

The Vision Paper
ISSUES FROM DISCUSSIONS (chart writing 20 June 2005):

BACKGROUND:

- Time-line of historical events
- Duplicates – emphasize extent rather than quantities
- Introduce concept of Base-collection
- Relate to conservation in GPA and ITPGRFA and Trust
- Include paragraph of EU policy and EC Regulations and address roles of national programmes

1. PROBLEM STATEMENT:

- Arguments concept of sub regional collaboration
- Conservation not included on environment, scientific expertise, biology (mostly political)
- Difficult to identify duplicates (identify references (Theo van Hintum)) expensive (needs more money)
- Focus on conservation or ML access (have to look at access/use; open mind to access)
- Lack hooking up AEGIS to scientific basis such as linkage with *in situ* – on farm, use and research, international collaboration
- Problem also cultural aspects/heritage in GB

2. GOAL:

- Turn –ve to +ve – include arguments about environment, scientific expertise, biology, ecogeographic, *etc.*
- Should we only include food and agricultural crops? Expand scope? “PGRFA”
- Should not restrict use
- Genetically unique (and important??)

- Vigor change to viability
- MLS → European system
- Vision should restrict to genebank; need to have clear understanding of
 - Genebank → definition e.g. under box 2
 - Accession → definition e.g. under box 2
- Include sentence on links to *in situ*, use and research, international collaboration
- Delete last sentence. Transfer the idea on genetic uniqueness to first sentence
- Include rational system in 1st sentence
- Delete '*bona fide*'

3. SCOPE

3.1. MEMBERSHIP:

- Policies important – careful on EU institutions as key players – maybe other institutions → GBs also outside EU can play a role
- Delete last sentence in last paragraph
- Questions about private GBs being eligible
- Move EU membership in last sentence to the first
- Role of national institution?
- Delete in 2nd paragraph: ECP/GR....
- Explain selection procedure. Countries to invite stakeholders to join – (use language in Treaty). Under clear conditions
- Delete last sentence in first paragraph
- Include centre of div. in some countries in next section

3. SCOPE

3.2. GERMPLASM:

- Criteria AEGIS → Europe
- Standard terminology CWR originated in Europe and other countries; merge bullets 7 and 8

- Add landrace to 3rd bullet
- Need to discuss with Trust issues about which collections in AEGIS
- Question about wild plant species economically important?
- Who decides inclusion of germplasm in system?
- Question about 'high importance'
- Are the criteria necessary?
- Different approach – selection process by genebank
- Institutions to first make offers to crop advisory groups as to what will be included
- Leave details to crop advisory group which level to include their collection based on criteria of MOS
- Accessions that have better info preference over those that have less – documentation can be one of criteria
- What is 'valuable' accession?
 - Potential value
 - Scale of diversity
 - → criteria that define the value markers, distribution (geographical)
 - Core collections

4. DESCRIPTION OF VISION:

- First bullet: need legal advice relating to MTA
- Need for AEGIS general MTA with specific conditions
- Suggestion to follow IT or other MTA?
- AEGIS MTA might be less restrictive than IT MTA
- Need system that is built on trust (mutual), scientific bases
- AEGIS needs to focus on conservation and access issues follows IT (cannot undermine IT)
- Suggestion not to differentiate between Annex 1 and Non-Annex 1 species within AEGIS
- Rationalize access to does not matter who holds the accession
- Crop Advisory Group – extended to include users, researchers

- who will it be? Include crops REPs etc.
- Networks?
- Use ECP/GR SC for unclear issues to discuss
- ECP/GR working group take decisions on who will be included in crop Advisory Group
- Additional role of coordinating national institution to oversee activities at national level (using existing focal point such as National inventory *ex situ* collection, national coordinator etc.
- Question about ECP/GR CCD
- Is there a need lead European institution? Yes → link with CCD
- Need for monitoring on standard agreed on
- Need for reporting function of European institute
- How to deal with savings in AEGIS! Between GBs → Finances → co-financing → needs criteria!
- General standards required (documentation)
- Characterization/evaluation data → public domain data

5. BASELINE:

- Exclude section of Baseline, represent it graphically
- Move Baseline figure in background section or in Problem Statement. Part of it could also go in Implementation section

6. BENEFITS:

- Should have pro's and con's of the system?
- Disadvantages? Or risks?
- Vision → Benefits and Costs
- How to overcome constraints → chapter on constraints? Include not only conservation → concept of Base / Active collections → Related activities – characterizing, evaluation *etc.*
- Cost savings – put more in positive way
- Better quality – base on environment, climate, biology

- Identify duplicates costly initially but leads to savings in LT
- Easier for other regions to collaborate with Europe
- Flexibility – crop expertise – local expertise
- European Commission
 - infrastructure supporting research
 - 870
- Capitalize on technological advances
 - in research
- Benefit can concentrate on few genera / species
- Increased access to expertise
- Discussion of labour/tasks → everybody can find a role even NGO's
- Link to *in situ* / on farm