

Spain's response to the suggested Table of Financial Contributions 2023-2027.

We agree with the rationale and the aim to increase GBIF's budget and thereof the contribution of individual country members. We also keep supporting the principles on which the model is based.

The underlying message of the CODATA 20 year review of GBIF is "GBIF should grow", but it was also very specific on "expanding resources for core funds". It does not say that it has to be accomplished by increasing the contributions of a shrinking number of countries.

We believe that the global economic situation and the evolution of GBIF membership do not make such a move advisable. So, we do not support the proposed "Suggested Table of Financial Contributions 2023-2027". Instead, we propose to extend the financial contribution levels of 2017-2021 one more year (to include 2023), and revisit the Country financial contribution levels for 2024-2028 next year, to take into account how the countries' economic situation is evolving, the behavior the voting constituency of GBIF, and how "Resource Mobilization Strategy" is working. By raising the voting country contributions the pressure to move from voting to assorted, and choose to contribute to the Supplementary Fund in areas of the interest of the country increases. That was the route taken by Japan, and one we are considering.

CODATA 20 year review of GBIF suggest to increase GBIF presence in Asia, but just recently we have lost Japan and India as GBIF Members. This should move us to think if the five-year limit for a country to remain as GBIF associate member is having the intended effect or the opposite. When countries leave GBIF we lose more than their financial contribution, we lose network and nodes capacity and resilience. We believe we should revisit RoP in this regard and find new ways to maintain significant country participation for the benefit and stability of GBIF and ultimately for its growth.

Moving the focus on other regions, the CODATA 20 year review of GBIF mentions the success of GBIF in Latin America. However, if we look a bit into the details, we may realize how fragile it is and how an increase of country contributions could do more harm than good. In Europe, the absence of Italy and Greece in GBIF is flagrant. A dialogue with LifeWatch may be opened to encourage these two countries to be part of GBIF. Both of them are leading the initiative and are very strong in it.

LifeWatch admits as country in-kind contribution resources put into GBIF --that is the case with Spain-- so for them it is a very advantageous proposition, which makes even more sense as LifeWatch needs (and so uses) GBIF services to accomplish its objectives.

We apologize for the delay we have incurred regarding this response. The timing issuing this notice, and the overlapping of individual holidays on our side, did not help in this matter. However, we consider this matter of the utmost importance and thus decided to send our comments and position in this regard.