Views, Experiences and Best Practices as an example of possible options for the national implementation of Article 9 of the International Treaty

Note by the Secretary

At its second meeting of the Ad hoc Technical Expert Group on Farmers’ Rights (AHTEG), the Expert Group agreed on a revised version of the template for collecting information on examples of national measures, best practices and lessons learned from the realization of Farmers’ Rights.

This document presents the updated information on best practices and measures of implementing Article 9 of the International Treaty submitted by Norway on 20 June 2019.

The submission is presented in the form and language in which it was received.
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- **Title of measure/practice**: Global consultations on Farmers’ Rights
- **Date of submission**: 20 June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place**: Norway (and Zambia, Ethiopia and Indonesia)
- **Responsible institution/organization**: The national focal point to the International Treaty: Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
  Senior Advisor, Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
  Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no

- **Type of institution/organization (categories)**: Government
- **Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors**:

**Fridtjof Nansen Institute**
P.O.Box 326, 1326 Lysaker
Norway
post@fni.no
(+47) 67111900

**Regine Andersen**
Senior Research Fellow
Fridtjof Nansen Institute
regine.andersen@fni.no
+47 95118037

**Zambia Agriculture Research Institute**
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Private Bag 7
Chilanga
Zambia
Tel: +260 0966745604 (mob) / +260 1 278380
(office)
mwilagodfrey@yahoo.co.uk

**Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute** (previously Institute of Biodiversity Conservation)
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
P. O. Box: 30726
Tel. +251 11 661 22 44
Description of the examples

Mandatory information:

- **Short summary to be put in the inventory (max. 200 words):**
  Norway, in cooperation with research organizations of the respective host country and the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, has been involved in three global consultations on Farmers' Rights, which took place in Lusaka, Zambia in 2007, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in 2010 and in Bali, Indonesia in 2016. All consultations sought to involve a wide range of participants representing various stakeholders and regions. The program and objectives differed to some extent, but all consultations shared the purpose of producing constructive proposals to the sessions of the Governing Body regarding how to further enhance the implementation of Farmers' Rights. The second consultation consisted of both an e-mail-based survey and an international conference with regional components, which allowed more experts and stakeholders to participate than a conference alone could. Participants of these consultations actively engaged and shared views, experiences and examples of best practices relating to the implementation of Farmers’ Rights and discussed a range of issues that may affect their realization. Besides providing information to contracting parties and the Governing Body, these consultations have also strengthened the national implementation of Farmers’ Rights in some countries and contributed to awareness raising among government representatives and other stakeholders. The documented experiences could thus serve as examples of options for encouraging, guiding and promoting the realization of Farmers’ Rights.

- **Brief history; Core components of the measure/practice and description of the context and the history of the measure/practice is taking place:**

Norway has been involved in three global consultations on Farmers' Rights, which took place in Lusaka, Zambia in 2007, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in 2010 and in Bali, Indonesia in 2016. All consultations sought to involve a wide range of participants representing different stakeholders and various regions. The number of participants increased gradually from the first one, with less than 30 participants till the last one with almost 100 participants. The program and objectives different to some extent, but all consultations shared the purpose of producing constructive proposals to the sessions of the Governing Body regarding how to further enhance the implementation of Farmers' Rights.

**Lusaka, Zambia 2007**
The first consultation took place in the intersessional period between the first and second session of the Governing Body, where the implementation of the International Treaty was still at a very early

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
stage. The Bureau of the Governing Body decided in November 2006 to include “the implementation of Article 9” as an item on the provisional agenda for the Second Session of the Governing Body to the Treaty. To prepare for the discussions under this agenda item, Norway took the initiative to conduct an informal international consultation. The consultation took place in Lusaka, Zambia, 18–20 September 2007 and was co-hosted by the Zambia Agricultural Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Zambia; the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Norway; and the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway.

Addis Abeba, Ethiopia 2010
The Global Consultations on Farmers’ Rights carried out in 2010 consisted of both an e-mail based survey and an international consultation conference with regional components held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The consultations were organized as a response to Resolution 6/2009 of the Governing Body of the International Treaty, which called for regional workshops on Farmers’ Rights, and it was carried out by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute of Norway and hosted by the Institute of Biodiversity Conservation of Ethiopia. In the two phases of the consultations, a total of 171 experts and stakeholders from 46 countries in Africa, Asia, the Near East, Latin America and the Caribbean, North America and Europe, and from farmer organizations, government institutions, the seed industry, NGOs, IGOs, research institutions and other relevant groups participated. The participants shared their views and experiences and discussed obstacles and options to the realization of Farmers’ Rights. The consultation conference resulted in recommendations from the regional groups as well as joint recommendations from the conference. The prime concern among most participants is the need for guidance, support and capacity building to develop or adjust national legislation, policies, strategies and programs for the realization of Farmers’ Rights. Based on these global consultation in 2010, Ethiopia submitted an input paper to the 4th session of the Governing Body, which was circulated to all contracting parties.

Bali, Indonesia 2016
In response to the invitation of the Governing Body through Resolution 5/2015 to organise consultations on Farmers’ Rights, Indonesia invited Norway to co-organise a global consultation in Bali, Indonesia. The consultation brought together about 95 participants from 37 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Near East, North America and Southwest Pacific. The participants were drawn from farmers’ organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), Contracting Parties, seed industry organizations and research institutions. The event was co-chaired by Regine Andersen from Norway and Carlos Correa from Argentina.

The consultation addressed the following issues in particular: (i) why Farmers’ Rights matter; (ii) different challenges for the realization of Farmers’ Rights; and (iii) possible ways of further strengthening the realization of Farmers’ Rights. During the consultation, participants actively engaged and shared views, experiences and examples of best practices related to the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, as addressed in the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. They also identified a range of issues that may affect the realization of Farmers’ Rights and discussed a possible set of recommendations to the Governing Body in this regard. Due to the large number of participants, limitation of time and that some participants represented organizations without a mandate to adopt recommendations, it was agreed to request the Co-chairs to make a summary reflecting their interpretation of the discussions at the Consultation. Later, Norway and Indonesia submitted the co-chairs' proposal to the sixth session of the Governing Body so that the
Governing Body could consider these recommendations and possibly adopt a resolution on Farmers’ Rights reflecting these considerations.

- *To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate*
  
  Art. 9.1  
  Art. 9.2a  
  Art. 9.2b  
  Art. 9.2c  
  Art. 9.3

*Other information, if applicable*

- *Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks⁴, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).

⁴ Including seed houses.
• In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? ____________________________________________________________

• **Objective(s):**

The objective of the 2007 informal consultations on Farmers' Rights was to prepare for the discussions under the agenda item *implementation of Farmers' Rights* at the upcoming session of the Governing Body.

The overall goal of the 2010 global consultations on Farmers' Rights was to support the implementation of Farmer’ Rights at the national level, as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty. Its project objective was to fulfil the provision of Resolution 6/2009 on regional consultations on Farmers' Rights. In particular, the consultations were aimed at the sharing of national experiences on the implementation of Farmers’ Rights among Contracting Parties of each region, and the identification of gaps and needs at the national level with regard to the further implementation of Farmers' Rights.

The objectives of the 2016 global consultations Farmers' Rights were to develop common ground for understanding Farmers’ Rights, to find inspiration in the exchange of best practices on realization of Farmers’ Rights, and to gather ideas on how to strengthen implementation of Farmers’ Rights by bringing together a broad range of stakeholders.

• **Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers**: different stakeholder groups from across the regions

• **Location(s) and geographical outreach**: International level

• **Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice**: Human resources: organising committee to plan for the program incl. inviting speakers, apply for funding, identifying participants, venue etc., report writing. Financial resources to cover all costs.

• **How has the measure/practice affected the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture?**

The outcomes of the consultations have provided valuable inputs to the sessions of the Governing Body, enhancing the discussions under this agenda item and different suggestions from the consultations have been included in the resolutions of the Governing Body, e.g. the suggestion to establish an intersessional process to produce an inventory of examples of realisation of Farmers' Rights.

The sharing of examples have also strengthen the national implementation of Farmers' Rights in some countries. The consultations have also been important for awareness raising among government representatives and other stakeholders.

5 Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
The consultation in Indonesia also gave the impetus to organise regional consultations prior to the global one (one in Africa and one smaller one in Europe) as well as regional consultations among farmers’ organisations in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

- Please describe the achievements of the measure/practice so far (including quantification) (max 200 words)
- Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice
- Are you aware of any other international agreements or programs that are relevant for this measure/practice?
- Other issues you wish to address, that have not yet been covered, to describe the measure/practice

Lessons learned
- Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).

Norway considers it useful to bring together participants from different regions, different stakeholder groups and thus with different perspectives. In our view, the consultations have enhanced the general understanding of Farmers’ Rights, identified several obstacles that prevents further realisation of Farmers’ Rights, as well as possible solutions on how to overcome those. E.g. the presentations made at the 2016 global consultation documented several experiences regarding the realisation of Farmers' Rights and could thus serve as examples of options for encouraging, guiding and promoting the realization of Farmers’ Rights.

Among these are:
- Strengthening of local seed systems, including supporting farmers as seed suppliers (e.g. through seed clubs)
- Strengthening farmers' and their organisations' participation in decision making at national and regional levels on policy and regulation regarding seed registration and plant variety protection
- Promoting participatory approaches such as community seed banks and participatory plant breeding
- Integration of Farmers’ Rights in development cooperation programmes

In addition, the consultations contributed to prepare Contracting Parties and other stakeholders to the upcoming sessions on Farmers’ Rights, thus contributing to enriching the discussions under this agenda item and providing inputs to the resolution on the subject matter.

- What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)

Funding is a challenge. All consultations have benefitted from numerous sponsors. It would have been easier to organise the consultations with fewer, but larger donors. However, the financial challenge was managed by asking as many participants as possible to cover their own costs as well as to sponsor other participants. Translation is costly, but highly valuable to increase the number and engagement of participants and stakeholders.

- What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)

The consultations became relevant because they all produced specific recommendations to the upcoming sessions of the Governing Body. It's important to have ownership of Contracting Parties, so that the results of the consultations can be formally presented at the sessions of the Governing Body. At the same time, due to the strong engagement of different stakeholders in the issues related to Farmers’ Rights, it's
The consultations have greatly benefitted from continuity (Regine Andersen, Fridtjof Nansen Institute) in organising all three consultations and participating in all sessions of the Governing Body. The approach has been research based including documented experiences, systematic collections of experiences through electronic surveys.

The consultations have produced concrete recommendations due to well prepared and structured co-chairs, and rich reports of the consultations.

**Further information**

*Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice*

- Norway's submission on Farmers' Rights: [http://www.fao.org/3/a-bs767e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-bs767e.pdf)
- Input paper submitted by Ethiopia based on Global Consultations on Farmers’ Rights in 2010 [http://www.fao.org/3/a-be078e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-be078e.pdf)

Submission from Norway and Indonesia containing the Co-Chairs' proposal from the 2016 Global Consultation on Farmers' Rights [http://www.fao.org/3/a-bt107e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-bt107e.pdf)
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- **Title of measure/practice:** Annual support to the Benefit-sharing Fund (BSF)
- **Date of submission:** 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place:** Norway
- **Responsible institution/organization:** Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture of Food

Contact details:
The national focal point to the International Treaty:
Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
Senior Advisor, Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no

- **Type of institution/organization (categories):** Government

**Description of the examples**

Mandatory information:¹

- **Short summary to be put in the inventory:**
Norway launched its annual contribution to the Benefit-Sharing Fund (BSF) during the official opening ceremony of the Svalbard Global Seed Vault in 2008 to stress the importance of on-farm conservation, complementing to ex situ conservation efforts. At the same time, this annual contribution is done in recognition of the benefit of Norwegian agriculture of plant genetic resources that originate from other areas of the globe. To illustrate this argument, this voluntary contribution is related to the seed trade and equals 0.1% of annual seed sales in Norway. It is referred to in the State Budget, endorsed by the parliament. Norway considers it to be a use-based, voluntary monetary benefit sharing. In addition, the annual contributions give an opportunity to bring the issue regularly to the attention of the political leadership of the ministry.

- **Brief history:** Core components and description of the context and the history of the measure/practice is taking place
Norway launched its annual contribution to the Benefit-sharing Fund during the official opening of the Svalbard Global Seed Vault in 2008. The venue and timing of the launch was deliberate chosen. At the occasion of opening the global back-up facility for the world's gene banks, Norway wanted to stress the importance of on farm conservation in addition to ex situ. At the same time, Norway underlined that its annual contribution is done in recognition of the benefit of Norwegian agriculture of plant genetic resources that originate other areas of the globe. To illustrate this argument, the Norwegian contribution is related to the seed trade. The annual contribution equals 0.1% of annual seed sales in Norway.

---

¹ This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
The first annual contribution to the BSF was sent in 2009, calculated from the seed sales of 2008. Every single year since, a similar annual contribution has been paid. The payment is based on a political decision to balance the management of Svalbard Global Seed Vault with giving attention and support also to on farm management of PGRFA. The annual contribution is referred to in the State Budget, which is endorsed by the Parliament.

The annual contribution is voluntary monetary benefit sharing. In Norway's view, this contribution is not to intended to replace the SMTA of the Treaty, or reducing any obligations of mandatory or voluntary contributions of users of material from the MLS.

In addition to the annual contribution, which is covered by the budget of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Norway has also supported the BSF with major grants (40 Mill NOK in 2013 and 3 Mill NOK in 2017) from the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

- To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate
  - Art. 9.1 x
  - Art. 9.2a
  - Art. 9.2b x
  - Art. 9.2c
  - Art. 9.3

Other information, if applicable
- Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant(^2)</th>
<th>Also relevant(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

\(^3\) Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks\(^4\), seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.

Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection.

Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels.

Training, capacity development and public awareness creation.

Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.

Other measures / practices

- **In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category?**

- **Objective(s)**
  Predictable contribution to the BSF from a user country ensuring financial support to on farm conservation of PGRFA.

- **Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers\(^5\)**
  The Benefit-sharing Fund invests directly in high impact projects supporting farmers in developing countries conserve crop diversity in their fields and assisting farmers and breeders globally adapt crops to our changing needs and demands.

  The BSF seeks to accelerate the conservation and use of plant genetic resources on a global scale through technology transfer, capacity building, high-impact projects and innovative partnerships involving farmers, plant breeders, civil society and other stakeholders. The Benefit-sharing Fund prioritizes on-farm management and conservation, it increases food security and facilitates innovative partnerships.

- **Location(s) and geographical outreach**: Global

- **Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice**
  The annual contribution in 2018 was NOK 858 046 (equals USD 110.430).

- **Are you aware of any other international agreements or programs that are relevant for this measure/practice?**
  Other example of annual contribution to the Benefit-sharing Fund: During the 7\(^{th}\) session of the Governing Body in 2017, French GNIS announced that it will give an annual contribution to the BSF equals 175.000 Euros.

---

\(^4\) Including seed houses.

\(^5\) Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Other issues you wish to address, that have not yet been covered, to describe the measure/practice

In March 2018, the state secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Ms. Hanne Maren Blåfjelldal, went on a field trip to Malawi to visit projects that have got support from the Benefit-sharing Fund (BSF). This trip highlighted in several ways how the BSF supports the realization of Farmers’ Rights. Among the key issues discussed at the field trip:

- The importance of seed policy and legislation in order to give legal space for the improvement of local seed systems, e.g. the possibility for farming communities to sell seeds from community seed banks.
- The challenge of the formal seed system to meet the demand for certified seeds both in terms of quantity and quality.
- The possible synergies between BSF-supported projects (relatively small amount of funding) and other agricultural development programmers.

Lessons learned

Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).

The annual contributions give an opportunity to bring the issue regularly to the attention of the political leadership of the ministry.

What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)

What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)

Norway has chosen to link the national contribution to the annual seed sales. The information of seed sales is easily available to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. In 2008, Norway also considered option to make farmers, farmers’ organizations or seed traders to pay to the BSF. Given the specific structure of Norwegian agriculture and the tight financial links between the authorities and the farmers’ organizations, it was considered to be a much simpler approach that the Ministry pays the annual contribution. What could be the possible most efficient or practical approach in other countries should be considered based on the national circumstances and agricultural sector in that country.

Contribution to Sustainable Development Goal 2.5

Further information

Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice

State budget, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food (in Norwegian):  

Official website of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, announcement of 2018 contribution (In Norwegian):  
https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/blafjelldal-reiser-til-malawi/id2592576/

Official website of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, announcement of 2017 contribution (In Norwegian):  
https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/norge-stotter-bonders-aktive-bruk-av-savaremangfold/id2540728/

Announcement of 2017 contribution:
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- **Title of measure/practice**: Farmers' Rights to Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture: Implementation of the Plant Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol in Bulgaria, RIGHTS

- **Date of submission**: 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place**: Norway, Bulgaria
- **Responsible institution/organization**
The Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources at the Norwegian Institute for Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO)

**Contact person:**
Morten Rasmussen
morten.rasmussen@nibio.no
NIBIO
Postbox 115
NO-1431 Ås
Norway

- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** Government, research
- **Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors**
Institute of Plant Genetic Resources „K. Malkov”
http://ipgrbg.com/en/

**Description of the examples**

Mandatory information:1

- **Short summary to be put in the inventory**
The Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources at the Norwegian Institute for Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO), together with the Institute of Plant Genetic Resources ‘K. Malkov’ in Bulgaria, participated in a project on the implementation of the Plant Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol (2015-2016). The project’s main purpose was to propose elements for a national strategy supporting Farmers’ Rights in access to PGRFA in the context of the International Treaty and the Nagoya Protocol, both signed and ratified by Bulgaria. The Norwegian partner actively engaged in several workshops and seminars and offered a study tour to Norway for a group of six Bulgarian representatives of target groups. They visited the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, NIBIO, farmers as well as organizations that are part of value chains using plant genetic resources. Further activities included the development of a report on best practices for the realization of Farmers' Rights; capacity building workshops; development of a list of measures for implementation of Farmers' Rights; and of a draft strategy for PGRFA in Bulgaria. The project activities contributed to enhancing awareness and capacities

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
regarding key aspects of Farmers’ Rights, including methods to study policies and processes and to reach consensus on important topics and issues of relevance for farmers’ access to plant genetic resources.

- **Brief history** Same as above
- **Core components of the measure/practice** Same as above
- **Description of the context and the history** Same as above

- **To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate**
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art. 9.1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 9.2a</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 9.2b</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 9.2c</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 9.3</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Other information, if applicable**

  - **Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant</th>
<th>Also relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

3 Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).

4 Including seed houses.
Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.

Other measures / practices

- In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? ____________________________________________________________

Objective(s) The main purpose of the project is ensuring farmers' rights in access to plant genetic resources for agricultural activities and food industry in the context of the signed and ratified, by Bulgaria, international treaties: International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) and the Nagoya Protocol.

Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers The National Gene bank, seed sector, growers organizations, Central government institutions, ministries and government agencies, research and scientific organizations, individual farmers and farmers’ branch structures, civil society organizations.

Location(s) and geographical outreach Bulgaria

Lessons learned

- Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).
  The human resource capacity was developed during workshops (more than 100 people were involved, while 30 were planned). Measures were proposed for applying an integrated approach to ensure the rights of farmers. Awareness of the need to preserve traditional knowledge was built. Studies of existing policies and practices have been carried out. Methods to study policies and processes and to reach consensus on important topics were applied. The goal was to modernize the relationship between farmers, NGOs, gene banks and decision-makers. The project activities contributed to updating views at all levels of the problematic areas, in support of the farmers' access to plant genetic resources. Reflection in legislation was extensively covered.

  During the project implementation was the establishment of working contacts and knowledge exchange with many Norwegian, Scandinavian and international organizations, e.g. Biodiversity International. Project developed ideas and models for implementation of practices for sustainable growth based on the diversity of traditional genetic resources. A very successful study visit to Norway for a group of 6 Bulgarian representatives of the target groups (decision makers from MAFF and MOEW, farmers, and IPGR Sadovo), which visits to the Norwegian Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, NIBIO, farmers working with PGR, and other organizations/institutions, part of the PGR value chain. Project results were verified during the meetings at Biodiversity International and the full compliance with the international norms was acknowledged.

- What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)
- What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)

---

5 Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Building bridges between public, private and civil society sector within the field of PGR was extremely important for the implementation of all articles of the Plant Treaty, holding all stakeholders accountable for their participation and securing their contribution. Bringing together representatives from all relevant stakeholders were crucial for the success of the project.

Providing a path for understanding how Farmers' Rights may serve as a vehicle to fulfil the purposes of the Plant Treaty by showing examples of structures underpinning access to plant propagative material for all uses was important, hereunder seed saver organizations and community gene banks in an European context.

It was particularly helpful to meet the Biodiversity International product groups, due to the organization's experience in the field of our project worldwide.

Bringing different actors together – government, research and NGOs – all having different roles in the management of PGRFA, is a good learning exercise for all. Closer coordination between the environment and the agricultural sector is also strengthening the management of PGRFA.

Further information
Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice
Project description: https://eeagrants.org/project-portal/project/BG03-0008
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information
- Title of measure/practice: The Plant Heritage Award
- Date of submission: 20th June 2019
- Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place: Norway
- Responsible institution/organization: The Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources at the Norwegian Institute for Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO)
  
  Contact person:
  Morten Rasmussen
  morten.rasmussen@nibio.no

  NIBIO
  Postbox 115
  NO-1431 Ås
  Norway

- Type of institution/organization (categories): Government/research

Description of the examples

Mandatory information:
- Short summary to be put in the inventory
  The Plant Heritage Award was created in order to support awareness, engagement and action to preserve and use plant genetic resources. It was awarded for the first time in 2006. The candidates are proposed to the Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources at the Norwegian Institute for Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO) and approved by its advisory board. The award is meant as an appreciation for special efforts that promote the goal of conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic diversity. It can be awarded to individuals as well as institutions and is not exclusively directed towards farmers. However, since it was established, several farmers have been awarded the prize, which consists of a unique lithography by a Norwegian artist as well as a diploma. Thus, the prize also recognizes the important efforts of farmers in addition to those of researchers and formal institutions in conserving PGRFA and ensuring sustainable use of those resources. It creates an annual event that gives an opportunity to strengthen awareness on the importance of conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, thus addressing the general public, other farmers as well as the political leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, amongst other public institutions.

- Brief history; Core components and description of the context and the history:
  In order to create awareness, engagement and action to preserve and use genetic resources, the Plant Heritage Prize has been created. The award is an appreciation for special efforts that promote the goal of

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic diversity. The prize consists of a unique lithography by the Norwegian artist Otto Østenstad as well as a diploma.

The prize was awarded for the first time in 2006. The candidates are proposed to the Norwegian Genetic Resources Centre and the recipients are approved by their advisory board on Plant Genetic Resource. The prize can be awarded to individuals as well as institutions.

The prize is not exclusively directed towards farmers, but since it was established, several farmers have been awarded the prize. Thus, the prize also recognizes the important efforts of farmers in addition to those of researchers and formal institutions in conserving PGRFA and ensuring sustainable use of those resources.

Examples of farmers who have received the prize:
(i) Erling Olsen, a farmer and formerly a breeder at a Norwegian research facility, was awarded in 2006 for his conservation of more than 170 older varieties of potato;
(ii) Johan Swärd received the price in 2011 due to his comprehensive work of documenting the different properties of old cereal varieties, and to ensure that they are cultivated. At his farm, Johan Swärd has a rich collection of varieties stored.
(iii) In 2012, Stephen Barstow was awarded due to his unique knowledge of plant diversity, having around 2000 different plants in his own garden, and having a comprehensive information activity, including presentations and on-line publications regarding PGRFA, e.g. https://www.adlibris.com/no/bok/around-the-world-in-80-plants-an-edible-perennial-vegetable-adventure-for-temperate-climates-9781856231411

To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate
Art. 9.1 x
Art. 9.2a □
Art. 9.2b □
Art. 9.2c □
Art. 9.3 □

Other information, if applicable
Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.
³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
3 Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA

4 Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge

5 In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites

6 Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks⁴, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.

7 Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection

8 Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels

9 Training, capacity development and public awareness creation

10 Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.

11 Other measures / practices

- In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? __________________________________________________________

- Objective(s) To create awareness, engagement and action to conserve and use plant genetic resources

- Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers⁵ Direct target group: individuals or institutions that have made special contributions to the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic diversity in agriculture in Norway. Indirect target group: general public and Norwegian press

- Location(s) and geographical outreach national

- Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice The measure require limited financial resources to be implemented, and can be exploited for public attention depending in input in publicity work.

- How has the measure/practice affected the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture? Difficult to quantify impact, but the prize contributes to awareness raising both among the general public as well as among the political leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, and amongst other public institutions. Such awareness is necessary in order to have political support to continued public funding of related activities.

⁴ Including seed houses.

⁵ Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Lessons learned

- Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).

The level of contribution to awareness raising with such an award is linked to several aspects, including:

- Creates an annual event that gives an opportunity to address PGRFA issues
- The process of finding candidates and announcing nominees gives potential to give information e.g. through news articles on web or trying to get media attention
- Announcing the prize winner at a public seminar gives more attention to the prize winner and the topic
- Having Deputy Minister to hand over the prize gives more prestige to the prize – as well as gives an opportunity to raise awareness in the political leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.
- Necessary to "translate" technical reasons for the award to a language that is understandable by the general public.

The Award serves as a way to provide farmers and the public in general with information on genetic resources and biodiversity, and it can also supply farmers with valuable input on how to utilize such resources. It has also heightened the focus on conservation and sustainable use of older varieties of plants, and increased the demand for propagating material of such varieties. This ensures that the varieties are actually used, which is the best guarantee against genetic erosion.

Further information

Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice

About the prize in 2018 (in Norwegian):

https://nibio.no/nyheter/helge-skinnes-fekk-plantearvenprisen-for-unikt-arbeid;
https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/forsker-helge-skinnes-mottok-plantearveprisen-for-2018/id2612396/
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information
- Title of measure/practice: Linking on farm management and ex situ conservation at Svalbard Global Seed Vault
- Date of submission: 20th June 2019
- Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place: Norway
- Responsible institution/organization: Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
  Senior Advisor,
  The national focal point to the International Treaty
  Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
  Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no
- Type of institution/organization (categories): Government
- Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors:
  ✓ Nordic Genetic Resources Centre (NordGen)
  ✓ Global Crop Diversity Trust

Description of the examples
Mandatory information:
- Short summary to be put in the inventory

The Svalbard Global Seed Vault in Norway offers storage facilities for duplicates of seed accessions conserved by national, regional and international genebanks, research institutes and NGOs. It thus serves as a ‘backup’ of the ex situ collections of the world. However, it is a major objective of the Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food and its partners, the Global Crop Diversity Trust and the Nordic Genetic Resources Centre (NordGen), to strengthen the links between various conservation strategies, including in situ and on-farm conservation, and to highlight the complementarities of the various strategies. This has been done, for example, by inviting individual farmers and their organizations to present their work in official ceremonies, like for example the opening ceremony in 2008 and the 10th anniversary of the Svalbard Global Seed Vault in 2018. In addition, storage is also offered for duplicates of unique seed accessions conserved by farming communities. Norway’s annual contribution to the Benefit-Sharing Fund (BSF), announced at the official opening, is also meant to highlight the importance and complementary contributions of various conservation strategies.

- Brief history; Core components and Description of the context and the history of the measure/practice is taking place

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
The idea of having a global security storage facility in Svalbard, to house duplicates of seed conserved in gene banks all over the world began being discussed in the 1980s. After the entry into force of the International Treaty, the idea was realised. In 2008, the Svalbard Global Seed Vault was officially opened. The Seed Vault provides facilities for the safe deposit of seeds samples that have distinct genetic resources of importance to food security and sustainable agriculture. After ten years of operation, more than one million accessions have been stored at Svalbard.

The Svalbard Global Seed Vault is the backup of the ex situ collections of the world. However, to Norwegian authorities it has been a major objective to stress the need also for in situ and on farm conservation, as well as to strengthen the links between different conservation strategies. These are examples of this:

1. the involvement of farmers and their organizations have been important as well as highlighting the complementarities to on farm. Among the speakers at the official opening in 2008, was also late Tay Gipo, a Philippe farmer. In the audience were about 200 scientists, diplomats and world leaders including 2004 Nobel Peace Prize Awardee Wangari Mathai of Kenya and UN Food and Agriculture Organization Secretary General Jacques Diouf. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food of Norway invited Tay Gipo for his work on seed conservation, rice breeding and maintenance of biodiversity in his farm.

2. Annual contribution to the BSF announced at the official opening (see example 2 from Norway)

3. The Seed Vault offers storage for duplicates of all unique seed accessions conserved also by farming communities. For example, in 2015, potato farmers from Peru deposited seeds in the Vault.

4. During the 10 year anniversary of the Seed Vault in February 2018, also representatives of organisations working closely with farming communities, were invited to make presentations at the Svalbard Seed Summit. One of the key messages from this summit was that governments should facilitate improvement of community seed banks and the multiplication of the seeds they contain. This will conserve crop diversity that has been saved by the farming community. It will give local farmers easy and timely access to diverse and

---

To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate

Art. 9.1  x □
Art. 9.2a  □
Art. 9.2b  □
Art. 9.2c  x □
Art. 9.3  □

---

2
Other information, if applicable

- Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Also relevant&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? Linking ex situ, in situ and on farm conservation

- **Objective(s)** The Svalbard Global Seed Vault provides facilities for the safe deposit of seeds samples that have distinct genetic resources of importance to food security and sustainable agriculture. The Seed Vault offers storage for duplicates of all unique seed accessions conserved by national, regional and international gene banks, research institutes and NGOs.

- **Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers**<sup>6</sup> National, Regional and International gene banks, research institutes and NGOs.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

<sup>4</sup> Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).

<sup>5</sup> Including seed houses.

<sup>6</sup> Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Location(s) and geographical outreach Norway, International level

Lessons learned
- Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).

Work closely with civil society organizations to link up with farmers and institutions working with farmers that are involved with on farm management.

Further information
- Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice

Submitted by Norway
- General information about the Svalbard Global Seed Vault: https://www.seedvault.no/
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- **Title of measure/practice**: Norwegian community seed bank
- **Date of submission**: 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place**: Norway

- **Responsible institution/organization**
The Royal Norwegian Society for Development (Norges Vel)
Bråteveien 200, N-2013 Skjetten
Norway
https://norgesvel.com/home/
Contact person: Henriette Vivestad
henriette.vivestad@norgesvel.no

- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** independent non-profit member organisation

- **Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors**
Solhatt økologisk hagebruk AS
Almsgutua 59
2335 Stange
https://solhatt.no/
Contact person: Jasper Kroon
info@solhatt.no
+47 40 67 30 74

Økologisk Spesialkorn DA
Hov,
3350 Prestfoss
https://spesialkorn.no/
Contact person: Anders Naess
(+47) 95 75 97 65
anders.naess@online.no

Description of the examples

Mandatory information:

- Short summary to be put in the inventory

The Norwegian community seed bank is a joint initiative of the Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre, the Royal Norwegian Society, private sector partners and associations. The objective is to promote the use of traditional varieties, including orphan crops, where it is economically viable to do so, and to facilitate efforts that these varieties once more can become commercially interesting. After

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
consulting with various partners, the Norwegian community seed bank was founded in 2018. It is owned by a newly-established cooperative with funding provided by the Norwegian Agriculture Agency and technical support by the Norwegian Extension Service. The Norwegian community seed bank institutionalizes the previous on-farm conservation work done by individual farmers and gardeners, thus reducing the dependence on idealistic individuals, particularly since some of the most knowledgeable and active farmers are approaching the age of retirement. It can further help to enhance restoration, regeneration and reintroduction of traditional varieties stored in collections, e.g. of universities, to create awareness among farmers and to increase their interest in engaging in seed production and use of traditional Norwegian varieties.

- **Brief history; Core components and Description**
  In 2018, a Norwegian community seed bank was established in order to conserve plant genetic material and ensure the survival and availability for use of diversity of Norwegian varieties. Old Norwegian varieties of plant material can have good characteristics and be resilient to certain illnesses. Norway is currently entirely dependent on overseas vegetable varieties.

  The Norwegian community seed bank was set up by the Royal Norwegian Society for Development together with cultivators of old plant varieties. This is a formal and visible cooperative for all producers and cultivators of Norwegian seed that naturally belongs in a community seed bank.

  In the autumn of 2017, the Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre and Organic Norge invited the Royal Norwegian Society for Development to discuss the founding of a Norwegian Community Seed bank for plant material. Bodies involved in Norwegian seed work indicated that the Royal Norwegian Society for Development would be a natural hub for a national Community Seed bank of this kind.

  A collaboration agreement was signed in 2018 with the Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre and the work is being financially supported by the Norwegian Agriculture Agency. The joint owners of the newly-established cooperative are initially Økologisk Spesialkorn DA and Solhatt Økologisk Hagebruk AS. Organic Norway and Norwegian Extension services (Norsk Landbruksrådgivning) are active supporting bodies.

  The Norwegian Community Seed Bank is continuing the previous work done by Johan Swärd, a farmer who has about 60 varieties in a local community seed bank at his farm. Johan Swärd is still regenerating those seeds, but the Norwegian Community Seed Bank aims to institutionalize this work, to reduce the dependence on idealistic individuals. The two main owners of the Norwegian Community Seed Bank are companies that have specialised in commercialisation of traditional varieties. The first company, Økologisk Spesialkorn, owned by two farmers with decades of experiences in the use of traditional varieties. The other company, Solhatt, is specialised in organic garden seeds, and also sells seeds of traditional varieties.

- **To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate**
  Art. 9.1 □
  Art. 9.2a x□
  Art. 9.2b x□
  Art. 9.2c □
  Art. 9.3 □

**Other information, if applicable**
Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks⁴, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective(s) The Norwegian Community Seed Bank (Norsk Bruksgenbank SA) is to promote the use of traditional varieties, including orphan crops, where it is economically viable to do so, and to work to ensure that these varieties once more can become commercially interesting.

Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers⁵ Potentially all Norwegian farmers, particularly diversity farmers

Location(s) and geographical outreach National

Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.
³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
⁴ Including seed houses.
⁵ Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
How has the measure/practice affected the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture?

It is too early to measure any effects yet as the community seed bank is a very young set up.

Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice The community seed bank is set up in collaboration with the Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre.

Lessons learned

Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).

Reintroducing old, historically and culturally important varieties in countries with well-established commercial seed systems are challenging, particularly in the Nordic countries with well-educated farmers, where landraces and traditional varieties where rapidly replaced by modern high yielding varieties when these became available. Existing varieties have therefore survived at e.g. universities and research centres, not specifically trained in variety maintenance. Many surviving varieties conserved at the gene bank must therefore be restored true to type before use is possible, and sufficient quantities for testing must be generated. The Norwegian community seed bank is instrumental for carrying out such activities and thus providing possibility for reintroduction, where commercially relevant.

What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)

Main tasks/challenges in the near future for the Community Seed Bank:

✓ Transfer the local community seed bank for cereals from Johan Swärd, the farmer, to the organisation behind the national seed bank. It's necessary to improve the regenerating work. This demands financial resources to e.g. equipment for storage, small batch handling and seed cleaning.
✓ Establish a standardised list of varieties and defining criteria for which varieties to keep and include in the seed bank.
✓ Advocacy work in order to increase the political priority of the work of the seed bank. Today, there is not sufficient funding to replace the work done on an idealistic and voluntary basis.
✓ Awareness raising to increase the interest among farmers to use of old, Norwegian varieties.
✓ Recruit more co-owners of the seed bank to strengthen the organisation. There is a need to recruit more farmers to be seed producers. It’s a challenge that some of the most knowledgeable and active farmers are approaching the age of retirement.

What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)

Further information

Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice

About the project:

Involved institutions:
https://norgesvel.com/home/
https://spesialkorn.no/https://solhatt.no/om-oss/
Template for submission of Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information
- **Title of measure/practice** Farmers’ access to gene bank material
- **Date of submission** 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place** Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Iceland
- **Responsible institution/organization**
  Nordic Genetic Resource Centre (NordGen)
  Box 41, SE-230 53 Alnarp, Sweden
  +46 40 53 66 40
  https://www.nordgen.org/en/
  plants@nordgen.org
- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** Intergovernmental organization (regional gene bank)
- **Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors, if applicable** Ministries in Nordic countries.

Description of the examples
Mandatory information:¹
- **Short summary to be put in the inventory:**
  Facilitating access to germplasm under the Multi-Lateral System (MLS) of the International Treaty could be considered as a contribution to benefit sharing. The Nordic Genetic Resource Centre (NordGen) is the genebank maintaining germplasm of Nordic origin as well as material relevant for the Nordic region. The seed material stored at NordGen is available upon request for plant breeders, plant researchers, museums and other bona fide users. Germplasm managed by NordGen is available in small quantities for research, breeding, conservation or similar purposes. While NordGen mainly serves the scientific community, it also honors reasonable requests from individuals, such as farmers and gardeners, provided that the requester has a serious interest in seed saving and maintaining old or rare varieties. To facilitate access for these individuals, NordGen has developed a simplified material transfer agreement, called ‘Hobby Material Transfer Agreement’; a small administrative fee was introduced to manage the rising number of requests.

  **Brief history; Core components and description:** See summary above. The so-called Kalmar Declaration of 2003 clarifies the joint Nordic position on access and rights to genetic resources. The Declaration establishes that all plant genetic resources in the Nordic Gene Bank, not only those that are used for food and agriculture or are part of the Multilateral System, are freely available to all users.

¹ This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate

- Art. 9.1
- Art. 9.2a
- Art. 9.2b ✔
- Art. 9.2c
- Art. 9.3

Other information, if applicable
- Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant</th>
<th>Also relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks(^4), seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? Farmers access to MLS material
- Objective(s) Potentially all farmers and other individuals interested in gene bank material

\(^2\) Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

\(^3\) Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).

\(^4\) Including seed houses.
• **Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers**
  Nordic region (but also get requests from other countries)

• **Location(s) and geographical outreach**
  Nordic, international

• **Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice**
  The Norwegian community seed bank is instrumental to gain actual access for farmers to PGR conserved at the gene bank. Far too small quantities of seeds as well as non-true to type seeds created obstacles for direct use of gene bank materials by farmers, and is in most cases prohibitive for use. Having a stakeholder securing the required multiplication and restoration of an accession prior to testing and use is of uttermost importance.

  KVANN, the Norwegian seed saves are instrumental to disperse seeds of conserved accessions to private growers for hobby purposes while minimizing costs and workload for the gene bank. Furthermore, seed saver organizations also produce seeds of the most popular varieties for distribution amongst their members, and thus over years reduces costs and workload at the gene bank.

**Lessons learned**

• **What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)**
  The number of requests for seeds have been so high, that the gene bank has run out of seeds and cannot meet the full demand. It has been necessary to introduce a small administrative fee.

**Further information**

• **Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice**

  Submitted by Norway
  https://www.nordgen.org/en/

  Hobby Material Transfer Agreement:
  https://shop.nordgen.org/index.php/terms-and-conditions/

---

5 Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Template for submission of
Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information
- **Title of measure/practice** Participation in decision-making
- **Date of submission** 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place** Norway
- **Responsible institution/organization** Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
  Senior Advisor,
  The national focal point to the International Treaty
  Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
  Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no
- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** Government
- **Collaborating/supporting institutions**
  The Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources at the Norwegian Institute for Bioeconomy
  Research (NIBIO)
  Contact person: Morten Rasmussen
  morten.rasmussen@nibio.no
  NIBIO
  Postbox 115
  NO-1431 Ås
  Norway

Description of the examples
**Mandatory information:**
- **Short summary to be put in the inventory** Farmers and their organizations have a multitude of channels to participate in and influence on policy processes in Norway. For example, there are annual agricultural negotiations between the Government and the farmers’ unions, resulting in the Annual Agreement on Agriculture. This agreement stipulates the financial support to agricultural purposes. In the field of genetic resources, farmers indirectly participate in decision making, since farmer cooperatives are major actors in the sector. E.g. Norway’s major breeding company as well as the main seed distributing company are owned by such cooperatives. There are also projects for developing new varieties with a high level of farmer participation. In addition, farmers are represented in the advisory board on plant genetic resources at the Norwegian Genetic Resource Centre. The Centre aims to maintain close working relationships with both the major farmer cooperatives and unions as well as with the smaller number of farmers who are actively involved in issues directly related to seed diversity and cultivation of traditional varieties. The reason is that all farmers do not necessarily have competencies or special interest in PGRFA. During the last few years, farmers cultivating traditional varieties, including loose networks of interested farmers, have become more

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
organized, and cooperatives were established. Through this development, it has become easier for the authorities to involve dedicated ‘diversity farmers’ in various processes.

- **Brief history; Core components; Description** See summary above.

- **To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate**
  
  Art. 9.1  
  Art. 9.2a  
  Art. 9.2b  
  Art. 9.2c  
  Art. 9.3

**Other information, if applicable**

- Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant</th>
<th>Also relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.

3 Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).

4 Including seed houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other measures / practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s) Ensure farmers' participation in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers All farmers and their organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s) and geographical outreach National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lessons learned**
- *Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).*

Farmers' participation in decision making in mainstream agriculture, in particularly seed production and plant breeding is a main pillar in Norwegian agriculture. However, all farmers do not necessarily have particular competence or special interest in direct use of PGRFA, while agriculture as such depends on sustainable use through science and breeding. It would be beneficial to enhance the involvement of also "diversity farmers", who apply a high degree of biodiversity, in decision-making processes.

- *What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)*

Preservation of and further developing/modernizing adequate testing systems for varieties especially in minor and orphan crops is a major challenge. Farmers' participation in decision making and priority setting is crucial to this aspect.

**Further information**
- *Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice*

---

5 Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
Template for submission of
Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- Title of measure/practice: Revision of regulations on plant variety release and the marketing of seed and seed potatoes
- Date of submission: 20th June 2019
- Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place: Norway
- Responsible institution/organization:
  Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
  Senior Advisor,
  The national focal point to the International Treaty
  Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
  Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no

- Type of institution/organization (categories): Government
- Collaborating/supporting institutions:
  Norwegian Food Safety Authority
  Torgun Johnsen,
  Senior Advisor,
  Section Plants
  Phone: +47 22 77 91 38
  Email: Torgun.Marit.Johnsen@mattilsynet.no

Description of the examples
Mandatory information:

- Short summary to be put in the inventory

Until 2004, the Norwegian seed regulation did not put restrictions to farmers’ rights to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds to his or her neighbors. However, as a member of the European Economic Area (EEA), Norway had to revise its seed regulations to harmonize them with regulations of the European Union (EU). As a result, the revised regulation even prohibited farmers to give away seeds or exchange seeds among each other. This situation raised concerns of farmers’, gardeners’ and civil society organizations as well as researchers in both Norway and the EU. In 2008, the EU adopted a directive on conservation varieties, which entered into force in 2009. To comply with this new directive, the Norwegian Food Safety Authority proposed changes to three regulations, following an open dialogue with farmers’ organizations, other relevant organizations and researchers: the Regulation on testing and approving of plant varieties, the Regulation on seeds and the Regulation on seed potatoes. The purpose of these revisions was to better accommodate the use of a wider diversity of plant varieties with other objectives, like ensuring seed quality and health standards. “Contributing to in situ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA” was added to the objectives of the three seed regulations. The proposed changes were endorsed by the Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food in 2010.

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
• Brief history, Core components and Description

The laws and regulations regarding seed quality and seed safety, as well as intellectual property rights, are the most relevant regarding farmers' rights to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds. Until 2004, the Norwegian seed regulation allowed farmers to both save, use and sell farm-saved seeds to his or hers neighbours. The situation changed in 2004, when Norway changed its seed regulation due to the implementation of various EU regulation. As a result, the regulation prohibited farmers to give away seeds or exchange seeds between each other. The farmers could only buy certified seeds from an authorized seed company. In addition, since few traditional varieties comply with the strict DUS criteria for approval of varieties, those crops could legally only be grown if farmers already had them in their own fields. However, the exchange of seeds of traditional varieties among farmers continued and the authorities were not too strict on enforcement. Nevertheless, concerns were raised by civil society, researchers, gardeners and farmers' organization. In 2007, several organizations demanded the "right to give away seeds" and changes in the seed regulations.

Also in EU there were growing concerns for conservation varieties, and new regulations were adapted in EU to better accommodate both the concern for ensuring the highest possible standards of health and quality in the production and sale of seeds, and at the same time ensuring the use of crop diversity. In 2008, the EU adopted a directive on conservation varieties, which entered into force 30 June 2009. As an EEA member, Norway was obliged to comply with this directive. In 2009, the Norwegian Food Safety Authority proposed changes to the current regulations for the seed sector. The proposal concerned the Regulation on testing and approving of plant varieties, the Regulation on seeds and the Regulation on seed potatoes.

In 2010, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food endorsed the changes to the Regulation of 13 September 1999, No. 1052 on seeds; the Regulation of 2 July 1996, No. 1447 on Seed Potatoes; and the Regulation of 1 October 1999 on the Testing and Approval of Plant Varieties. This action served to soften the prohibitions of 2004, and the Norwegian Food Safety Authority went to great lengths to accommodate EU regulations to the principles of sustainable management of crop genetic diversity.

• To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate

Art. 9.1 ☐
Art. 9.2a ☐
Art. 9.2b ☐
Art. 9.2c ☐
Art. 9.3 ☒

Other information, if applicable

• Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.
³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recognition of local and indigenous communities', farmers' contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In case you selected 'other measures', would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? Farmers' Right to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds/ Seed policies and legislation**

**Objective(s)** The purpose of the revision of seed regulation was to better accommodate the use of a wider diversity of plant varieties and thus ensure sustainable use of PGRFA. Continued use of crop diversity is necessary in order to conserve them. The objective "contributing to in situ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA" was added to the objective of the three seed regulations.

**Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers** Farmers and their organizations

**Location(s) and geographical outreach** National

**How has the measure/practice affected the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture?**

The main gains with the changes are:
- Exchange of seeds are allowed

---

4 Including seed houses.

5 Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
• To give away or sell seeds on non-commercial basis to cost coverage are allowed (It is not allowed to market seeds without having a seed company.)
• Easier to establish small seed companies for farmers
• Distribution of seeds from gene banks are allowed
• Easier to get plant varieties approved

Some remaining challenges are linked to the definition of “region of origin” and the quantity limitation for marketing seeds of conservation varieties. There are also some challenges linked to the possibility to do selection and further develop agricultural landraces with a view to market seeds from such varieties or material. Nevertheless, the changes in the seed regulation widened the scope for farmers' possibility to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds in small quantity and on non-commercial basis.

Some experiences with the seed regulations:
✓ The registration fees for conservation varieties are reduced. While the fee for value testing and registration of ordinary varieties are 14.475 NOK per year of testing, the fees for registration of conservation varieties are currently 1.565 NOK.20
✓ The general DUS-criteria are applied in a less restrictive way for conservation varieties. So far, 12 conservation varieties and three varieties of traditional vegetables are registered.
✓ It's easier for farmers to register as a seed company. So far, four companies are registered in this category.

• Please describe the achievements of the measure/practice so far (including quantification) (max 200 words)
• Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice
• Are you aware of any other international agreements or programs that are relevant for this measure/practice? EU regulations on seeds and propagating material
• Other issues you wish to address, that have not yet been covered, to describe the measure/practice

Lessons learned
• Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).
  During the process of adjusting the seed regulation, there was an open dialogue with farmers’ organizations, other relevant organizations and researchers and the authorities. The "ban on farmers' varieties" in 2004, was an unintended consequence of the development of the food law. Thus, it’s a valuable lesson learnt that laws with noble objectives in one field could impact PGRFA negatively if this is not accounted for.

• What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)
  Any change of seed regulations need to be in compliance with EU regulations. Limitations regarding region of origin for traditional varieties to be approved as conservation varieties across borders makes are not so suitable in a Norwegian / Nordic context. Historically, varieties have been crossing borders whenever needed, and in a region with repeatedly challenging climate and harvest conditions, the fluctuations have been considerable. Furthermore, the direct use of historical varieties is limited in our region, and collaboration across borders has for long been well established between stakeholders. These conditions could have been better reflected in the regulation.
• What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)

Further information
• Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice


Links to the regulations (in Norwegian):

Regulation of 13 September 1999, No. 1052 on Seed Materials: https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/1999-09-13-1052?q=såvare


Regulation of 1 October 1999 on the Testing and Approval of Plant Varieties: https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/1999-10-01-1069?q=såvare
Template for submission of

Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights
as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

Basic information

- **Title of measure/practice** Balancing PVP and Farmers’ Rights
- **Date of submission** 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place** Norway
- **Responsible institution/organization**
  Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  Svanhild-Isabelle BATTA TORHEIM
  Senior Advisor,
  The national focal point to the International Treaty
  Post-box 8007 Dep 0030 Oslo, Norway
  Email: Svanhild-Isabelle-Batta.Torheim@lmd.dep.no
- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** Government

Description of the examples

**Mandatory information:**
- **Short summary to be put in the inventory**

Intellectual property rights protecting plant varieties are relevant regarding Farmers’ Rights to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds. Norway became a member of UPOV in 1993, based on the 1978 Act of the UPOV Convention. Even though the 1991 Act was adopted by many other countries at that time, Norway chose to adhere to the 1978 Act. In 2004, the government proposed changes to the Plant Breeders’ Rights Act and to join the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention. However, this proposal spurred public debate. After the election in 2005, the new government withdrew the proposed changes in the PVP legislation on the grounds that they limited Farmers' Rights. At the same time, the breeding industry was promised to receive stronger government support for the development of varieties that are suitable to Norwegian conditions and adapted to climate change. Based on this agreement, farmers in Norway could continue to save and use farm-saved seed and propagating material of protected varieties without paying any remuneration to the holder of the plant variety protection right.

- **Brief history, Core components and Description** See summary above.

- **To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate**
  Art. 9.1
  Art. 9.2a
  Art. 9.2b
  Art. 9.2c
  Art. 9.3 x

---

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
Other information, if applicable

- Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks⁴, seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In case you selected ‘other measures’, would you like to suggest a description of this measure, e.g. as a possible new category? Farmers’ Right to save, use, exchange and sell farm-saved seeds/ Impact of IPR on Farmers' Rights
- Objective(s) Balancing farmers’ rights to save seeds and plant breeders' rights.
- Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers⁵ Breeding companies, farmers and their organizations
- Location(s) and geographical outreach National

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.
³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
⁴ Including seed houses.
⁵ Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
- **Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice** legal measure combined with financial measures (annual support to breeding programmes).
- **How has the measure/practice affected the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture?**
- **Please describe the achievements of the measure/practice so far (including quantification) (max 200 words)**
- **Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice**
  The financial support to plant breeding aims at supporting breeding crops suitable to Norwegian conditions and adapted to climate change.

- **Are you aware of any other international agreements or programs that are relevant for this measure/practice?**
- **Other issues you wish to address, that have not yet been covered, to describe the measure/practice**
  Norway has also presented its policy and legislation on plant breeders' rights and how these are balanced towards Farmers' Rights, at the symposium on possible interrelations between the International Treaty and the different Acts of the UPOV Convention.

**Lessons learned**
- **Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).**
- **What challenges encountered along the way (if applicable) (max 200 words)**
- **What would you consider conditions for success, if others should seek to carry out such a measure or organize such an activity? (max 100 words)**
  - The possibility for PVP protection is a valuable tool to stimulate plant breeding, but is not sufficient to ensure crop development for small markets, e.g. fodder adapted to Northern Norway (cold, short summers with a lot of day light). Financial measures to support plant breeding is a suitable measure.
  - Close collaboration between the national focal points for the International Treaty and the UPOV Convention facilitates mutually supportive implementation.

**Further information**
- **Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice**

  Norway's presentation at symposium on interrelations between the Plant Treaty and UPOV (page 109-115)
  [https://www.upov.int/edocs/mdocs/upov/en/upov_itpgrfa_sym_ge_16/upov_itpgrfa_sym_ge_16_2_proceedings.pdf](https://www.upov.int/edocs/mdocs/upov/en/upov_itpgrfa_sym_ge_16/upov_itpgrfa_sym_ge_16_2_proceedings.pdf)

  Link to the Plant Breeders' Rights Act (in Norwegian): [https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1993-03-12-32](https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1993-03-12-32)
Template for submission of

**Measures, Best Practices and Lessons Learned from the Realization of Farmers’ Rights**

as set out in Article 9 of the International Treaty

**Basic information**

- **Title of measure/practice** Norwegian Seed Savers (KVANN)
- **Date of submission** 20th June 2019
- **Name(s) of country/countries in which the measure/practice is taking place** Norway

- **Responsible institution/organization**
  Norwegian Seed Savers
  post@norwegianseedsavers.no
  http://www.norwegianseedsavers.no/

- **Type of institution/organization (categories)** independent non-profit member organization

- **Collaborating/supporting institutions/organizations/actors:**
  Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources
  Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO)
  NIBIO, Postbox 115, NO-1431 Ås. Phone: + 47 406 04 100
  E-post post@nibio.no www.nibio.no

  Norwegian Agriculture Agency
  Address: PO Box 1450 Vika, NO-0116 Oslo, Norway
  Visitors: Oslo Stortingsgt. 28, 0161 Oslo
  Phone: (+47) 78 60 60 00, postmottak@landbruksdirektoratet.no, www.landbruksdirektoratet.no

  NordGen – the Nordic Genetic Resource Center
  Box 41, SE-230 53 Alnarp, Sweden Phone: +46 40 53 66 40
  plants@nordgen.org https://www.nordgen.org/skand/

  Overhalla Klonavlsenter AS (Cloning potatoes for distribution to farmers)
  https://www.overhallaklon.no/miniknollproduksjon/
  Gnr 43 Bnr 99, 7863 Overhalla

Local sister organizations as Community Seed Banks in Europe and USA. Countries with collaboration: Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, England, Finland, Scotland, Switzerland, Austria, USA, Canada.

KVANN – Norwegian Seed savers have established collaboration with some Norwegian plant reserves and plant museums, such as Oslo Tøyen University plant museum and botanical garden, Trondheim botanical garden, Ringve botanical museum, Væres venner “The world garden”, as well as a series of other NGOs working with permaculture, seeds and plants in Norway:

**Økologisk Norge (Organic Norway)**
Address: Engebrets vei 3, 0275 OSLO, Phone: +47 24 12 41 00
Description of the examples

Mandatory information:1

- **Short summary to be put in the inventory**
  The Norwegian Seed Savers (KVANN) is an independent non-profit member organization established in 2016, into which several former ‘plant clubs’, originally initiated by the Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources, were integrated. KVANN has a cooperation agreement with the Centre and receives annual grants from the Norwegian Agriculture Agency. The overall objective is to promote sustainable use of plant diversity for private use in Norway and to enhance public awareness and knowledge about plant breeding, conservation and sustainable use of domestic crops and plants. Main activities include distribution of seed and plant catalogues through which members can exchange breeding material among themselves. These catalogues also include plant genetic resources held by the Nordic Genebank (NordGen) and research stations of the Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO) system. KVANN also puts emphasis on raising knowledge and awareness about the need to protect traditional plant varieties and seeds, and organizes regular training courses and seminars on seeds, plant diseases, fruit grafting, potato seedlings etc. In addition, the association currently has the national responsibility to manage the distribution of potato seedlings to hobby growers in Norway. It engages with museum gardens and other public and private gardens for demonstration and awareness creation purposes.

- **Brief history (including starting year)**
  Norwegian Seed Savers was established in 2016 and given the Norwegian name KVANN after the old Nordic plant, called Kvann (Angelica Archangelica). The name is also an abbreviation for “Kunnskap og Vern Av Nytteplanter i Norge” (Knowledge and protection of domestic plants in Norway) The association has grown rapidly since the start, and includes more the 500 members from all parts of Norway as of December 2018.

- **Core components of the measure/practice (max 200 words)**
  Norwegian Seed Savers is a Norwegian Community Seed Bank (CSB) with a mandate to support and work for sustainable use of plant variation for hobby growers in Norway. Its main focus is on free exchange of genuine varieties of seeds and healthy plants between its members. The genetic material for plant breeding should primarily encompass varieties that normally are not for sale and not commercially available. The association distributes two seed and plant catalogues a year, where members exchange such breeding material between themselves. The catalogues also include seeds from the Nordic seed bank, NordGen and from local plant stations within the NIBIO system. The association currently has the national responsibility to administer the distribution of potato seedlings in Norway to hobby growers. KVANN also plays a great emphasis on raising knowledge and

1 This mandatory information is required in order for the measure/practice to be included in the Inventory.
awareness about the need to protect old plants and seeds, and organizes regular courses and seminars in the use and protection of seeds, plant diseases, fruit grafting, correct use of potato seedlings etc. The association is currently developing its organizational structures in order to organize a growing number of members, tasks and requests for national and international cooperation.

- **Description of the context and the history of the measure/practice is taking place (political, legal and economic framework conditions for the measure/practice) (max 200 words)**

Norwegian Seed Savers (NSS) was established in 2016 as a joint association for the former plant clubs initiated by the Norwegian Centre for Genetic Resources in 2006. The former groups were amalgamated into one organization. NSS is a Norwegian NGO with a freer connection to the Norwegian government than the former Plant Groups. KVANN is still maintaining a clear mandate in the annual working plans of the Centre. KVANN also holds a formal cooperation agreement with the Centre. In 2017 and 2018 KVANN received annual grants from the Norwegian Agriculture Agency on 50.000,- Norwegian kroner. KVANN’s engagements are regulated by the Agency’s strategic plans for protection of genetic resources in Norway. KVANN has a steering board with 7 members. The annual meeting is open for all members, and is KVANN’s highest decision making body. As KVANN has taken over the responsibility to administer distribution of potato seedlings from the Centre for Genetic Recourses, it has realized that such public bodies not always are willing to pass on the appropriate economic resources with the tasks given to the NGO. KVANN has discussed this problem with the Norwegian Agriculture Agency and will take such problems up the Norwegian Parliament to enhance public responsibility here.

- **To which provision(s) of Article 9 of the International Treaty does this measure relate**

  Art. 9.1 □
  Art. 9.2a □
  Art. 9.2b x□
  Art. 9.2c x□
  Art. 9.3 □

**Other information, if applicable**

- **Please indicate which category of the Inventory is most relevant for the proposed measure, and which other categories are also relevant (if any):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most relevant²</th>
<th>Also relevant³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition of local and indigenous communities’, farmers’ contributions to conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA, such as awards and recognition of custodian/guardian farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial contributions to support farmers conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA such as contributions to benefit-sharing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approaches to encourage income-generating activities to support farmers’ conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Please select only one category that is most relevant, under which the measure will be listed.
³ Please select one or several categories that may also be relevant (if applicable).
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catalogues, registries and other forms of documentation of PGRFA and protection of traditional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In-situ/on-farm conservation and management of PGRFA, such as social and cultural measures, community biodiversity management and conservation sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Facilitation of farmers’ access to a diversity of PGRFA through community seed banks(^4), seed networks and other measures improving farmers’ choices of a wider diversity of PGRFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participatory approaches to research on PGRFA, including characterization and evaluation, participatory plant breeding and variety selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmers’ participation in decision-making at local, national and sub-regional, regional and international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training, capacity development and public awareness creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Legal measures for the implementation of Farmers’ Rights, such as legislative measures related to PGRFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Other measures / practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Objective(s)** To promote sustainable use of plant diversity for private use in Norway and to enhance public awareness and knowledge about plant breeding, sustainable use and protection of seeds and domestic plants.

- **Target group(s) and numbers of involved and affected farmers\(^5\)** KVANN’s target groups are private hobby growers and farmers. The number of members is 530 (December 2018). Other target groups for awareness etc. are the general public, politicians, public management, farmer’s associations, educational institutions, youth, and green sentiments in cities.

- **Location(s) and geographical outreach** KVANN has members all over Norway. It is a national association with local groups emerging.

- **Resources used for implementation of the measure/practice**

  A membership fee of 200 Norwegian Kroner (NOK) in 2018 and 530 members, plus 50,000 NOK from the government have given some economic leave-way for the organization. Its annual budget for 2019 is 400,000 NOK, which includes monetarization of some of the free work by its steering board. With no human and economic resources for administrative tasks, the board members have to use too much time on administration to the detriment of strategic work and outreach etc. The board’s prime focus is on annual seed and plant catalogues, knowledge-raising courses and meetings and member and public meetings in gardens, plus conservation of plants in (public) gardens, plant reserves and domestic gardens. This engagement has definitely raised public awareness about the need to preserve old genetic plant recourses and promote the use of a wide variety of plants in order to cope with the coming climate change. Several thousand seeds and plants have been distributed and are grown locally over the whole country. (No precise counting has been made yet.) More than 30 meetings, courses etc. are held annually. 10 different plant reserves, museum gardens and private reserves are

---

\(^4\) Including seed houses.

\(^5\) Any classification, e.g. of the types of farmer addressed, may be country-specific.
engaged directly with the organization. An increased public economic and technical support would greatly improve the results of our work and engagement.

- **Other national level instruments that are linked to the measure/practice**
  The Government of Norway's policy for and economic support to farming has of course a great impact on the use and protection of old Norwegian plant resources. In the view of KVANN, far more public and private economic recourses must be used in order to promote organic farming and sustainable land use. According to KVANN, the Norwegian government is currently cutting back on its budget for plant stations and educational institutions for such purposes. There is no longer any Norwegian breeding of vegetables.

- **Are you aware of any other international agreements or programs that are relevant for this measure/practice?**
  Internationally, KVANN relates to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. There are programs in the European Union to promote the work of Community Seed Banks and related engagements, including research. There are also private funds supporting such work, but KVANN has not been able to engage with these organizations yet.

**Lessons learned**

- **Describe lessons learned which may be relevant for others who wish to do the same or similar measures/practices (max 250 words).**
  One lesson is certainly that such organizations as KVANN must be clear on its prime mandate and focus and be willing to put its first priorities here. Secondly, it is important to build up a sustainable organizational structure, which is not dependent on individuals. Long-term sustainability must rest on good economic management, sound administration, and accountability, both in the practical work as well as in principles. Modern organizations should also be able to communicate well with the general public and its core constituencies. Modern digital platforms have to be used and managed well. KVANN has also experienced a growing interest among young people for green themes and gardening. Both old plants but not the least exotic sorts are in high demand. Communal gardening is popular, and communal action as a whole should be used much more to promote green values. It seems like people are tired of talk and talk about problems, and want to engage in practical work and solutions. Thus, common practical solution, steered by people with good knowledge and solid engagement is perhaps the best answer to our challenges in this field today.

**Further information**

- **Link(s) to further information about the measure/practice**
  KVANN/Norwegian Seed Savers exchange is linked up on: [http://Norwegianseedsavers.no](http://Norwegianseedsavers.no)
  Facebook: [https://www.facebook.com/groups/planteklubben/](https://www.facebook.com/groups/planteklubben/); [https://www.facebook.com/KVANN.org/](https://www.facebook.com/KVANN.org/)