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Plant breeding needed for ever!

- **INPUT:** Access to PGRFA a prerequisite
  - Breeders' exemptions
  - The Multilateral system on access and benefit sharing
  - Conserve and sustainable use

- **OUTPUT:** diverse and adaptive varieties

- **HOW:** Funding, structure

- Both UPOV and ITPGRFA specialized instruments for plant breeding
Breeding in Norway

- Aquaculture
- Animal
- Plants: Graminor
- Different IPR strategies
Experiences with UPOV

• Benefits:
  – Access to foreign germplasm
  – Export of Norwegian varieties
  – Buying DUS-testing in Finland

• Public funding – still needed and wanted
• Debate in 2004/2005: yes or no to the 1991 Act?
Why Farmers' Rights?

- Essential for conservation and sustainable use: farmers are custodians and innovators
- Farmers' seed system:
  - Reservoirs of PGRFA
  - Main source of seeds
  - Local cultures.

- In Norway, approx. 25% farmed saved seeds.
- Main forage is based on land race.
Mutually supportive implementation

• Kept the 1978 Act
• Disclosure of origin in the PVP and patent law
• Annual contribution to the Benefit-sharing Fund equal to 0,1% of seed sales.
• Some support to activities for the conservation and sustainable use, e.g. pre-breeding, participatory plant breeding, community seed bank
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International policy

- Crop Wild Relatives
- Meeting of UPOV and ITPGRFA focal points in Oslo in 2014
- Transparency and participation
Lessons learnt

• Link UPOV and Treaty implementation
• Plant breeding needs to meet local agroecological conditions
• Balance Plant Breeders' Rights and Farmers' Rights according to national context
• Still untapped potential for enhanced mutual supportiveness
• Broad participation and inclusiveness is beneficial