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Abstract

In the context of the legislative procedure related to the Commission proposal for a Regulation on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization (COM(2012) 576), the European Parliament requested the organisation of a workshop to discuss the Commission’s legislative proposal putting special emphasis on the challenges of implementing the Nagoya protocol both at global and EU level, and on future perspectives.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen a growing public concern for the social, environmental and ethical conditions under which goods are produced. Goods directly or indirectly derived from genetic resources are no exception.

The entry into force of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in 1993 set a first milestone for the governance of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS). So far, the EU and all its Member States have ratified the CBD\(^1\). Nonetheless, several factors such as lack of awareness, insufficient specifications on its scope and legal principles, and inadequate policies and legislation at country level have prevented an effective implementation of ABS\(^2\). In order to tackle this issue, the Nagoya Protocol on ABS was adopted in 2010.

Against this backdrop, the European Commission presented a legislative proposal on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization in the Union (2012/0278) as the way to implement the Nagoya Protocol. In order to have an exchange of views between the main stakeholders in the field, the ENVI Committee requested the Policy Department to organise a workshop on the topic. This took place at the European Parliament in Brussels on Tuesday 19 March 2013.

The workshop was structured in three sessions. The first session, chaired by ENVI Shadow rapporteur MEP Mr Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE, NL), aimed at presenting an overview of the process towards the introduction of the Nagoya Protocol into the EU legislative framework and outlining the main features of the Commission’s proposal. The second one addressed the main challenges of implementing the Protocol both in the EU and globally. This session was chaired by ENVI Shadow rapporteurs MEP Ms Anna Rosbach (ECR, DK) and MEP Mr Pavel Poc (S&D, CZ). The last session, chaired by ENVI rapporteur MEP Ms Sandrine Bélier (The Greens/EFA, FR), outlined the future perspectives.

---

1. [https://www.cbd.int/information/parties.shtml](https://www.cbd.int/information/parties.shtml)

2. THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL AND THE EC'S PROPOSAL

In her opening remarks, MEP Ms Bélier made reference to the agenda to discuss the transposition of the Nagoya Protocol into the EU legislative framework. As she explained, a draft version of her report on the topic will be made available by end of March and following discussions and the tabling of the amendments, it will be first voted by the ENVI committee in July and then by the Plenary in October. Before giving the floor to MEP Mr Gerbrandy, MEP Ms Bélier introduced the topic under discussion and highlighted the relevance of wildlife and nature conservation in the Union.

Following her intervention, MEP Mr Gerbrandy stressed the importance of the legislative proposal, as well as its technical and legal complexity. In order to follow the actual events leading to the EC's proposal, it was agreed to switch the order of the first two speakers so that the presentation on the main features of the proposal would be preceded by the presentation on the negotiation of the Nagoya Protocol.

2.1. The Nagoya Protocol: main features and challenges in the negotiation

First of all, Mr Pierre du Plessis, negotiator of the government of Namibia in topics related to ABS, clarified that despite having represented the government of Namibia in negotiations related to ABS, he was acting in his personal capacity.

In the beginning of his speech, Mr du Plessis stated that one of the main reasons leading to the negotiation of the Nagoya Protocol was the lack of progress on ABS since the CBD was implemented. Ten years after the CBD was signed, a call to negotiate an international regime on ABS was made in the Johannesburg Summit. The call was responded with the initiation of the negotiations that finally led to the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol.

As explained by Mr du Plessis, in the initial phase of the negotiation process the provider countries were focused on the benefit sharing arising from the utilization of genetic resources, while the user countries made clear that in return, access to genetic resources should be facilitated. Some of the early disagreements referred to the demand from user countries to establish access standards to genetic resources. This was accepted in exchange for the establishment of legally binding rules and measures for user countries as a compliance system. As he highlighted, such a compliance system was a key provision of the Protocol, since access was unlikely to be granted in absence of trust.

Nonetheless, Mr du Plessis pointed out that in the end, the Protocol was far from being the document that every representative wanted, and thus, everyone compromised to a certain extent.

One of the things in which there was a general agreement during the negotiations was that the Protocol should focus on the utilization of genetic resources, since the term “utilization” goes beyond mere possession or access. In this line, Mr du Plessis stated that in his opinion, this was not sufficiently stressed in the draft EU Regulation.

Other of the topics that generated certain degree of controversy was whether different access regimes should be established for certain activities such as basic research, vaccine development, etc. In the end, this was covered by Article 8 of the Protocol, which addresses special considerations. In any case, he called for facilitating access to resources for all the user clusters when implementing the Protocol.

3 For more information, see Annex 2.
As for the indigenous and local communities (ILC), their rights are just acknowledged by the Protocol, so no real rights are granted. In practice, these are subject to domestic legislation.

Mr du Plessis continued by referring to the concept of benefit sharing, which is in line with the objectives of the CBD and therefore, more than a mere sharing of economic benefits. Thus, benefit sharing aims at fostering the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources.

In his final remarks, Mr du Plessis made reference to the main unfinished issue of the Protocol, the global multilateral benefit sharing mechanism, which, if correctly negotiated, would have an enormous potential to contribute to halt the loss of biodiversity.

2.2. The EC’s proposal for a Regulation on ABS

Mr Hugo-Maria Schally Head of the Unit “Multilateral Environmental agreements, processes and trade issues” at DG Environment\(^4\), began his speech by clarifying that the scope of the EC’s proposal is set on genetic resources subject to national sovereignty. Hence, for the time being genetic resources whose origin is hard to be tracked back and those not subject to national sovereignty are not covered by the proposal. As he pointed out, the EU and all its Member States are signing parties of the Nagoya Protocol.

He continued by outlining the preparatory work done in support of the proposal. This included:

- consultations with EU stakeholders,
- bilateral consultations with other Parties,
- conferences and workshops,
- a comprehensive consultant report that included sectoral studies, and
- the Commission’s Impact Assessment.

The consultant report addressed all the sectors that would be affected by the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in some way or another. The EU baseline was established based on the results of the report. Its main characteristics are:

- Genetic resources used for a wide range of purposes, by a wide range of actors with different interests.
- Multiple actors intervene at different stages of the value chain.
- Access is mostly done by the research community, not the commercial users.

On the basis of the findings of the baseline, several measures were evaluated in the impact assessment with particular focus on the access and the user compliance pillar of the Protocol. The measures chosen aimed at ensuring EU compliance with the Protocol, providing legal certainty for users, enabling conditions for R&D, making maximum use of existing practices and reducing administrative burden.

As explained by Mr Schally, the current legislative proposal does not regulate access to genetic resources and therefore leaves freedom to Member States to do so. Actually, the core of the proposal is the establishment of user compliance rules in the form of a due diligence obligation requiring users along the user chain to ascertain that genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources have been accessed in conformity with the provider state rules and that benefits are shared upon mutually agreed terms.

\(^4\) For more information, see Annex 2.
To ensure this, users have the duty to declare how they exercise due diligence. Likewise, competent authorities to be established by my Member States will carry out checks to verify user compliance and act accordingly. Among the ways of exercising due diligence, Mr Schally cited the following:

- An international certificate of compliance
- Best practices (recognised by the Commission)
- Acquiring samples from trusted collections (recognised by Member States)

Mr Schally closed his intervention by acknowledging that there are still open issues that need to be discussed in the next steps of the legislative procedure and hoped to reach an agreement by the end of 2013.

### 2.3. Interfaces between the Nagoya Protocol and the multilateral system

In the beginning of his speech, Mr Emile Frison, Director General of Bioversity International\(^5\) compared how ABS is seen in the Nagoya Protocol and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA). In the former, ABS is mainly considered from a bilateral point of view, while in the latter from a multilateral point of view. As he explained, one of the main reasons is that plant genetic resources have been exchanged over centuries and activities such as animal breeding use a wide variety of traditional plant resources that might have very diverse origins.

In this line, he called for ensuring that the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol does not undermine the functioning of the ITPGRFA, but contributes to foster synergies. In order to do so, Mr Frison enumerated some measures to be taken at Member State level:

- Remove the existing legal obstacles that impede the proper functioning of the Protocol and the Treaty.
- Compile information on what material is in the public system and could be made available through the multilateral system.
- Look at mechanisms to encourage voluntary inclusion of this material into the multilateral system.
- Share the non-confidential information related to this material.
- Confirm who has the authority to grant access to the material and provide clear rules.
- Use the standard material transfer agreement in domestic and international exchanges.
- Develop procedures for *in situ* access.
- Support the provider in their undertakings.
- Ensure that farmers have access to the material.

In his closing remarks, Mr Frison stressed the need of collaboration between the agricultural and environmental sectors and referred again to the lack of action in removing the legal impediments that exist in some countries and that prevent the proper implementation of the ITPGRFA and its multilateral system.

---

\(^5\) For more information, see Annex 2.
3. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING ABS IN THE EU AND GLOBALLY

MEP Mr Poc and MEP Ms Rosbach chaired the second session of the workshop.

3.1. Presentation by Dr Axel Braun

After stating that the members of European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations support the objectives of the CBD and the Nagoya Protocol, Mr Braun, speaking on behalf of the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations⁶, stressed that the number of pharmaceutical companies with active natural product research programmes has been reduced by a factor of 2. The main reason behind this trend is the complexity of natural compounds, although legal uncertainty to access them can also play a role.

In order to implement ABS globally, Mr Braun called for a regime based on the accurate appraisal of current and future uses of and benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources. In this vein, he clarified that future potential uses will also depend on the administrative burden of implementation.

Further, Mr Braun called for providing as much legal certainty as possible. To do so, he enumerated the following needs:

- Respect the Protocol’s non-retroactivity principle.
- Clear provisions on commodities and exclusion of true pathogens from the Protocol.
- Support the Protocol’s ABS principles through clear provisions for access and mutually agreed terms for benefits sharing.
- Support the Protocol’s monitoring mechanism through National Competent Authorities as checkpoints.

As for the EU case, Mr Braun acknowledged the following needs:

- Clarity on the scope of the due diligence obligations (e.g. commodities, true pathogens, and consideration of specific scenarios to improve the proposal).
- Monitoring provisions should not differentiate between regulated and unregulated products.
- User checks should only be requested in case of a reasonable suspicion of non-compliance and not on a routine basis.
- Procedural safeguards in accordance with principles of due process.
- Appropriate penalties, not interfering with established regulatory approval procedures.

⁶ For more information, see Annex 2.
3.2. **Presentation by Mr François Meienberg**

In his introductory remarks, Mr Meienberg, Campaign Coordinator at the Berne Declaration\(^7\) stated that benefit sharing is not well represented in the current Commission’s proposal. He continued by clarifying that the main issue to be addressed in his speech was the temporal scope.

In this vein, he claimed that if the temporal scope of the Protocol only applies to genetic resources and traditional knowledge accessed after the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol for the Union, a big part of the benefits will not be shared and legal certainty will not be achieved, since an incredible amount of genetic resources has already left the country of origin. As he explained based on several articles of the Nagoya Protocol and the CBD, this would not in conflict with the non-temporary principle, as the focus would still be on present and future utilization of genetic resources. From his point of view, the current temporal scope would also lead to legal uncertainty and injustice.

As an example of how to implement this, Mr Meienberg cited botanical gardens and the ITPGFRA, which implement mutually agreed term clauses for genetic resources with new uses for which access was already granted under different circumstances.

In his closing remarks, Mr Meienberg enumerated some of the changes needed by the proposal:

- More definitions to be added in the regulation.
- Change the nature of trusted collections. As defined in the draft regulation, there would be a tool to circumvent the benefit sharing obligation under the CBD and the Nagoya Protocol.
- Include checkpoints along the whole chain and require users to present evidence supporting they exercised due diligence.
- Modify the penalty clause to allow not only the suspension of the use, but also of the commercialisation.

3.3. **Presentation by Dr Andreas Drews**

Mr Drews, representative of the ABS Capacity Development Initiative\(^8\), began by giving an overview of the ABS Capacity Development Initiative, which aims at supporting the national implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the African continent and in the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States. In this line, they support the countries in establishing national regulations in accordance with the Protocol.

As he explained, national legislation cannot ensure a fair benefit sharing on its own. Thus, they also provide advice to companies in terms of how to get access to the genetic resources, what rules have to be followed, which are the compliance mechanisms, etc. Further, they also try to amplify the ABS process by involving other organisation to foster capacity development, and support (sub-)regional processes. To do so, they use a set of tools such as multi-stakeholder workshops, thematic and stakeholder-focused trainings, technical papers and studies, and best practice examples with the private sector.

---

\(^7\) For more information, see Annex 2.

\(^8\) For more information, see Annex 2.
Mr Drews cited then the main challenges and requirements related to ABS in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific:

- More capacity building required, both among providers and users of genetic resources.
- More awareness-raising needed in the area of R&D as users of genetic resources.
- Need to find practical solutions for separating non-commercial research (with potential change of intent) from commercial research (i.e. biodiscovery and development phase).
- Need to balance due diligence of users and monitoring/checking obligations by government authorities when putting into place compliance mechanisms.

In his closing remarks, Mr Drews stressed that more emphasis is needed in Europe in terms of capacity building and awareness rising.

3.4. Q&A

Mr Claudio Chiarolla\(^9\) quoted a paragraph from the EU proposal in the context of the World Intellectual Property Organisation in which the EU and its Member States recommend the inclusion of the mandatory requirement to disclose the country of origin or source of genetic resources in patent applications at all levels. In this context, Mr Chiarolla asked Mr Schally why something similar was not included under the monitoring and compliance provisions of the Commission’s proposal to avoid that patents are registered for products resulting from genetic resources accessed and utilised in contradiction to the Protocol.

Following Mr Chiarolla’s question, Mr Worms\(^10\) showed his concern for the uncertainty surrounding the implementation of the Protocol and wondered about its effectiveness.

Mr Schally responded Mr Chiarolla’s question by arguing that the reason for not including checkpoints at the patenting stage pursued the reduction of administrative burden. The current checkpoints capture the beginning (request of research funds) and the end (commercialisation) of the chain. Further, not all the commercialisations of products are based on patents, so it was considered unnecessary to set a checkpoint at that stage.

The next question was formulated by Ms Ljiljana Šučur Perišić\(^11\). Concretely, she asked whether the implementation of the Protocol will allow patenting something created by nature. To respond to this question, Mr Meienberg explained that the patenting rules will not be altered by the Protocol and came back to the point raised by Mr Chiarolla’s. Further, he clarified that there are several patents in Europe for natural products.

Before closing the second session, MEP Ms Rosbach highlighted the global nature of ABS and the need of getting all the stakeholders on board.

---

\(^9\) Mr Chiarolla works for the Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations. He spoke in his personal capacity.

\(^10\) Mr Worms works for the World Agroforestry Centre. He spoke in his personal capacity.

\(^11\) Ms Perišić works as interpreter for the European Parliament.
4. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Before introducing the first speaker of the last session, MEP Ms Bélier, making reference to the question raised by Ms Perišić, stressed that she hoped that the EP report would reaffirm the principle for which life patenting should remain forbidden.

4.1. Presentation by Dr Cornelia Löhne

In her opening remarks, Ms Löhne, Science Policy Coordinator at the Berlin-Dahlem Botanic Garden explained that she was going to focus on the Union’s trusted collections. In this context, she claimed that botanic gardens and natural history museums should be acknowledged as special trusted institutions due to their role in documenting, understanding, and conserving biodiversity and because they strive for the implementation of the CBD and ABS. Likewise, she stressed they should be considered neither “major suppliers of genetic resources”, nor typical “actors at the beginning of the genetic resources value chain”.

Then she referred to the International Plant Exchange Network, which aims at meeting the CBD’s provisions on ABS only for botanic gardens and only for non-commercial purposes, while at the same time creating confidence among provider countries and facilitating exchange of plant material within the network. After briefly explaining how it works, Ms Löhne clarified that the network covers also pre-CBD and pre-Nagoya Protocol material in ex situ collections and also puts emphasis on non-monetary benefit sharing. Based on this, similar codes of conduct are currently being developed among Natural History Museums and DNA repositories. Hence, a clear distinction should be made between commercial and non-commercial users.

To finish her intervention, Ms Löhne presented some points that need to be clarified in the Commission’s proposal:

- Will “trusted collections” have to take over due diligence obligations of users?
- Will “trusted collections” be expected to monitor compliance of third parties (users)?
- Will this Regulation really lead to an acknowledgement of collections as “trusted” institutions (outside the EU) – or will there be a contrary effect?
- Will this Regulation increase legal risks and costs for collection-based biodiversity research institutions in the EU (due to vague definitions and terms)?

4.2. Presentation by Ms María Julia Oliva

Ms Oliva, Senior Adviser on Access and Benefit sharing at the Union for Ethical BioTrade, began her intervention by referring to the growing awareness of companies in topics related to biodiversity, including ABS. As she explained, the Union for Ethical BioTrade helps companies to embrace a set of international standards that have conservation, sustainable use of natural resources, and benefit sharing at the core. Companies willing to implement this system have to embrace the ABS principles, independent from whether domestic legislation on this matter is in place. In this line, independent verification bodies check whether companies’ move forward with their commitment.

---

12 For more information, see Annex 2.
13 For more information, see Annex 2.
After briefly describing some of their experiences, Ms Oliva acknowledged some of the elements of the Commission’s proposal, e.g. the flexibility of the due diligence approach, the idea of best practices, the importance of going beyond access, etc. To finalise her speech, Ms Oliva highlighted the importance of learning from the already existing practices to build trust and of raising the level-playing field to push companies to comply with the ABS principles.

4.3. Presentation by Mr Mathieu Mellul

In his opening remarks, Mr Mellul, cofounder of the Collective for an Alternative to Biopiracy\(^{14}\) outlined the main objectives of the Collective for an Alternative to Biopiracy, which are related to the protection of the local groups, their knowledge and the places they live in, since they play a critical role in preserving and promoting biodiversity. In this context, the main focus is on biopiracy. As he explained, in cases in which biopiracy exists, property right regulations work against the interest of local communities both from and economic and moral terms.

Mr Mellul acknowledged the nature of the Protocol in terms of conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources, but claimed that the need of involving the local communities should be better addressed in the Commission’s proposal in line with the text of the Nagoya Protocol. Mr Mellul hoped the representation of local communities and their interests would be strengthen in future versions of the proposal and called for guaranteeing through independent checks that best practices to be adopted by other users are actually the best available practices.

To finish his speech, Mr Mellul hoped more resources would be allocated to the process of implementing the Protocol in the EU and called for the establishment of an international conformity certificate.

4.4. Q&A

Ms Christine von Weiszäcker\(^{15}\) opened the last Q&A session by criticising the concept of trusted collections for its immaturity. She argued that in case governments set business’ obligations on a quasi-voluntary basis, shoulder their responsibilities on taxonomists untrained in governmental matters, make NGOs research and expose biopiracy cases with their limited financial resources, leave out of the system European consumers that oppose biopiracy, or do not address biotraders, biobrokers, bioarchives to whom access is outsourced via countries that have not ratified the Protocol (e.g. US), then Europe will not earn the necessary trust.

Following Ms von Weiszäcker’s intervention, Ms Dawn Howard\(^{16}\) commented that potential future shifts in the flow of genetic resources should be considered at this stage. As an example, she mentioned the case of animal breeding, an activity that will likely increase significantly in the developing world.

Before MEP Ms Bélier closed the workshop, Mr Gerald Verkley\(^{17}\) called for describing more clearly in the Commission’s proposal what the duties of the collectors are.

\(^{14}\) For more information, see Annex 2.

\(^{15}\) Ms von Weiszäcker is a researcher, activist and negotiator on ABS related topics.

\(^{16}\) Ms Howard represents the European Forum of Farm Animal Breeders.

\(^{17}\) Mr Verkley represents the Microbial Resource Research Infrastructure.
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ANNEX 2: SHORT BIOGRAPHIES OF THE EXPERTS

Mr Hugo-Maria Schally, DG Environment - European Commission

After graduating from law school (University of Graz, Austria) he practiced law in Austria for several years. He then did postgraduate studies in international relations at the Vienna Diplomatic Academy. In his further career he worked mainly on issues linked to sustainable development in the multilateral context holding jobs with UNDP, the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Vienna. He joined the European Commission in 1998 and has been a Head of Unit in Brussels in the Directorates General “External relations” and “Development”. He is currently heading a unit at the Directorate General “Environment” dealing with Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Trade. In the course of his career he has been closely involved with the negotiation and implementation of many multilateral environmental agreements such as on the Ozone Layer, Climate Change, Bio-Diversity, Trade in endangered species, Waste as well as with major global Conferences such as UNCED (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), ICFFD (Monterrey, 2002) and WSSD (Johannesburg, 2002), etc.

Mr Pierre Du Plessis, Government of Namibia

Pierre du Plessis has a degree in Southern African Economic History from the University of Cape Town and 25 years experience in indigenous natural products commercialisation and management, appropriate technology, strategic planning, project design and implementation, media, communication and adult education, mainly in Namibia and other African countries.

He is a Senior Consultant member and former Director of the Centre for Research Information Action in Africa – Southern African Development and Consulting (CRIAA SA-DC), based in Windhoek, Namibia. His current work includes:

- consulting for the GIZ Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) Capacity Development Initiative on guidelines for a coordinated implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Africa;
- advising the African Group in the WIPO IGC negotiations around intellectual property rights over genetic resources; and
- evaluating the feasibility of establishing a natural products research and development platform in Namibia, with a regional focus in southern Africa.

Since the year 2000 he has been centrally involved in Namibia’s national efforts to promote the sustainable commercialisation of indigenous plant products, integrate such value chains into the national Community-Based Natural Resource Management programme and develop a functional and user-friendly system to regulate Access and Benefit Sharing. He served for five years on the Management Board of the Southern African Natural Products Trade Association, now better known as PhytoTrade Africa, and was its Chairman for three years.
Pierre has practical experience at all levels of biotrade value chains, from organising rural raw material supply chains through processing and marketing to national and international policy development. During the development of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing he was one of the lead negotiators for the African Group and co-chaired many of the negotiating sessions.

He also compiled Namibia’s first greenhouse gas inventory, served on the Namibian Climate Change Committee for many years and has represented Namibia at international negotiations under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

**Dr Emile Frison, Bioversity International**

Dr Emile Frison has been Director General of Bioversity International since August 2003. In that role, he increased the emphasis of the Center’s work on the use of agricultural biodiversity to improve the lives of smallholder farmers in developing countries by diversifying their livelihoods and improving their nutrition and the sustainability of their production systems. He has spent most of his career in international agricultural research, including 22 years on work related to plant genetic resources. He started his career at the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture in Nigeria. He joined Bioversity in 1987 and was regional Director for Europe from 1992 to 1995. He participated actively in the negotiation process of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, providing technical and scientific inputs to the negotiators. He was the Secretary for the Genetic Resources Policy Committee of the CGIAR from 2003 to 2010 and is currently a Member of the Executive Board of the Global Crop Diversity Trust, a Member of the Executive Board of Ecoagriculture Partners, and a member of the Comité d’Orientation de l’Agence de Recherche pour le Développement, France. He has published over 170 scientific and policy papers.

**Dr Axel Braun, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.**

Dr Axel Braun is a Vice-Director and Head International Development in Group Patents Global of F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. (Roche) in Basle and in this function responsible for IP policy. He also represents Roche in the intellectual property working groups of various industry associations: International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers & Associations (IFPMA), the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries & Associations (EFPIA), where he chairs the CBD Working Groups, Interpharma, the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) and BUSINESSEUROPE (BE). He is also a representative for BE in the Standing Advisory Committee of the European Patent Office (SACEPO) and a Member of the European Patent Attorney’s epi Harmonization Committee. Before he had been active in various other functions as a patent attorney within the patent department of Roche. Admitted as a European Patent Attorney to practice before the European Patent Office since 1994, Mr. Braun holds a Ph.D. degree in Biochemistry from the University of Munich / Max-Planck Institute of Psychiatry (Germany), a diploma degree of chemistry also from the University of Munich / Max-Planck Institute of Biochemistry (Germany) and a bachelor degree of philosophy from the University of Heidelberg (Germany).
**Mr François Meienberg, Berne Declaration**

François Meienberg works since 1999 as Campaign Coordinator for the Berne Declaration (BD, [www.evb.ch](http://www.evb.ch)) with a focus on ABS, Intellectual Property Rights and Agriculture. Since 2009 he is also joint managing director for the BD.


In the nineties he worked as a campaign coordinator for Greenpeace Switzerland and from 1987 to 1993 as an actor for theatres in Germany and Switzerland and for TV, Film and Radio. He is the author a several hiking books.

He has a Bachelor of Arts and a diploma as a chemical laboratory worker.

**Dr Andreas Drews,**

**ABS Capacity Development Initiative**

Dr Andreas Drews (*1954) is a biologist by training and holds a PhD in natural sciences. He served as a consultant on biological pest control and natural resource management mainly to several programmes of Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH. Since 1995 he advised the GTZ (since 2011 Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH) Programme “Implementing the Biodiversity Convention” on ABS and traditional knowledge – as such conceptualizing and supporting national projects and trainings on the development and implementation of ABS regulations in Asia and Africa. Since 2000 he is advising as a member of the German delegation the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) on the ABS process under the CBD.

He is founder and manager of the Dutch-German ABS Capacity Development Initiative for Africa, which was established in 2005 to support African countries in developing and implementing ABS regulations as well as fostering exchange among and joint position building of African negotiators with the view that substantive information is a prerequisite for fair compromise. He guided the transformation of this Initiative into the ABS Capacity Development Initiative, a multi-donor platform to ensure long-term funding for ABS capacity development not only in Africa but also in the Caribbean and the Pacific regions. With the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS in 2010 focus is now set on supporting ABS implementation at the national level.
Dr Cornelia Löhne, Botanic Garden Berlin-Dahlem

Function:
- Science Policy Coordinator

Curriculum:
- 2002-2006 PhD studies at Nees Institute for Biodiversity of Plants, University of Bonn; Thesis on Molecular Phylogeny and historical biogeography of water-lilies (Nymphaeales).
- 2006-2008 Research assistant at Botanic Gardens of the University of Bonn; Projects on the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation in Germany and on Education in Botanic Gardens, Zoos and Open Air Museums (in cooperation with the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, BfN).
- Since April 2008 at BGBM.

Research interests:
- Phylogeny and historical biogeography of basal angiosperms, in particular water-lilies (Nymphaeales).
- International strategies for nature conservation, especially CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) and GSPC (Global Strategy for Plant Conservation).

Ms María Julia Oliva, Union for Ethical BioTrade

María Julia Oliva is Senior Adviser on Access and Benefit sharing at the Union for Ethical BioTrade (UEBT). In this capacity, Ms. Oliva manages legal and policy issues in the work of the organization and provides training and technical support on access and benefit sharing issues to UEBT members and partners. Previously, she held positions at the International Centre on Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL). She has worked and published extensively on a range of issues at the interface of trade, intellectual property and sustainability. Ms. Oliva is a member of the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law, and is also on the Board of Directors of IP-Watch. She holds a law degree from the University of Mendoza and a Masters of Laws (LL.M) in environmental law, cum laude, from Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College.
Mr Matthieu Mellul,
Collectif pour une alternative à la biopiraterie

Matthieu Mellul est co-fondateur du collectif pour une alternative à la biopiraterie. Ce collectif, qui a été à l’initiative des premières rencontres internationales sur la biopiraterie à Paris en 2009, accompagne les populations autochtones dans la défense de leurs savoirs traditionnels et plaide pour une gestion concertée et durable des ressources génétiques associées à ces savoirs. Titulaire d’un master in management option "Alter" à HEC Paris, Matthieu est investi dans la société civile. Il a notamment soutenu des programmes de développement économique locaux en Amérique du Sud et collaboré avec des organisations qui cherchent à généraliser des initiatives ou des modèles économiques alternatifs comme la Fondation pour une Terre Humaine, l’institut Angenius ou la société Savoirs des Peuples.
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The EU Commission's legislative proposal on implementing the Nagoya Protocol in the Union
By Hugo Schally
European Commission
DG Environment

Background (1)

- The European Union and all of its 27 Member States are Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
- CBD (1992): the first international treaty that aims to limit biodiversity loss, to sustainably use its components and to ensure ABS arising from using GRs.
- The Nagoya Protocol helps advancing implementation of the third objective of the CBD. It was adopted by the consensus of the Parties to the CBD on 29 October 2010.
**Background (2)**

- The EU and its Member States signed the Nagoya Protocol while it was open for signature (2/2011- 2/2012), expressing their political commitment to swift implementation and ratification.
- The Council of the EU and the European Parliament repeatedly urged the Commission to propose measures for Union implementation/ratification of the Nagoya Protocol.

---

**The EU Commission's legislative proposal on implementing the Nagoya Protocol in the Union**

I. Preparatory work done in support of the proposal and important findings

II. Main features of the legislative proposal

III. Next steps
I. Preparatory work done in support of the proposal and important findings

1. Consultation with EU stakeholders
2. Bilateral consultations with other Parties
3. Conferences and workshops
4. Consultant report including sectoral studies to develop "EU baseline"
5. Commission Impact Assessment

Sectoral studies to develop "EU Baseline"

- Step 1 - Sector analysis (Annex 3 of Consultant Study)
  - Pharmaceutical Industry
  - Culture collections
  - Botanic gardens
  - Plant Breeding/Seed sector
  - Biocontrol
  - Horticulture
  - Academic Research
  - Cosmetics Industry
  - Animal Breeding Industry
  - (Industrial) Biotechnology
  - Food and Beverage Industry

- Step 2 – Establishment of "EU Baseline" (Annex 8 of IA)
Some characteristics of the "EU Baseline"

- Genetic resources used for a wide range of purposes, by a wide range of actors with different interests.
- Multiple actors intervene at different stages of the value chain (collecting, basic research, applied research, product development).
- Future interest in R&D on genetic resources stable or increasing, while demand for ‘in situ’ access declining in most sectors.
- Use of TKaGR of limited importance, expected to decline further.
- In situ access mostly done by university-based researchers and scientists affiliated with ex situ collections.
- Commercial users rarely collect in the wild.
- Ex situ collections play a fundamental in the EU genetic resources value chain for both non-commercial and commercial users.
- ABS best practices exist particularly up-stream in the EU user-chain. Currently less relevant for downstream activities.

>> The "EU Baseline" served as benchmark for analyzing impacts and for identifying the best performing implementing measures.
Focus of the Impact Assessment

Different measures were analyzed with particular focus on the access and the user compliance pillar of the Protocol.
Starting point: maximizing research and development opportunities on genetic resources will maximize benefits in support of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.
Main IA criteria – in accordance with better regulation principles - were:
- EU compliance with the Protocol
- Legal certainty for users
- Enabling conditions for research and development
- Correspondence of measures with existing practices
- Distribution of impacts and costs in the value chain, particularly focusing on academic researchers and SMEs
- Administrative burden and costs

II. Main features of the legislative proposal

- The EU proposal does not regulate access to EU resources
- The core of the proposal is the establishment of user compliance rules in the form of a due diligence obligation requiring users along the user chain to ascertain that GR and TKaGR have been accessed in conformity with the provider state rules and that benefits are shared upon MAT.
II. Main features of the legislative proposal

- MS must establish one or more competent authorities to supervise the due diligence obligation.
- Users have the duty to declare how they exercise due diligence either at the stage of receiving public research funding or at the stage of requesting market approval or at the time of commercializing a product not submitted to market approval.
- Competent authorities have the duty to carry out checks to verify user compliance.
- In case shortcomings are detected, the authority shall issue a notice of remedial action, take other measures and/or apply penalties and fines.
- Information on checks is collected by MS and the Commission and is available for the public and ABS CH.

II. Main features of the legislative proposal

- There are ways of creating less burden for users/administrations/supervising authorities:
  - International certificate of compliance: sufficient as evidence of PIC & MAT
  - Implementation of recognized best practices reduces risk of non-compliance and checks of non-compliance
  - Users acquiring samples from trusted collections shall be considered to have exercised due diligence as regards the seeking of information relevant to access and benefit sharing,
  - Best practices are recognised by the Commission.
  - Trusted collections are recognised by MS
II. Main features of the legislative proposal

While most of the monitoring takes place at MS level, the EU also plays an important role:

- Establishes an EU focal point
- Keeps the registry of EU trusted collections and approves best practices of EU users
- Acts as check point for R&D projects funded under EU research programmes
- Receives and complies reports from MS on the declarations made to MS check points as well as compliance reports and makes them available to the ABS CH
- Adopts implementing acts on trusted collections, monitoring and checks of user compliance, best practices
- Reports to the CoP on behalf of the EU and MS

III. Next steps

- Ordinary legislative procedure
- EU ratification
two procedures launched

Brussels, 4.10.2012
COM(2012) 576 final
2012/0279 (COD)

Proposal for a
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL
on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Aiding
from their Utilization in the Union

Brussels, 5.10.2012
COM(2012) 577 final
2012/0279 (NLE)

Proposal for a
COUNCIL DECISION
on the conclusion of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair
and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on
Biological Diversity

objective

Nagoya protocol to be ratified by the EU and all MS in time for the next CBD CoP (end of 2014)
All relevant documents available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/international/abs/index_en.htm

Thank you for your attention!

Hugo-Maria.Schally@ec.europa.eu
“Significant shifts took place in the decades following the entry into force of the CBD. It became clear that industry demand for access and the odds of developing a commercial product were not as significant as had been hoped. […]"

Dramatic advances in sciences and technology, and shifts in business environments and models, changed the nature of the demand for genetic resources and the ways in which they were used. […] Many of the large companies with active natural products programmes and associated bioprospecting efforts overseas have closed their programmes […]"

“Understanding these changed realities is critical for the effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.”

**Challenges in implementing ABS globally**

Any new regime must:

* Be based upon an **accurate appraisal** of:
  - **current uses of GR**: decline in natural product research in large pharmaceutical companies
  - **future uses** (potential benefits): depend also on the administrative nature of implementing provisions

* Provide for **legal certainty**:
  - Respect the Protocol’s non-retroactivity principle
  - Clear provisions on commodities and true pathogens
  - Support the Protocol’s access and benefit-sharing principles
  - Support the Protocol’s monitoring mechanism through National Competent Authorities as checkpoints

---

**Challenges in implementing ABS in the EU**

* Clarity on the **scope of the due diligence** obligations.

* **Proportionate** operating and transaction costs and **easily implementable** administrative procedures in normal business practice.

* Monitoring **provisions** should not differentiate between products.

* **Propotionate compliance system**:
  - User checks only in case of a **reasonable suspicion** of non-compliance
  - **Procedural safeguards** in accordance with principles of due process.
  - **Appropriate penalties**, not interfering with established regulatory approval procedures.
Presentation by Mr François Meienberg

Outstanding issues regarding the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol
Brussels, 19th March 2013
François Meienberg, Berne Declaration

Introduction

1. The Proposal for a regulation says in the Context:
   - "The protocol rests on two pillars: measures on access, and measures on user compliance."

2. This definition is a very selective view on the protocol – cutting out the main pillar: Benefit-Sharing. Access, Benefit-Sharing, Compliance = the ABC of ABS!

3. This approach- the non-implementation of the Benefit-Sharing obligations - could be observed through the wohle draft regulation
Temporal scope

- Preamble (9): “In order to ensure legal certainty, it is important that the rules implementing the Nagoya Protocol should only apply to genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with TK accessed after the entry into force of the Nagoya Protocol for the Union.”

- > By this way a big part will not be shared
- > Legal certainty will not be achieved

Distribution of plant species
And botanical gardens

Temporal scope is crucial

- An incredible amount of Genetic Resources have already left the country of origin.
- Excluding these Genetic Resources would mean to empty the protocol.
- This would mean that obligations of parties under the CBD are not implemented. The Nagoya Protocol would not implement its main objective. An additional protocol would be necessary.
- The trigger of Benefit-Sharing is not „Access“ but „Utilization“.
What others say on the subject: Gurdial Singh (Ceblaw Brief, 2011)

- No explicit formulation. This creates legal uncertainty.
- Art. 15 CBD makes it mandatory for access to be based on PIC. If the protocol applies only to resources acquired after the entry into force of the Protocol, this may be implied as condoning access in violation of the CBD. Unacceptable.

Retroactivity (Gurdial Singh)

- A national law could require new rules for new situations or ongoing situations
- Applying the rules of the Vienna Convention, the Protocol will not apply to situations which ceased to exist before the entry into force of the Protocol. By the same token, it would apply where the situation has not ceased to exist. So if a situation arose in the past (resources acquired before the entry into force of the Protocol) but continues to exist under the new Protocol (new or continuing use of the resource) the provisions of the Protocol will apply without violating the retroactivity rule in international law.
The relevant articles: Art. 1 Nagoya Protocol

- The objective of this Protocol is the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, (...) taking into account all rights over those resources (...) 

-> This wording supports the scope already agreed under the CBD

The relevant articles: Art. 4.4

- This Protocol is the instrument for the implementation of the access and benefit-sharing provisions of the Convention.

-> This wording makes only sense, if the scope of the protocol is similar to the scope of the convention.
The relevant articles: 5.1

- In accordance with Article 15, paragraphs 3 and 7 of the Convention, benefits arising from the utilization of GR as well as subsequent applications and commercialization shall be shared in a fair and equitable way with the Party providing such resources that is the country of origin of such resources or a Party that has acquired the genetic resources in accordance with the Convention.

- A restricted temporal scope would not be “in accordance” with Art. 15 CBD

Art. 5.2:

- Each Party shall take (...) measures, as appropriate, with the aim of ensuring that benefits arising from the utilization of GR that are held by ILCs, in accordance with domestic legislation regarding the established rights of these ILCs over these GR, are shared in a fair and equitable way with the communities concerned, based on MAT.

- It seems to be at least consensus for the temporal scope of GR that are held by ILCs. There is nothing like “the party providing” here.
It is possible to grant and obtain PIC/MAT for GR accessed long time ago.

- MAT of the International Plant Exchange Network (IPEN) includes the following para: "By signing this Agreement the recipients commit themselves to act in compliance with the CBD and its agreed provisions on Access and Benefit-Sharing. This includes a new Prior Informed Consent (PIC) of the country of origin for any uses not covered by terms under which it has been acquired (such as commercialisation)."

- ITPGFRA – There is MAT (the SMTA) for GR accessed in the country of origin 50 years ago.

---

Legal uncertainty

- The draft regulation is leading to legal uncertainty: There are cases which would be legal in regard of the European law, but illegal in regard of the law of the providing country or the CBD. The European regulation could be seen as protecting individuals/companies breaking the law of other countries.

- It’s leading to injustice: All stakeholders who have followed the rules till now, would be disadvantaged. The ones who accessed and used Genetic Resources and TK illegally would have a comparative advantage.
Art. 3 Definitions

There are just some definitions chosen selectively from the CBD or the Protocol. More definitions have to be added (e.g. biotechnology).

Art. 5 trusted collections

„Trusted collections“ - as defined in the draft regulation - will be a tool to circumvent the Benefit-Sharing Obligation under the CBD and the Nagoya-Protocol.
Monitoring and Compliance

- We need checkpoints along the chain: research funding, patent offices, market approval etc.
- These checkpoints have to check PIC and MAT (and check if the terms of the MAT are followed).
- Draft Regulation: users shall declare that they exercised due diligence and submit related evidence.

Art. 11 - Penalties

- 2 (b) immediate suspension of specific use activities and commercialization
- -> If not it’s useless – because the checkpoint are only after utilization (Research and Development).
Presentation by Dr Andreas Drews

The ABS Capacity Development Initiative

Challenges in Implementing ABS in the EU and Globally: Capacity Development

Dr. Andreas Drews
Manager, ABS Capacity Development Initiative

ENVI Workshop
Brussels, 19 March 2013

ABS Capacity Development Initiative

Donors:
- German Government
- Institut de la Francophonie pour le Développement Durable
- Norwegian Government
- Danish Government
- European Union

Administered by the
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GiZ) GmbH

Aim: Support stakeholders on the African continent and in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States to ratify and implement the Nagoya Protocol and to create in cooperation with academia and the private sector ABS compliant value chains which contribute to conservation and livelihoods of the rural poor.
The ABS Capacity Development Initiative

**Core processes for ABS capacity development 2012-2015**

- **2012**
  - Value chain establishment
  - Amplifying ABS processes
  - National Implementation (in selected countries)

- **2013**
  - Supporting CEPA
  - Institutionalisation: concept, policy
  - Business models

- **2014**
  - Pre-phase: stock-taking, gap analyses, local, national & sub-regional
  - Institutionalisation: implementation
  - Business partners; resource identification
  - Cooperation with local, regional, supporters and financing sources

- **2015**
  - National ABS landscape
  - Relevancy and awareness of ABS
  - Relevant skills & topics
  - Self-sustaining ABS (support) processes in selected countries / regions

**Approaches and Instruments**

- Regional and sub-regional multi-stakeholder workshops
- Thematic and stakeholder-focused trainings
- Technical papers and studies
- Best practice examples with the private sector
- Peer-to-peer knowledge transfers
- Information exchange and knowledge management
- Technical consultations with relevant stakeholders and gatekeepers in ABS-relevant decision-making processes
Challenges & further requirements

- More capacity building required, both among providers and users of genetic resources.
- More awareness-raising needed in the area of R&D as users of genetic resources.
- Need to find practical solutions for separating non-commercial research (with potential change of intent) from commercial research (i.e. biodiscovery and development phase).
- Need to balance due diligence of users and monitoring/checking obligations by government authorities when putting into place compliance mechanisms.

Thank you

.....more on ABS and the ABS Capacity Development Initiative

-> brochure “local to global”

-> www.abs-initiative.info
Presentation by Dr Cornelia Löhne

- Proposed EU Regulation on ABS – Perspectives from Botanic Gardens and other Natural History Collections

Cornelia Löhne
Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum Berlin-Dahlem
Freie Universität Berlin

Perspectives on...
... „Union Trusted Collections“ (Article 5)

- Yes, botanic gardens and natural history museums should be acknowledged as special trusted institutions
  - Because they play an essential role in documenting, understanding, and conserving biodiversity
  - Because they strive for the implementation of the CBD and access & benefit sharing

- But, they are not „major suppliers of genetic resources“ (paragraph 19)
  or typical “actors at the beginning of the genetic resources value chain” (introduction)
A system of trust and transparency...  
...The International Plant Exchange Network

How does it work?

- **Philosophy**: meet the provisions of the CBD on access and benefit sharing in receiving, storing, and supplying plant material by establishing an exchange network only for botanic gardens and only for non-commercial purposes.

- **Aim 1**: Creating confidence among provider countries
  - botanic gardens: holding genetic material on trust
  - origin of the material traceable at any stage of exchange due to clear and easy documentation

- **Aim 2**: Facilitating exchange of plant material within the network of botanic gardens

> IPEN covers also pre-CBD and pre-NP material in ex situ collections; emphasis on non-monetary benefit sharing.
A system of trust and transparency...

Similar Codes of Conduct are currently being developed among Natural History Museums and DNA repositories

General aim: clear distinction between

- non-commercial, basic research on biodiversity, i.e. research aiming at the functional/evolutionary characterization of genetic resources (for which exchange and deposition of material needs to be facilitated) and

- commercial utilization of genetic resources (for which strict measures on access, compliance and benefit sharing should be applied)

Concerns about...
... the proposed EU Regulation on ABS

- Will „trusted collections“ have to take over due diligence obligations of users?

- Will „trusted collections“ be expected to monitor compliance of third parties (users)?

- Will this Regulation really lead to an acknowledgement of collections as „trusted“ institutions (outside the EU) – or will there be a contrary effect?

- Will this Regulation increase legal risks and costs for collection-based biodiversity research institutions in the EU (due to vague definitions and terms)?
Useful links...

- International Plant Exchange Network (IPEN)
  http://www.bgci.org/resources/ipen/
- European Botanic Gardens Consortium
  http://www.botanicgardens.eu/
- Consortium of European Taxonomic Facilities (CETAF)
  http://www.cetaf.org/
- DNA Bank Network
  http://www.dnabank-network.org/
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