

Hosting arrangements

Programmatic affinity of hosting arrangements

Continuity an important issue but change provides opportunities
ECPGR with it's 30 year of existence guarantees the continuity

Present hosting situation with Bioversity is appreciated

Pros (not necessarily unique for Bioversity)

In house technical and legal PGR expertise

Neutral ground

Politically neutral

Synergies e.g. information channels

Independent of national legislation and employment regulations

Cons

International recruitment of staff, more costly

Research institute providing only administrative services could be a conflict in the future

ECPGR perceived as a Bioversity project to the outer world

General remarks

- Other options for hosting arrangements should not be excluded
- Preferred option depending on legal status of ECPGR
- A thorough analyse is needed
- Bioversity good value for money (also in the future?)
- ECPGR needs a certain degree of independence in order to be competitive and visible for funders

Administrative support for the operation of the Secretariat

- Bioversity is providing professional administrative support

Cost implication of the hosting

- Hosting at Bioversity will increase the ECPGR total budget with approx 15% (due to full cost recovery on services provided)
- Bioversity is prepared to cover the development and operational costs for EURISCO
- Will Bioversity value ECPGR as an economic asset and if so how would that be reflected?
- Other options might be more costly than Bioversity
- Changing process might be costly/staying might save costs

Location considerations

- Rome is a good spot with Bioversity, the Treaty secretariat, the GCDT and FAO

EURISCO

- Including EURISCO in the development of a global documentation system is positive
- Giving EURISCO (and other regional systems as well) a separate “window” is useful and necessary considering the special functions related to AEGIS
- Influence of its development needs to be improved
- Ownership of EURISCO needs to be clarified and should be under ECPGR governance
- The role and use of the CCDB needs to be sorted out

New conditions

- Bioversity's priorities have changed and some traditional contributions will terminate however some in kind contributions can still be provided
- Position of the Director of the Regional office for Europe will be terminated at the end of 2011
- European newsletter production might have to be rearranged

Needs/opportunities identified

- Strengthened secretariat
- EC member of ECPGR
- Current revision of the EU seed legislation possible entrance point for raising the status of ECPGR/AEGIS

Actions proposed

- Splitting functions and key components of ECPGR e.g. separate hosting of secretariat, EURISCO, AEGIS
- Cost and consequence analysis needs to be done
- A task force should be established

Consensus

- Objectives, institutionalization, hosting and financing are interrelated
- Final decision on hosting arrangements should not be taken before all possible options have been investigated and appraised
- A task force should be appointed (as part of the road map) during the current meeting and be given the task to develop an options paper
- Terms of reference to be developed by the SC
- Options paper to be discussed by the SC might be followed by a tendering procedure

Final assumption

Biodiversity might still be a preferable option