



## **Submission by the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) On Technology Transfer, Technical Assistance, and Capacity Development for DSI/GSD**

The International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), a global platform representing more than 6000 organizations and 300 millions of small-scale food producers, welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the ongoing discussions related to technology transfer, training, and capacity building in the context of Digital Sequence Information/Genetic Sequence Data (DSI/GSD). For the IPC, these discussions are at the heart of the struggles for technological justice, peoples' self-determination, and food sovereignty.

First and foremost we need to acknowledge that we, the small holders, Indigenous Peoples and local communities around the world, co-exist and work together with the physical ecosystems, and not data or DSI. Our systems have been feeding the world for millennia and will keep on doing so sustainably even in the times of climate change. Therefore, DSI is not something we require, we are forced to deal with it as it is leading to the disruption of our farming practices and food-systems. Peasants and Indigenous Peoples do not need technologies that increase their dependency and undermine their resilience. In that context, the most urgent need for us in terms of technology transfer, technical assistance, and capacity development for DSI/GSD is the setting up of a system that can monitor violation of our rights through biopiracy exacerbated by the growing release of patents and other IPRs on DSI and on Living Modified Organisms created using DSI. This system should have farmers organizations as an integral part in the capacity as decision-makers right from its inception, to its implementation.

The IPC wants also to recall that the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) serves as the specific implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) with regard to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA). Consequently, decisions and frameworks established under the CBD concerning access and benefit-sharing of DSI/GSD related to PGRFA apply only in countries that have not ratified or are not party to the ITPGRFA.

As reiterated by the Governing Body, technology transfer and scientific cooperation are essential to address the widening technological and scientific gap between countries of the Global North and Global South. However, the IPC underscores that **technology transfer must not be framed as acts of generosity or benefit-sharing**, but rather as long-overdue **compensation for centuries of extractivism, colonization, and systemic economic injustice**.

The extraction and commodification of genetic resources from the Global South, without fair compensation or meaningful involvement of peasants and Indigenous Peoples, has contributed to huge wealth accumulation in industrialized countries. These historical injustices continue today in new forms of digital colonialism, where biological data is extracted, digitized, and monetized violating the rights of farmers' and Indigenous Peoples. Today's discussions on DSI/GSD must begin with the recognition that most of the foundational genetic material and traditional knowledge used in biotechnology and breeding programs worldwide originated in territories and communities

in the Global South, without their Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), with few exceptions. **Technology transfer, therefore, is not a benefit. It is a mandatory reparation.**

We request that:

1. **Technology transfer must not be conditional on policies that give private companies increased influence or control over national economies or food systems.** Past experiences with technology packages tied to trade liberalization, structural adjustment programs, and intellectual property regimes have shown how such conditionalities reinforce dependency, erode national sovereignty, and negatively impact Farmers' Rights. We need a completely different approach: technology transfer projects, programs and agreements must be assessed in advance with the participation of farmers' and Indigenous Peoples organizations, respecting Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and human rights obligations, exclude conditionalities, and be subject to a revision (or approval) of national legislation on DSI. National laws should clearly state that process or product patents on DSI/GSD shall not cover the physical genetic resources containing that genetic information. Infrastructure and tools transfer must comply with the Article 12.3d of the International Treaty and the aforementioned national legislation.
2. **Any technology transfer involving DSI-based LMOs must comply fully with the international obligations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.** DSI-based synthetic organisms should be evaluated, and in case of dissemination reliably traceable, under existing biosafety global frameworks, and national laws on genetic modified organisms where applicable, to ensure environmental and health safety, as well as traceability. Transfers involving synthetic biology or gene editing technologies related to project, programs, and agreements related to DSI/GSD must not bypass the precautionary principle enshrined in the Protocol. It is crucial to prevent any transfer of risks to communities in the Global South, where the impacts of such technologies could be irreversible for ecosystems, local farming practices, and human health.
3. **Capacity development using DSI must neither replace nor undermine the development of farmers' seed systems nor the traditional knowledge, including innovations of local communities,** especially Indigenous Peoples and small-scale food producers, along with their priorities. This includes support for community seed banks, peasant and participatory plant breeding, and agroecological research. These are initiatives that can strengthen collective rights and peasant and community governance of biodiversity, consistently with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants (UNDROP).
4. **Training and capacity development should strengthen the ability of countries and communities to generate, manage, and govern their own data,** rather than serving as vehicles for further extraction of DSI/GSD, and the takeover of the local seed market by patents on these DSI/GSD claimed by seed companies or "research" organizations from developed countries. That is why access to data generated through technology transfer shall be conditioned to a ban on patents, and databases must not serve as loopholes for biopiracy.
5. **Scientific cooperation must be equitable,** ensuring that farmers, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, researchers and institutions in the Global South are recognized as equal partners, with full access to funding, authorship, and decision-making. This includes supporting the development of public research infrastructure in developing countries and resisting the privatization of data and research outputs.

We call upon Contracting Parties and international stakeholders to **develop and support technology transfer mechanisms that are transparent, governed by democratic participation, and based on full respect for the rights of farmers, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities as guaranteed by international law**, especially the rights of those communities whose biodiversity and knowledge have historically been exploited. The architecture of these mechanisms must reflect the spirit of **redistributive justice**, not charity, nor include any derogation from these rights.