

ITPGRFA GB 11 Highlights: Thursday, 27 November 2025

Delegates engaged in text-based negotiations on draft resolutions in plenary and in contact groups. Plenary addressed draft resolutions on a range of items, including on cooperation, compliance, the Global Information System (GLIS), and implementation and operations of the Multilateral System (MLS) of access and benefit-sharing. Contact groups considered draft resolutions on conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA), and farmers' rights.

In the afternoon, Vladimir Cuno Salcedo, Minister of Agrarian Development and Irrigation of Peru, addressed the meeting. Drawing attention to the country's rich crop diversity, outcome of the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and farmer communities and their respectful relationship with Mother Earth, he urged delegates to prioritize solidarity, transparency, and efficiency, for a shared sustainable future.

Plenary

Emergency reserve for germplasm collections at risk:

Delegates approved the draft resolution with a minor change, to be integrated in the resolution on policy guidance to the Crop Trust.

Compliance: Delegates addressed a draft resolution. On a paragraph inviting Parties to provide detailed information in their reports on a list of themes, delegates decided that this should be done "in line with national capacities," following proposals by GERMANY and the US. They agreed to encourage Parties and other donors to consider providing financial resources for capacity-development activities, including on reporting capacities, deciding not to refer to providing "adequate" financial resources, following proposals by JAPAN and the US. The US further proposed, and delegates agreed to, deleting a provision noting that these resources should be directed to Parties that have not yet provided compliance reports. Plenary then approved the draft as amended.

Contribution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO): Delegates addressed a draft resolution. On a paragraph inviting FAO to continue its support to the Treaty, delegates decided to refer to "active" support to the Treaty "as a key international instrument" for PGRFA conservation and sustainable use, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits derived from their use, following interventions by Finland for the EUROPEAN REGIONAL GROUP (ERG), ARGENTINA, COLOMBIA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, TÜRKIYE, and others. They further agreed to note that this support will contribute to the Convention on Biological Diversity's (CBD) Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework "where applicable and as appropriate," following suggestions by the US and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

ARGENTINA and the US, opposed by ERG, suggested deleting a reference to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Chair Kopše noted that such references are a cross-cutting issue and established an informal group with a view to reaching consensus.

On a paragraph encouraging FAO to continue identifying and pursuing synergies between the Benefit-sharing Fund (BSF) and other multilateral funding mechanisms, BRAZIL supported encouraging "cooperation and complementarities" between "the projects supported by the BSF" and these mechanisms. NORWAY, supported by CAMEROON, preferred the original language stressing that FAO does not manage the BSF and its projects. The issue remains pending.

Cooperation with the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA): Delegates considered a draft resolution. Following a proposal by ARGENTINA, Parties agreed to request the Secretariat to strengthen collaboration in assembling relevant information for "assessing, measuring, and monitoring" monetary and non-monetary benefit-sharing. Regarding a workshop on the implications of CBD Decision 16/2 (digital sequence information on genetic resources), they discussed whether it should be organized "subject to the availability of resources," and include "the need and expectations" for capacity building. The issue remains unresolved.

Cooperation with the Crop Trust: Plenary approved a draft resolution, with a bracketed reference to the *Ad Hoc* Technical Committee on Conservation and Sustainable Use of PGRFA, pending agreement on its establishment.

GLIS: Plenary considered a draft resolution. Delegates engaged in a lengthy discussion on a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to report on the impact of assigning digital object identifiers (DOIs) to *in situ* and *ex situ* management of PGRFA, proposed by CANADA. ARGENTINA proposed, opposed by Canada for NORTH AMERICA, addressing it under reporting on the MLS. Plenary eventually agreed on a proposal by GERMANY to delete the paragraph, and incorporate a request to the Secretariat to report on the status of assigning DOIs in a paragraph addressing progress in the promotion of use of DOIs.

Delegates discussed a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to promote capacity development, including technology transfer. The US, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, and JAPAN proposed specifying that technology transfer should be "on a voluntary basis and mutually agreed terms," while URUGUAY, BRAZIL, and KENYA opposed. The issue remains unresolved.

On a paragraph requesting the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) on the GLIS to continue considering scientific and technical issues related to digital sequence information/genetic sequence data (DSI/GSD), delegates agreed to note that GLIS is not currently serving as a repository for, or a tracking and tracing system of, DSI/GSD, "without prejudice to future decisions" of the Governing Body.

The NETHERLANDS, EGYPT, SWEDEN, and the US requested deleting a paragraph taking note of progress achieved in other fora on benefit-sharing from DSI/GSD, in particular CBD Decisions 15/9 and 16/2 (DSI on genetic resources). KENYA proposed combining it with a request to the SAC to undertake an assessment of the GLIS capabilities to integrate DSI/GSD. Informal consultations continue on the two clauses.

Cooperation with the CBD: Delegates addressed a draft resolution. On a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to continue monitoring and participating in relevant CBD and Nagoya Protocol processes to promote mutually supportive interfaces, ARGENTINA proposed adding “taking duly into account all rights over genetic resources.” The proposal was bracketed, pending consultations.

Delegates further decided to: “acknowledge” rather than “stress” the importance of integrating PGRFA in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and in Biodiversity Finance Plans, following a suggestion by ARGENTINA; and encourage increased cooperation in the implementation of strategies for resource mobilization, removing reference to synergies.

Plenary decided to take note of the cooperation, as appropriate, between the Secretariats of the Treaty and the CBD on issues of relevance to Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs), rejecting suggestions to amend the term IPLCs. A suggestion by JAPAN to reaffirm that “the Treaty shall not be interpreted as implying in any way a change in the rights and obligations of Parties under other international agreements” remained bracketed. The draft resolution will be revisited to address outstanding issues, including references to the SDGs.

Implementation and Operations of the MLS: Delegates addressed a draft resolution. On a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to continue publishing the report on the availability and transfer of material in the MLS, delegates agreed to request to include in the report, among others, information on transfers of PGRFA per individual country and a distinction between domestic and international transfers.

On maintaining and improving the MLS data store and reporting tools, MOROCCO, with KENYA, suggested reporting on the providers and recipients under the Standard Material Transfer Agreements (SMTAs) and the PGRFA accessions shared through such SMTAs. GERMANY and the US opposed, and the issue remained unresolved, pending informal consultations.

Delegates engaged in lengthy discussions on the content of future reports on MLS operations. ARGENTINA and the US supported including: analysis of data gaps; non-reporting Parties; Secretariat contributions; project-generated data; and Party-reported data. CAMEROON opposed, and CANADA proposed that future reports on the MLS operations indicate data gaps and that the Secretariat consider improvements suggested by Parties. Plenary accepted the compromise. Delegates then accepted inviting Parties and other stakeholders to support needs-specific capacity-development initiatives.

On reviews and assessments under the MLS, delegates accepted to invite Parties to encourage and support natural and legal persons to make PGRFA available in the MLS, including by depositing them in *ex situ* collection under the control of a Party or an Article 15 institution.

Delegates agreed to request the Secretariat to provide technical and administrative support to collection holders so they can include material in the MLS, and invite the Crop Trust and other donors to provide financial support for regeneration and multiplication, especially of unique materials with low visibility, following interventions by the NETHERLANDS, the US, CANADA, and TOGO. Deliberations will continue.

Contact Groups

Conservation and Sustainable Use: Delegates continued deliberations on a draft resolution. They debated future work, including a list of requests to the Secretariat. Noting that the Treaty alone cannot implement Articles 5 and 6, a region proposed organizing regional consultations in conjunction with key international organizations, including CGRFA, CGIAR, and the Crop Trust. Delegates debated a request to collaborate with partners, including city networks and research institutions, on initiatives related to PGRFA conservation and sustainable use in urban food systems, without reaching agreement. Negotiations continued in a Friends of the Co-Chairs group. In the evening, the contact group reached agreement to encourage Parties and other donors to provide additional financial resources and underline the importance of availability and accessibility of financing.

Farmers' Rights: The group continued discussions on the draft strategy on how the use of the “Options for encouraging, guiding, and promoting the realization of farmers' rights” can be promoted, followed by a debate on the draft resolution and the terms of reference of the committee on farmers' rights.

Regarding the draft strategy, a Party proposed adding a footnote to ensure that legal frameworks, measures, and actions in the strategy would not contradict the 1991 Act of the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV 1991). Many regions opposed, arguing, among others, that the issue had been addressed in previous decisions; the strategy's measures are voluntary; and not all ITPGRFA Parties are UPOV members. No agreement was reached.

Delegates debated a recommendation to use the terminology “IPLCs” without reaching agreement. Some supported using the term to ensure consistency with the CBD, while others opposed, noting that the CBD is currently reviewing this terminology.

Delegates then discussed whether to extend the *ad hoc* technical expert group (AHTEG) or establish a standing committee. The Secretariat outlined key differences, noting that a standing committee is limited to Parties only and has reduced regional representation, budget implications, and restrictions on stakeholder participation. A region initially calling for establishment of a standing committee withdrew their support, due to restrictions in participation of farmers and other stakeholders. Another region suggested further exploring the establishment of a standing committee with modified rules to allow farmers' participation. Others opposed due to budgetary constraints.

In the evening, delegates deleted reference to the “Farmers' Rights in Action” programme. They debated, without reaching consensus: language on establishing measures of success as a means to measure governments' efforts to implement farmers' rights; hybrid meeting modalities for the AHTEG; and a Party's proposal to invite UPOV as an observer to the AHTEG's meetings.

In The Corridors

Deliberations on farmers' rights repeatedly stumbled upon references to past decisions, revealing principled differences on farmers' role in agrobiodiversity conservation and agricultural development, and the Treaty's role in setting concrete steps toward their realization. While some pointed to national examples of implementation, a delegate lamented that “every time we propose any international action on farmers' rights, it seems like we hit a wall.” Many expressed frustration over the persistent deadlock, with tensions crystallizing around the relationship between the Treaty and instruments on intellectual property rights, particularly UPOV. As a Party proposed a footnote noting that measures under the Treaty would not contradict UPOV 1991, pointing to the positive impact of plant variety protection on farmers' rights, most opposed, with some highlighting ongoing threats and limitations instead, and others refusing to cite a Convention they have not joined.