

What Provider Countries Need for ABS to Deliver under the Nagoya Protocol

From Adoption to Satisfaction

ABS IN PRACTICE

79%

Institutional representatives from provider countries rated the Protocol's contribution to fairer negotiations globally as medium to high.

Ratings 6–10; n = 48

6.15 / 10

mean overall satisfaction with ABS.

1 = very dissatisfied;

10 = very satisfied; n = 48

Key Findings

- **Adoption exceeds implementation:** Provider rights have become more visible, but national implementation and realised benefits remain uneven.
- **Governance gains matter:** Institutions, coordination and biodiversity policy may improve before substantial benefits flow from individual agreements.
- **Clarity and capacity support cooperation:** Clear procedures and specialist expertise support informed negotiation. Standard tools need room for case-specific terms.
- **Process quality shapes satisfaction:** Transparency, trust, timely communication and meaningful participation were among the factors that most strongly enhance satisfaction with negotiations.
- **Compliance must continue across borders:** Reporting gaps, transfers and changed uses make benefits difficult to verify. Provider states, user states and users share responsibility for clarity and transparency throughout the utilisation of genetic resources.

Key Recommendations



Provider states

- Clear rules and capable institutions
- Meaningful IPLC participation
- Monitoring and transparent benefit distribution



User states

- Substantive compliance checks
- Cross-border cooperation
- Integration of ABS into research funding



Users

- Early planning for ABS and transparent negotiations
- Verifiable benefit commitments
- Reporting of transfers and changed use

Research Community and Funders

Track satisfaction and realised benefits over time. Include IPLC perspectives. Study governance effects and standardisation vs. flexibility. Assess the DSI multilateral mechanism alongside bilateral ABS.

Sources:

Based on the Öko-Institut ABS study with 12 expert interviews (2024) and 60 valid survey responses (2025), mainly from provider-country institutions. Exploratory findings; not statistically representative and not direct IPLC testimony.

Kampffmeyer, N.; Pietschmann, M. (2026): Access and Benefit Sharing – Fair and Equitable Cooperation? A Provider Country Perspective on the Nagoya Protocol. Available at: <https://www.oeko.de/fileadmin/oekodoc/Access-Benefit-Sharing-Nagoya-Protokoll2026.pdf>.

You can find the complete Policy Brief here: https://www.oeko.de/fileadmin/oekodoc/Policy_Brief-From-Adoption-to-Satisfaction.pdf.

The research was funded by the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) with resources from the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN) under grant number FKZ 3523800300.