Chairman of the Working Group. The Group expressed its truthful appreciation for the work accomplished by Mr di Mottola during his two mandates in the chair of the Group and agreed
that Mr M. Worede, Chairman of Commission would chair the Working Group till the Commission accepts the resignation of Mr di Mottola and designates a new Chairman.

26. The Group also discussed the current Terms of Reference and regulations and the possibility of amending and adapting them to the current needs, especially in view of the possible role it may have in the preparation process of the ICPGR. It was mentioned that the revision should cover elements such as interaction between the Working Group and the Chairman of the Commission as well as renewal of membership of the Working Group. Some members of the Working Group volunteered to send suggestions for a possible revision of the Terms of Reference.
Appendix E

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE COMMISSION ON PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES

I. Introduction

1. The Eighth Session of the Working Group was attended by representatives of Cape Verde, Congo, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Italy, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, the United States and Venezuela. In the absence of the acting Chairman, Mr M. Worede (Ethiopia), the Working Group elected Mr J. M. Bolivar (Spain) to chair the meeting.

2. The Working Group selected from the Provisional Agenda of the Fifth Session of the Commission those topics which it thought might facilitate the work of the Commission. The Working Group discussed the following documents in some detail: Draft International Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer (CPGR/93/8); Towards a Code of Conduct on Biotechnology as it affects Plant Genetic Resources (CPGR/93/9); International Network of Ex-situ Base Collections under the Auspices or Jurisdiction of FAO, and Model Agreement for the International Research Centres (CPGR/93/5/Annex). The Working Group also reviewed other matters concerning the ex-situ collections and the implications of UNCED (documents CPGR/93/5 and CPGR/93/7), and discussed possible changes in the Terms of References of the Working Group and the election procedures for its members and Chairman.

The Working Group observed that, in view of the heavy programme of work of the Commission and the importance of the material to be discussed, it would be advisable to speed up the Commission’s discussions to allow enough time for each item to be discussed.

II. Code of Conduct for Plant Germplasm Collecting and Transfer

3. The Working Group considered it highly important that the Fifth Session of the Commission finalize this document for presentation to the Conference of FAO in November 1993.

4. The Working Group agreed to recommend that the Commission approve the text presented by the Secretariat with the changes appearing in the Annex to this report. These changes, which do not affect the substance of the document, could be presented under Agenda Item 7. The Working Group also considered that the Text of the Draft Resolution (Appendix 1 of document CPGR/93/8) might be an appropriate preamble to the Code.

III. Code of Conduct on Biotechnology as it Affects Plant Genetic Resources

5. Given the complexity and importance of the matters covered by this Code, the Working Group observed that it would be advisable for the agenda of the Commission to proceed so as to allow sufficient time for discussion of Item 8.1.

6. Some delegations expressed the view that it was extremely urgent to have a Code on Biotechnology prior to the appearance on the market of plant biotechnology products.
7. There was general agreement that these questions should be approached pragmatically, and that it might be better to deal with them separately rather than to lump them all together under a single Code. In this respect, it was suggested that the most urgent could be dealt with immediately, whereas the less urgent could be left for discussion at future sessions of the Commission and its Working Group. It was also agreed that the Code should be limited to those aspects directly affecting food and agriculture, although which aspects these were and which were the most urgent was not defined.

8. Some delegations, in consideration of the complexity of the matters covered by the Code, pointed out that some matters might be better handled by other fora, and that some components of the Draft Code might be shifted to them as a contribution of the Commission. It was specifically suggested that the section on biodiversity could contribute to the studies on biosecurity undertaken in the context of the convention on Biological Diversity. However, the Working Group did not discuss the mechanisms for interacting with these other fora.

9. The Working Group agreed that the Code should be addressed primarily to governments, and also to the relevant organizations and professional associations, and that this should be reflected in Article 4.2.

IV. Availability of Plant Genetic Resources, Status of Existing ex situ Germplasm Collections, and Other Matters derived from UNCED

10. The Working Group recalled its discussions at the Seventh Session concerning the implications of UNCED for the Global System (CPGR/93/7).

The Working Group observed that the Convention on Biological Diversity did not cover access to ex situ germplasm collections existing prior to the entry in force of the Convention, and that those approving the Text of the Convention as part of the Final Act of the Conference in Nairobi considered that this matter should be resolved within the Global System.

11. Consideration was given to the fact that both Article 15 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Article 5 of the International Undertaking of FAO, stated that the sharing of germplasm should be upon mutually agreed terms.

12. The Working Group acknowledged the role of bilateral agreements under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Nonetheless, it thought it might be highly important to develop a broader multilateral agreement under mutually agreed terms, with adequate compensations, in order not to restrict access to germplasm. Otherwise, with the entry in force of the Convention, so many different bilateral agreements might be required that the availability and sharing of germplasm would be seriously restricted.

13. The Working Group agreed to recommend that the Commission give priority consideration to finding ways and means to ensure complementarity and closer cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global System.

14. The Working Group, recalling the debate during its Seventh Session, also agreed to recommend that the Commission give priority to taking the necessary steps to revise the International Undertaking, incorporate its three annexes into the main body of the text and harmonize its wording and concepts with the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as to develop a multilateral agreement in mutually agreed, equitable terms concerning germplasm (as mentioned).
15. With reference to intellectual property rights, some delegations insisted that germplasm collected in one country should not be protected by the recipient country in such a way as to restrict its use in the donor country.

V. The Proposal of the IARC to Place its Germplasm Collections within the International Network of Base Collections under the Auspices of FAO

16. The Working Group discussed the proposal of the IARC to place its collections within the international network under the auspice of FAO (Document CPGR/93/11).

17. The Working Group expressed satisfaction with this decision of the IARC. Some delegations asked for clarification of certain specific points, particularly concerning the "ownership" of the resources held in the collections, and the implications of the concept of "trusteeship".

18. The Director of the IBPGR commented on some of these points. He noted that the question of "ownership" is unclear; that much of the material in the collections is the result of international cooperation and, therefore, should be considered public property; and that, often enough, the origin of the materials is unknown. He made the point that the centres consider themselves to be the custodians of the germplasm and not the owners, and that they have the obligation to make the materials accessible. This obligation would include, where possible, mechanisms to avoid another party making the collections inaccessible, for example through intellectual property rights. He explained that although the original parent material would be part of the international collection, not all breeding lines would; only those with characteristics of particular interest.

19. It was suggested that the draft model Agreement (Appendix 1 of document CPGR/93/11) should include provisions on the duplication of the germplasm designated in other genebanks, and on the situation which would arise should a centre close. It was also proposed that the wording of Article 5 be modified to make the centres responsible for "developing" rather than "determining" policies. Further clarification of the implications of the concept of "trusteeship" for the ownership of germplasm was also requested.

VI. The Svalbard International Seedbank

20. It was considered that FAO negotiations to ensure the long-term funding of the proposed Svalbard International Seedbank should be continued. It was also considered that priority for the placing of seeds should be given to those countries which lack the appropriate facilities.

VII. Genebank Standards

21. The Working Group agreed to recommend that the Commission adopt the text of the set of standards for genebanks (CPGR/93/5/Annex). It observed that the standards were applicable only to plants which produced orthodox seeds, and that once the technologies had been developed, standards should also be established for plants with non-orthodox seeds, vegetatively propagated plants and other perennials not covered by the present standards.
VIII. Procedures and Terms of Reference for the Working Group

22. The current Terms of Reference of the Working Group were reviewed. These were: "to consider the progress made in implementing the Commission’s Programme of Work and any other matters referred to by the Commission" (CPGR/85/Rep paragraph 78). There was general agreement that these broad Terms of Reference were appropriate for the Working Group.

23. It was agreed that the current procedures for electing the Working Group, whose composition is based on the regional groups, was satisfactory, but that the tenure of the Working Group and the principle of rotation did require attention and clarification. It likewise agreed that the Working Group should have a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman. There was also agreement that the Working Group should be empowered to invite observers to its meetings where relevant.

24. The Working Group discussed some options for the election of its members and its period of tenure. The representative of the FAO Legal Office described the system for the election of the Council. The general feeling, however, was that this was a very elaborate procedure, and perhaps a complicated one, and that a "lighter" system might be more appropriate for the Working Group. Some delegations expressed the view that it would be useful to have a system whereby only a portion of its members were replaced at each election, so as to ensure continuity and at the same time to facilitate rotation. The Legal Counsel was asked to present some options for possible consideration by the Commission.
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**Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Rep. 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asia and the South West Pacific**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat. People’s Rep. of Korea 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep. of 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latin America and The Caribbean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbuda 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep. 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Christopher and Nevis 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and The Grenadines 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Near East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep. of 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman 2/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**North America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America 1/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Commission

Countries which have adhered to the International Undertaking

The above totals 135 countries which have become members of the Commission on Plant Genetic Resources (118) or which have adhered to the International Undertaking (107).
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ESTONIA/ESTONIE
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Division for the Coordination of Agricultural Research
GHANA

Representative
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Miriam WALDMAN Jerusalem Director, Biological and Ecological Research Program Ministry of Science and Technology
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