



European Cooperative Programme for Plant Genetic Resources (ECPGR)

Minutes of the 5th ECPGR Executive Committee meeting Maccarese, Italy, 5-7 November 2013

Present: Alvina Avagyan (Armenia), Zofia Bulińska-Radomska (Poland), Fernando Latorre (Spain), Jens Weibull (Sweden), Gert Kleijer (Switzerland), Lorenzo Maggioni and Jan Engels (ECPGR Secretariat)

The Agenda for this meeting is available at:
http://www.ecpgr.cgiar.org/executive_committee.html

1. Financial status of ECPGR

The estimate balance of Phase VIII at the end of 2013 was presented by the Secretariat, amounting to a total of about € 509 000. This sum would remain unspent, out of a total budget of € 2 941 053 for Phase VIII. However, outstanding contributions remain at the level of € 435 750 (€ 401 450 related to Phase VIII plus € 34 300 related to Phase VII). Therefore, the estimated cash balance of Phase VIII at the end of 2013 is about € 73 400, should no further contributions be received before the end of the year. However, some of the outstanding contributions might be received before the end of the year (notably from Denmark and from Italy, but possibly also from other countries) and these would increase the cash balance at the end of Phase VIII.

It was noted that a number of countries have already paid contributions for the first or even the second year of Phase IX. Thanks to these countries (Bulgaria, Latvia, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland), the amount of € 87 250 pertaining to Phase IX has been already received.

The situation of countries that have not contributed to ECPGR for several years was discussed and it was agreed that only in cases with a potential for success the Secretariat should invest time and, where possible, also travel to lobby for the outstanding payments and for renewed membership. In these cases, it will be the responsibility of the National Coordinators (NCs) to prepare the ground and indicate whether any direct action from the Secretariat might be useful to obtain the outstanding payments and the renewal of the membership.

Decision 1

It was agreed that, with the start of Phase IX (January 2014), in conformity with the Rules of Procedure of ECPGR, the following specific provisions will be taken:

- 1) *Countries that never signed the Letter of Agreement (LoA) and never paid contributions during Phase VIII (Armenia and Malta) will not be considered any longer members of ECPGR until they sign for a new membership and pay the outstanding contributions.*
- 2) *Countries with two years or more of outstanding contributions will have no right to use ECPGR funds.*

- 3) *At the end of 2015, countries with two years or more of outstanding contributions will be notified that they are neither eligible to use ECPGR funds or vote for Steering Committee decisions.*

2. Agreements and arrangements related to the start of Phase IX and to the move of the Secretariat and of EURISCO

2.1. Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between ECPGR, the Trust and Bioversity

The Trust had notified the intention to withdraw from the bid they had submitted in November 2012, due to logistic, financial and legal issues. The expected formal letter with this notification, sent by the Global Crop Diversity Trust Executive Director, Marie Haga, was received by Gert Kleijer, Chair of the Executive Committee (ExCo) during the meeting. Consequently, the draft MoU that should have been signed by the ECPGR member countries to enter into an agreement with Bioversity and with the Trust for the hosting of the Secretariat during Phase IX was no longer relevant to be discussed in its current form.

The ExCo decided that a letter should be sent in reply to Marie Haga, with copy to the Chair of the Executive Board of the Trust, Mr Walter Fust. The letter should recapitulate the sequence of events, pointing out that ECPGR had not been trying to be hosted by the Trust, but rather responding to a spontaneous offer from the Trust. It should be regretted that a lot of time and efforts were invested in responding to the Trust on the basis of statements made by the Trust in its formal bid, statements which the Trust was eventually unable to honour. Upon consideration of the above, a suggestion should be made that the costs of the consultancy of the legal advisor, who was acting both on behalf of the Trust and of ECPGR, should be entirely borne by the Trust.

Regarding the next steps to find a host for the ECPGR Secretariat during the second part of Phase IX (2016-2018), the ExCo considered that the standard procedure would be to talk with the second bidder (Bioversity International), which had presented an offer considered eligible by the SC at its 13th meeting (Vienna, December 2012). Given the high cost originally requested by Bioversity International for the hosting, the discussion should primarily focus on the possibility to be granted more favourable financial conditions than originally proposed.

The alternative option to immediately publish a new tender was considered not desirable for the following reasons:

- Bioversity would likely not participate in a new tender and therefore we would lose the opportunity to explore the conditions that might still be negotiable with Bioversity.
- It remains difficult for a national institution to ensure the legal status for an international secretariat and therefore we would run the risk of launching a tender for which no institution would be prepared to submit a bid.
- Given the previous experience, the tender procedure in general was unanimously considered to bear high transactions costs and a low chance of success.

Decision 2

The following actions were agreed:

- *ExCo Chair to send a letter of reply to the Trust*
- *ExCo Chair to discuss with Bioversity's Director General about existing options and then to propose a decision to the Steering Committee (process to be completed by the end of November). This discussion should also reconfirm the conditions agreed by the previous DG for the first two years of Phase IX, and verify whether it would be necessary to prepare a MoU between the ECPGR countries and Bioversity in a more detailed form than it had been in the past.*

- *In case the negotiation with Bioversity would not be successful:*
 - *The LoA for membership to ECPGR Phase IX would only refer to the first two years of the Phase (including a budget which would be limited to 2014-15).*
 - *All NCs would be asked to explore possibilities for hosting the ECPGR Secretariat as of 2016, including national institutions or other arrangements.*
 - *The ExCo and the Secretariat would explore other international options: FAO, Council of Europe and/or others.*
 - *All the potentially successful arrangements proposed by the NCs would be verified in detail by the ExCo, in order to identify the most suitable and convenient one.*

2.2. MoU between Bioversity and IPK for EURISCO

The MoU for the hosting of EURISCO by IPK on behalf of the Trust had been agreed by both parties, but the decision to maintain the ECPGR Secretariat at Bioversity until the end of 2015 required adapting the MoU and making it a Bioversity/IPK agreement. Bioversity provided a number of amendments to the draft MoU, specifically requiring that the new MoU remained compatible with the Data Sharing Agreements (DSA) that Bioversity has signed with the countries providing data to EURISCO. One of the DSA provisions is that countries provide data to Bioversity. A literal interpretation of this article is making Bioversity to request that all the data should physically transit through Bioversity before being delivered to IPK. Since it would not be the intention of Bioversity to manage or to see these data, a technical solution should be set up at a negligible cost and without interference with the uploading mechanisms, to allow automatic delivery of the data to IPK.

Decision 3

The revised MoU between Bioversity and IPK will need to be commented by Gerald Moore and eventually an agreement should be reached with IPK on a final text.

Regarding the transfer of the EURISCO database and its website to IPK, a visit to Maccaresse by IPK staff took place in October. IPK identified the need to be provided with a description of the “back-end” infrastructure of EURISCO, as well as of the source codes of the scripts used for the website. As these documents do not exist, Bioversity will estimate the cost of developing them, as well as any other cost inherent to the transfer of EURISCO which will be charged to ECPGR.

Decision 4

The ExCo agreed to consider the payment of the necessary costs of the transfer, with the understanding that the tasks required from Bioversity should be completed within a short deadline.

3. Expectations regarding ECPGR and AEGIS in the transition phase

ECPGR is going through a critical time, with a high expectation having been raised especially regarding the establishment of the European Collection. The process is however revealing to be slow and complex, while necessary funding for activities that might speed up the implementation has not been secured.

Confronted with the above scenario, the ExCo members reiterated that they continue to see an important role for ECPGR in terms of enabling the sharing of responsibilities in Europe and of ensuring inclusiveness of all member countries, avoiding the creation of a North-South or East-West divide.

Decision 5

Two types of actions were considered important to be carried out:

- 1) *Developing a document listing all the benefits that a good operation of ECPGR can bring to the individual countries. These arguments should be used in a letter to be addressed to the NCs inviting the countries to join Phase IX.*
- 2) *Devoting more efforts to raising additional funds (see point 4 below).*

4. Actions to be undertaken to raise additional funds

It was proposed that ECPGR should try to diversify its sources of funding and explore the opportunities that may exist in terms of Foundations, with priorities for example on East-West cooperation in Europe. Also private companies in the food business or breeding companies might have an interest in associating themselves with securing the conservation and use of European germplasm in the public domain. Additionally, collaboration platforms with breeders are working well in some countries and these experiences could be up-scaled to a regional level.

The portal of the *Facilitating Mechanism for the Global Plan of Action*, which is offering information on funding opportunities, was mentioned (www.globalplanofaction.org).

The option to devote more resources of the ECPGR Secretariat to investigate funding opportunities was weighted against the risk of reducing the momentum for the implementation of AEGIS. Considering that at the moment very few funds seem to be available for activities in Phase IX, increasing fund-raising efforts, but without completely disrupting the routine of ECPGR, seemed wise.

Decision 6

It was agreed that the NCs, ExCo and the Secretariat should stimulate the Working Groups (WGs) into becoming more involved in the development of project proposals that are in line with the objectives of ECPGR. The Secretariat should be open and prepared to help WG members with advice and support. The Secretariat should also become more proactive in exploring opportunities for funding and pursuing the most promising ones. It would also be useful to set up a page on the ECPGR website, listing potential funding opportunities.

5. Restructuring of ECPGR - Status of implementation and pending items

5.1. ECPGR objectives

It was noted that the revised draft logframe of the ECPGR objectives, prepared by a Task Force led by Bert Visser, is a quite advanced and improved document. It was also noted that this document has a very ambitious workplan for Phase IX and that some activities might not be feasible, while others depend on stakeholders that are beyond the control of ECPGR. Therefore, while this document offers a useful guide of the direction that ECPGR wishes to take, it would not be possible to use it as such as an instrument to measure the accountability of the Programme. Finally, it was noted that the section related to the *In situ* objectives is premature, until the concepts have been agreed by the SC. Also the “use” objective may need to be revisited, pending the results of the specific Task Force activity.

Decision 7

After the finalization of, and the agreement on the In situ concepts, the ECPGR logframe document, with a revised in situ section, will be circulated by the ExCo Chair to all the NCs and the Secretariat for comments to be sent to ExCo. The document will need to refer to the long-term goal of ECPGR and it should be specified what its primary use should be, either as a guiding document or as an accountability instrument.

5.2. Compilation of Terms of References (ToRs) of ECPGR and transition to Phase IX

The draft compilation prepared by the Secretariat was considered appropriate, although a few sections were missing or under discussion and these were discussed.

The Secretariat presented a proposal for the transition to the new mode of operation, which was accepted in the following terms:

- The WGs will start the new Phase maintaining their current composition and the mandate of the current Chairs will also be extended until the end of 2014.
- Mechanisms to renew the WG membership and to identify the Chairs for the new Phase will be initiated by the Secretariat with the aim to complete the transition to the new mode of operation by the end of 2014.
- During the transition period, ECPGR NCs will be invited to send names of experts corresponding to pre-defined categories of expertise (i.e. genebank curator, documentation specialist, breeder, etc.). The categories of expertise will be defined on the basis of the type of expertise that is needed to implement the objectives of ECPGR. No limits will be put to the number of experts that NCs wish to nominate for the WGs' pools of experts. NCs may equally remove names of experts from their respective country at any moment.
- On the basis of the Terms of Reference for the WG Chairs, NCs will be invited to propose Chairs that they recommend for any given WG. Expressions of interest compiled by the candidate Chairs and supported by the respective NC will be evaluated by the ExCo, who will take decisions and appoint the Chairs of the WGs.
- Expressions of interest for the Chair and for the experts participating in funded activities will be submitted on a standard template and will include: field of interest, range of expertise, experience of working in international projects, description of time availability and type of commitment that can be ensured, *curriculum vitae* with 3-5 relevant publications.

Decision 8

By the beginning of December 2013, the Secretariat will provide drafts of the following documents to be endorsed by the SC:

- *ToRs for the WG Chairs*
- *Template for expression of interest (by Chairs and WG experts)*
- *Categories of expertise and criteria for selection of experts*
- *Flow chart explaining the transition to the new mode of operation and the operations of ECPGR during Phase IX.*

5.3. Country quota

A draft mechanism provided by the Secretariat was discussed and agreed with some modifications.

The option of attributing quota percentages not only based on annual contributions, but also for instance on the number of EURISCO accessions was discussed. The number of EURISCO accessions, or other parameter, would be a proxy representing the diversity conserved by each country. It was agreed that a discussion on expanding the number of criteria used to assign country quota could be included in the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting.

Decision 9

A revised proposal for the quota mechanism is attached as Annex I to these minutes. This will need to be commented and eventually endorsed by the SC.

5.4. User's group Task Force

The Secretariat reported on progress made by the Task Force on User's groups, referring to the inputs made by the three Task Force members and the overall limited familiarity of this group with the ECPGR activity. Considering that the Task Force would not find it easy to autonomously provide a comprehensive report as it was requested in the Terms of Reference, and also considering that a parallel activity to strengthen relationships with users

is being undertaken by the PGR Secure project, the Secretariat made a proposal for the next steps, which was accepted by the ExCo in the following terms:

Decision 10

The Secretariat will draft a short “framework” report for the Steering Committee, using as a reference the suggested outcomes foreseen for the work of the Task Force. The Secretariat report would take into account the inputs received from the Task Force, the results of the PGR Secure initiative and the proposed logframe related activities that have been drafted by the Task Force on ECPGR Objectives. The report will be circulated for comments to the User’s Group Task Force members before finalization. Such report will also include proposed specific activities to be included in the ECPGR logframe (to be completed by end of January 2014).

5.5 In situ and On-farm Task Forces

The ExCo discussed about the progress of the two Task Forces that are working on the respective *In situ* concepts, i.e. Crop Wild Relatives conserved *in situ* and Landraces managed on-farm.

Decision 11

The ExCo agreed that when the two draft concepts will be completed, they will be circulated together to the NCs, who will have to carry out national consultations on both concepts.

6. Participation of ECPGR in the PGR Secure final conference

An invitation was recently sent by Nigel Maxted with the suggestion that ECPGR might participate in and/or lead a session of the *PGR Secure* final conference to be held in Cambridge, UK in June 2014, and titled *Vision of future European PGRFA conservation and use*.

The ExCo thought that this would be a good occasion to present the ECPGR objectives for Phase IX to a qualified audience. Some doubts were expressed whether this would be the appropriate forum to develop “the” European vision, but there was agreement that discussion on “a” European vision was welcome.

Decision 12

The Secretariat should send a positive response to Nigel and offer to give a 10 min presentation on the ECPGR objectives for Phase IX, but ECPGR should not take the lead of this discussion in this case. The Secretariat will prepare its inputs for the meeting in close consultation with the ExCo.

7. Preparation for Documentation and Information (Doc&Info) WG meeting in 2014

The importance of holding a meeting of the Doc&Info WG during 2014 was reconfirmed, in view of clarifying the relationship between EURISCO and the Central Crop Databases, as well as to inform the ECPGR community about the new management of EURISCO by IPK and about its expected future developments. It was also agreed that this would be an initiative deserving the expenditure of part of the foreseen carry-over funds of Phase VIII.

Decision 13

The Secretariat will contact the Coordinator of the Doc&Info Network (i.e. Chair of the Doc&Info WG as of January 2014) and start the preparation for a meeting with a budget of approximately € 35 000.

8. Definition of strategic steps to be taken

The ExCo summarized the strategic steps that should be taken in the end of 2013 and during 2014:

- Hosting arrangements: a solution needs to be found. Next steps are described above in chapter 2.1 (as soon as possible).
- Prepare invitation for countries to join Phase IX, including a list of expected benefits and a budget (beginning of December 2013).
- Complete the transfer of EURISCO to IPK (expected to be completed in early 2014).
- Finalize the *in situ* concepts through endorsement by the SC (expected conclusion around March-April 2014).
- Organize the meeting of the Doc&Info WG in the first semester of 2014
- Continue implementation of AEGIS by the Secretariat (ongoing).
- Secretariat to start exploring alternative fund-raising opportunities for ECPGR as a whole and set up a dedicated web page with funding opportunities for the ECPGR community (ongoing during 2014).

9. Possible actions to undertake with the European Union (EU) and European Commission (EC)

The ExCo revised the tasks and plans included in the *Strategy Paper on the ECPGR Relationship with the European Union/European Commission*. It was acknowledged that it would be difficult at this stage to interact with the EC or any other body until the arrangements for the hosting of the Secretariat had been settled, and the budget and membership for Phase IX would be better defined. Once the situation becomes clearer, it would be important to organize a visit to the EC and introduce ourselves to the relevant Directorates.

The Secretary provided some information on the latest available news regarding ESFRI (European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructure) and SCAR (Standing Committee on Agricultural Research), as well the respective lists of the representatives. There did not seem to be a clear opportunity in the pipeline for ECPGR action, other than monitoring the upcoming calls for proposal under Horizon 2020.

Fernando Latorre offered to check the situation through his national channels and prepare a draft letter to be sent to the NCs, including specific suggestions for lobbying with the EC, if appropriate.

Decision 14

The ExCo will wait until the ECPGR situation (hosting, budget, objectives, etc.) for Phase IX is clearer and then the Chair and the Secretariat will take appropriate action to make ECPGR's existence more visible in Brussels. A letter will be prepared to inform the NCs of possible lobbying actions to be undertaken through national authorities.

10. Clarification about the AEGIS Advisory Committee

The AEGIS Advisory Committee had been originally set up in 2009 to provide strategic and technical oversight to the Secretariat over the establishment and operation of AEGIS. The Committee, composed of individuals selected on the basis of their personal experience, served its purpose especially with regard to the selection of projects submitted for funding under the AEGIS competitive grant scheme.

A few members of this Committee eventually retired or changed jobs or became less available to dedicate voluntary time to this task. In the meantime, the ExCo was created as a

new ECPGR body in December 2010 and started to operate as an agile body providing oversight to the Secretariat over all matters. The question was therefore formulated whether it would still be justifiable to maintain two bodies or could the ExCo effectively absorb the function of the AEGIS Advisory Committee.

Decision 15

The ExCo agreed that the tasks so far assigned to the AEGIS Advisory Committee could be largely taken up by the ExCo itself, with the understanding that whenever specific tasks of a more technical nature should arise, the ExCo might decide to delegate these to a temporary ad hoc committee. This proposal will be submitted by the ExCo Chair to the SC for comments and final endorsement.

11. Replacement of one of the ExCo members

The ExCo Chair reminded the Committee that his own terms will expire at the end of 2014 and that he would not be available to extend his activity. Therefore, a new Chair will have to be identified and it would be useful to start exploring the existing possibilities.

Regarding the routine replacement of one of the current ExCo members to allow the rotation of the ExCo membership, Alvina Avagyan informed the Committee that she wished to make her position available for a new representative of the (broadly defined) Eastern region.

Decision 16

A ranked list of suggested candidates for the position of ExCo member was prepared and the Chair will explore the availability of the candidates, starting from the top of this list. The nomination suggested by the ExCo will then be proposed to the SC for endorsement before the end of the year.

12. Any other business

The Secretariat wished to mention the status of progress of the preparation of the *AEGIS Guidelines for Distribution of Material from the European Collection* and informed the Committee that one additional round of circulation will be necessary, considering that several comments and a few contentious issues had emerged during the process of preparation of this document.

The ExCo commented that this document would be valuable to enhance harmonization of AEGIS operations and agreed on the need to reach a final consensus, no matter how many rounds of circulation would be required.

ANNEX I. PROPOSAL FOR A COUNTRY QUOTA SYSTEM FOR ECPGR PHASE IX

1. Background and principles

1.1. Introduction

At its 13th meeting in Vienna, December 2012, the Steering Committee decided to maintain a country quota system to enable a fair use of the funds across countries to be spent for meetings and other activities. All the ECPGR member countries are expected to receive a direct benefit from the use of these funds. The SC requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft system, also giving an incentive to countries offering voluntary contributions, possibly in the form of “country quota”.

During the past two Phases, the country quota system consisted of a given and fixed “quota” (i.e. number of participants in meetings) that was assigned to each country on the basis of their contributing category (the larger the annual contribution, the higher the available quota). A number of quota units were reserved to the WG Chairs, who could invite one extra participant per meeting at their discretion, to ensure the presence of key experts, independently from their country of origin.

WG activities during Phase IX may consist of meetings and/or other activities (such as surveys, research, conservation actions, molecular analysis, etc.).

The number and type of activities is not known in advance, but they will be defined during the Phase, since allocation of funds for activities will be on the basis of a competitive scheme, whereby WGs will need to apply for funding.

The exact budget for activities is also not well known, since the expectation is that fund-raising and voluntary contributions will increase the budget during the course of the Phase. It should also be noted that an increased fraction of Phase IX budget, compared to Phase VIII, will be dedicated to EURISCO. The implementation of AEGIS by the Secretariat will also draw part of the resources. These portions of the budget dedicated to AEGIS and EURISCO should be considered to equally benefit all the countries.

The new mode of operation has introduced increased flexibility, compared to the past, i.e. the number and type of activities is not predefined, but it will depend on which proposals will be successful. Moreover, participation of experts of a given country in activities will be based on expertise and expression of commitment, rather than on the need to represent each country. At the same time, by maintaining a country quota system, the SC intends to guarantee that each country will have the opportunity to benefit from a certain level of participation in activities, either as an active involvement in the research or with the intention to build capacity. Therefore, the country quota system needs to strike a balance between contrasting requirements: on one hand the need for higher flexibility and competition (with the intention to obtain higher quality outputs), and on the other hand the need to insure a minimum level of participation to each country to ensure a Region-wide approach.

1.2. Principles and effects of a Country Quota for Phase IX

After considering the pros and cons of various options, the Secretariat, in consultation with the ExCo, elaborated the proposal below which is considered an acceptable compromise between the contrasting needs expressed by the Steering Committee regarding the adoption of a country quota within a new result-oriented mode of operation, aiming at flexibility, technical competence and efficiency.

The main principle of this proposal is that the country quota needs to be expressed in discrete units and it is the most practical to fix the value of one quota as corresponding to the average value of one night, including travel, spent in a meeting anywhere in Europe during Phase IX. Therefore, only the travel component (meetings) of the WG activities can be

regulated by a country quota, while the other activities are carried out by the successful project partners, outside of the quota system. Consequently, at the start of the Phase, it is necessary to establish the proportion to be spent for two components of the WG activities budget, i.e. “meetings” and “other activities” (e.g. 75% and 25%).

The advantages of a system based on the above principles are the following:

- The accounting mechanism and monitoring of use of country quota is simple and easy to display online in real time due to the already gathered experience with this system by the Secretariat.
- The cost of travel is equalized for all the countries (the cost of one night in a meeting anywhere is always one quota unit). In terms of the ECPGR budget, more expensive travels are compensated by less expensive ones. Each country is therefore given the same opportunities to attend meetings.
- Choice of partners and locations for other activities (other than meetings) is only based on expertise and technical convenience and is not influenced by the availability of quota in the various countries.
- The guarantee for all the countries to receive a benefit from ECPGR is insured (country quota for meetings), although the participation must be based on clear commitment (expressions of interest). Other activities are open to full competition.

One identified disadvantage is that flexibility is reduced, in the sense that the proportion of funds to be spent in meetings vs. other activities throughout the Phase needs to be pre-defined (e.g. 75% vs. 25%).

2. Proposed country quota system

2.1. Splitting the budget in “Meetings” and “Other activities”

The ECPGR budget for activities is split in two components, i.e. “Meetings” and “Other activities”. The relative proportion of the two components is defined at the start of the Phase, e.g. as 75% (Meetings) vs. 25% (Other activities). This proportion needs to be applied to the total budget for WG activities and therefore respected at the end of the Phase, but it does not apply to every single activity. Each activity approved for funding by the Steering Committee can therefore be planned in principle with total flexibility regarding the proportion of funds to be dedicated to meetings or other activities. The Secretariat will monitor the respective thresholds of e.g. 75% and 25% of the total budget for WG activities that need not to be surpassed.

2.2. Country quota

A country quota is assigned to each country based on their category of annual contribution. Quota units can be used to receive reimbursement of “nights” spent for an ECPGR meeting anywhere in Europe, including travel. Two nights in a meeting would cost two quota units and so on. Countries are excluded from reimbursement of costs in meetings whenever their total assigned quota units have been used.

2.3. ExCo quota

A small percentage of the budget (around 5%, corresponding to the difference left after all the rounded-up quota, are assigned to categories) is dedicated to a reserve called “ExCo quota”. The use of this quota can be left at the discretion of the ExCo to facilitate attendance of relevant participants to specific meetings (this can be used for capacity building or other purpose).

2.4. Proposed allocation of country quota per each category

Considering that the available budget for WG activities during Phase IX is not known at the time of writing (November 2013), an example based on a hypothetical starting budget of

€ 100 000 for “Meetings” is given below. Should the budget increase during the Phase thanks to voluntary contributions and other raised funds, additional quota units would be assigned to countries, as soon as new contributions are obtained and according to the proposed proportions outlined below in Table 1.

Table 1. Proposed country quota

CONTRIBUTION CATEGORY (annual contribution in €)	COUNTRY QUOTA (% of total available)	QUOTA UNITS (number of travel nights available for each country in the given category) ¹	TOTAL QUOTA PER CATEGORY (quota units x number of countries in each category)
A (2750)	1.5 %	3	3x5 = 15
B (3500)	1.7 %	4	4x7 = 28
C (6500)	2.2 %	5	5x3 = 15
D (7500)	2.3 %	5	5x2 = 10
E (11000)	2.5 %	6	6x3 = 18
F (12000)	2.6 %	6	6x5 = 30
G (12500)	2.7 %	6	6x 3 = 18
H (19000)	3.0 %	7	7x3 = 21
I (20000)	3.2 %	7	7x1 = 7
J (22000)	3.5 %	8	8x1 = 8
K (52000)	4.5 %	10	10x4 = 40
ExCo	Difference (ca. 5%)	12	12
TOTAL			222

2.5. Incentives for voluntary contributions

In the case of voluntary contributions to the “common fund” for WG activities, an incentive is established through the following mechanism: a donor country doubles its proportion of country quota to be received as a result of the increased budget.

Example: A country from category E donates € 100 000. These are split into “meetings budget” (€ 75 000) and “other activities budget” (€ 25 000). The increased “meetings budget” is converted into an additional bonus of 166 quota units to be proportionally distributed among all the countries. Normally a country in category E would receive a 2.5% proportion of the bonus (ca. 4 new quota units), but in this case the donor country would receive an additional 2.5% (incentive) for a total of 8 quota units. The 4 quota units of the incentive would be subtracted from the ExCo quota which would receive a lower increment.

¹ Based on a hypothetical budget for meetings of € 100 000. Preliminary estimate of the average cost of one night, including travel = € 450 (to be verified): 100 000/450 = 222 quota.