

Liberate diversity

Peasants' *Rights* and *Seeds*:
What's at stake for Europe



Report on the European Seminar on Seeds
Poitiers, France, November 2005



Seminar organized by :

- **CNDSF**

*Coordination Nationale
pour la Défense des
Semences Fermières*

Contact:

Zone industrielle - BP 37
16700 RUFFEC, France
Tel. +33 (0) 5 45 31 29 26
semences-ferm@infonie.fr



- **RSP**

Réseau Semences Paysannes

Contact:

Cazalens
81600 BRENS, France
Tel. +33 (0) 5 63 41 72 86
contact@semencespaysannes.org
http://www.semencespaysannes.org



The complete version of the proceedings can be consulted on:

www.bede-asso.org

thanks:

With the support of the Poitou-Charentes Region, Mairie de Poitiers, Misereor, The Charles Léopold Mayer Foundation (FPH), Humane Earth Foundation, French American Charity Trust (FACT) .



- Realization:

BEDE and RSP international

Contact: 47, place du Millénaire
34000 Montpellier
Tel./Fax +33 (0) 4 67 65 45 12
www.bede-asso.org

- Photo credits:

Anne Berson / CNDSF

- Computer graphics expert:

Marie Le Breton

Contact: +33 (0) 6 03 987 362
marie184@yahoo.com

Introduction	2
Topic 1: Biodiversity	6
Access to and management of biodiversity	
Topic 2: Norms	12
Obstacles in Norms and Marketing	
Topic 3: Research	16
Research and production methods	
Topic 4: Contamination	21
Contamination of seeds by GMOs	
International steering committee	24
Participants	27



A European seminar:

Yves Manguy, CNDSF, France

It was in July 1989, when they were harvesting their cereals, that the French peasants learned that a new regulation made official on the 4th of that month forbade them from preparing their seeds from their harvest. They no longer had the choice and were obliged to purchase commercial seeds that cost twice as much. As for the contractors called 'seed cleaners' - service providers who take their equipment from farm to farm to clean and coat grains to be used for sowing- they found their activity banned from one day to the next. This decision was felt by everyone as a provocation and an attack on freedom. One month later, 1000 peasants and seed cleaners gathered in front of the Poitiers Préfecture. They publicly decided to breach the law from the next day and restart preparing farm-saved seeds. This was the breeding ground for the CNDSF (Coordination Nationale pour la Défense des Semences Fermières), the national coordination committee for the defence of farm-saved seeds, which brings together three agricultural unions (Confédération Paysanne, Coordination Rurale, MODEF), the seed cleaner trade union and organic farmer organisations. Since then, it has had to fight continually against seed companies' constant attempts to prevent peasants from making their farm-saved seeds. From the beginning, our fight had two motivations: on the one hand, saving money by making our seeds, and, on the other, defending what is for us a fundamental freedom: that of reproducing from our harvest. With the passage of time and action, we discovered that the seed war doesn't stop at national borders. This is what motivated the organising of the first European seminar in 1999 on the theme 'What Future for Farm-saved Seeds?'. It brought together around 100 participants from Germany, Belgium, Holland, France, Portugal, Switzerland, India, and the USA. To conclude the seminar, the decision was made to come together in an informal network with the abbreviation 'UESFP' (Union Européenne des Semences et Plants de Ferme), thereby giving concrete expression to a common desire to defend the right of peasants. Several gatherings have been held since then, and the UESFP provided one-off support for trials in Germany, at the European Court, and in Belgium.

The more time passes, the more we note that seed firms are at the service of industrial agriculture and not of peasants. On the contrary, they have a part in the disappearance of the latter and make those who remain dependent. Research is geared towards standard varieties that can adapt themselves everywhere along with the indispensable help of chemical support. Biodiversity becomes very impoverished as a result. During these two days, based on very different situations, we are going to look for points of agreement enabling us to define common strategies. The power of firms is their financial striking force. Against them, we can do nothing alone. But we're convinced that the joining together of peasants around Europe and the world is our absolute weapon for changing the balance of power. We hope that this second seminar organised along with Réseau Semences Paysannes will act somewhat as the seed for this.

why and on what grounds?

Guy Kastler, Réseau Semences Paysannes, France

On all the continents, the seed companies are imposing free circulation of their seeds, the 'intellectual' protection of the royalties and the banning of peasant seed. The catalogue prohibits the distribution of peasant varieties that don't have the right to be registered in it. The plant variety certificate (PVC) and the patent forbid the exchange of seeds between peasants and drastically limit their right to resow their harvest. Genetic contamination completes the destruction of cultivated biodiversity. With their genetically manipulated seeds, several multinationals are imposing export monocultures as well as the mechanisation, chemical fertiliser, pesticides and irrigation that are essential for growing them. When the peasant seeds disappear, it's also food crops, peasant and organic types of agriculture, and the food sovereignty of peoples that are lost.

That's why the Réseau Semences Paysannes was created in France in 2003, to bring together all those who are rallying together beyond the elementary right to resow harvested grain, to defend and develop cultivated biodiversity in farms, legally or not. In Western Europe, reviving peasant seed is a huge task: peasants for the most part have lost even the foremost know-how for conserving, renewing or breeding their varieties. Membership of the Eastern European countries into the European Community is signing the death sentence of the peasant varieties still cultivated on family farms, which are in the majority. This calls for urgent common action. On all the other continents, the brutality of GMO progress is starving the peasant populations and requires a reaction at an international scale.

Four themes -biodiversity, norms, research and contamination- structure this seminar on the rights of peasants in Europe. On the one hand, it's no longer a question today of being satisfied with demanding that the public authorities organise the rescue of cultivated biodiversity. Peasants and civil society are getting down to it themselves, locally and without waiting. But their action remains fragile for as long as there is no recognition of their fundamental rights to resow and exchange harvested grain and to collectively protect and manage cultivated biodiversity. That's the theme of the exchanges of the first workshop. On the other hand, the issue of norms, contracts and constraints of catalogue registration represent obstacles to peasants' rights. This is what will be discussed in a second workshop. Furthermore, in a society in which the expert's opinion is replacing political decision more and more, work along with research is of primary importance for legitimising the practices and the collective rights of peasants. The third workshop will review the situation. Finally a fourth workshop will discuss the spread of patented genes through contamination that's threatening to destroy what's left of biodiversity and that must be stopped.

Two days is not much time for developing an international strategy on these four themes, but half the work has already been done by the simple fact of bringing together organisations from the majority of both Eastern and Western European countries and from all the continents of the planet.

Gerhard PORTZ, ABL, Germany

In Germany, large-scale farmers must fill in a form and indicate which varieties of seeds they have sowed, what quantity, and over what surface area. Today, the law having changed, farmers must pay a tax to resow. In France, you are not obliged to give this information. It's up to the companies to prove that they know which seeds you have used to create your own grains; if they manage to do so, they can ask for a fee for them. In Germany, we are fighting for change in this law that forbids us to have our own seeds.

Currently, different situations exist with regards to German and European law. Federal law requires that we give information on the varieties and the quantities cultivated over the year. Some companies force us to use certain varieties. If the owner doesn't know the nature of the seeds he's growing, he must not give a response. The German farmers are rich, because the companies cannot force you to give the name of the variety you have. But this can change, because the European seed companies could set up a law that would force the farmers to do so.

Dan Craioveanu, InfOMG, Rumania

For 34 years, communism had a very strong impact on seeds and agriculture, because all the agricultural policies of this regime were decided on by the so-called scientists of the regime. The type of seeds was decided by politicians, but the peasants kept local varieties nonetheless. The problem is that it's elderly people who have kept the seeds. The young people have left the countryside and have gone to live in cities. Today, the government asks why you should keep these traditional seeds; furthermore, to register them you have to pay a fee in addition to their having to meet stability and homogeneity norms. The initiative to preserve these treasures should come from the government. Everyone acknowledges that these seeds are better and more resistant: a real treasure, but the governmental authorities don't care about them. Rumania is moreover the greatest GMO producer in Europe. Officially, only soya is grown on very widespread areas, but the official figures vary. It's thought that there are around 120,000 ha, because the official figure doesn't include seeds kept by the farmers. Civil society and the peasants have a growing awareness of the GMO problem. The Minister of Agriculture has started to organise roundtables with the parties concerned: scientists and seed companies, but without civil society. Some GMOs are introduced without having been tested, especially by the Americans who want to use Rumania as a test area. The pressure is strong, and the question will not be reduced to a political decision.

Juanma Gonzales, Red de Semillas, Spain

For nearly 30 years, the legislation that regulates the protection and sales of plant material in Spain has been based on the UPOV agreements.

Up until March 2000, seed legislation prevented seed exchange between farmers. This de facto prohibition was not defined literally, but established through a series of conditions that, in practice, made all exchange impossible. The first of these conditions was the banning of sales or exchange between companies or individuals of non-registered plant material varieties, hence the creation of national and then European catalogues of commercial varieties. We can easily understand the negative consequences of the application of this seed circulation restriction on traditional exchanges between farmers, and therefore on the conservation and regeneration of cultivated biological diversity. It's forbidden to exchange seeds of a variety that has not gone through an official control procedure beforehand.

Fortunately, the definition of commercialisation in Directive 98/95 has brought about a certain improvement in the situation by enabling non-commercial transactions and therefore enabling exchange between farmers. This definition was recorded in Spain in Decree 323/2000. In April 2001, Red de Semillas, along with SCA (Andalusia Cooperative Society) and VERDE, asked for some commercial varieties to be registered in the catalogue. These were nine vocal varieties from Sierra de Cadiz, and they were further asked to have a 'conservation variety' distinction and exemption from official examination, in accordance with Royal Decree 313/2000. After four years of waiting, one of them was accepted in the catalogue of commercial varieties, even if we have not yet received the conservation variety distinction. But we must be cautious with regards to the regulations developed in this directive. The recent working documents revised by the commission's permanent committee on seeds is not making progress and is handling the issues of multiplication and commercialisation of conservation varieties in the same way as for commercial varieties.

Last June, the Council of Ministers approved the bill on seeds, plants and phyto-genetic resources, which claims to reform the 1971 law on seeds. When the text was drafted, several proposals from Red de Semillas were taken into account. However, the agricultural organisations are showing lack of interest on the issue of seeds and cultivated biodiversity.

Riccardo Bocci, Rete Semi Rurali Network, Italy

The work in the Italian regions on agricultural genetic resources is becoming increasingly significant, as much in terms of the public resources mobilised as in possible options for rural development of the land. The discussions between the regions are showing the need for adequate valorisation and improvement of already existing experiences in the regions that have ad hoc original laws (Tuscany, Latium, Umbria, the Marches, Friuli Venezia Giulia). For example, in Tuscany, the new Regional Law 64 of 16 November 2004 ('preservation and valorisation of the heritage of local species and varieties of agricultural, zootechnical and forestry interest') gives an idea of Directive 98/95, and Article 10 establishes the regional register of conservation varieties, with the aim of enabling commercialisation of such varieties, once the appropriate quantitative restrictions are made. The regulation bringing up to date such laws is currently in the process of being written. Lists of varieties risking erosion have been made and have been characterised and listed in the regional genetic resources bank located in Lucca. Furthermore, the professional profile of 'caretaker' farmers has been created, with the objective of reproducing material conserved at the bank in the field, in order to make adequate conservation possible. The diversity of situations shows how much the research activities on the land are in full development, thanks as well to the synergies that exist between the universities and the development agencies in this sector. Everyone agrees that the critical point of the system is that it's difficult to find the means for this to become an opportunity for rural development. The decree on the conservation varieties could be an initial significant step in this direction, on the one hand because it would offer the regions a normative framework in which to evolve and, on the other, because it would authorise the growing of several of these varieties currently conserved in the grain banks.



1. Access to and management of biodiversity

Observations

b
i
o
d
i
v
e
r
s
i
t
y

The inalienable rights of peasants and of rural communities over seeds determine the practices they implement to carry out their task of managing cultivated biodiversity. These include having access to the resources of collections formed from what has been taken from their fields, resowing harvested grain, exchanging and disseminating their seeds, and protecting them from bio-piracy and transgenic pollution. These rights must be constantly defended against the international treaties and agreements that put them into question. They represent the prerequisite to the food sovereignty of peoples and of regions, and to peace. This is why they are applied and govern the relationships between peasants, regardless of whether or not they are acknowledged in the laws.

The conservation and development of biodiversity can no longer expect goodwill from States that are subject to multinational seed companies. Peasants and civil society must organize themselves starting now, as much at the regional as global scale in order to apply themselves. It's a question of survival. This management can be understood within the framework of peasant and organic types of agriculture, as well as that of healthy management of ecosystems, landscapes, water, and land.

Seeds are a cultural good, and exchange is also an exchange of knowledge. Women are the primary guardians of this knowledge, which they renew and pass on. Their role in the cohesiveness of social structures that depend on them is irreplaceable and must be recognized.

No intellectual property right (P.V.C., patent) and no seed sterilization technique that reduces access to genetic resources (GURTS) can be accepted. The collective rights of peasants and local communities that have developed and conserved their varieties are in conflict with them. These collective rights should determine the use that members of the communities concerned can make of the seeds, as well as the conditions of negotiated access proposed to outside persons, including the controls on possible commercialization. They guarantee that local varieties are rooted in their traditional land, without preventing negotiated exchanges between territories. Their defence is the result of the alliance among peasants, environmentalists, and social movements.

A universal declaration of rights over seeds must be promulgated in order to reinforce and organize the links between the peasants and rural communities of the five continents.

Today, Europe cannot lose the battle against GMOs and for biodiversity without the risk of leading to a global defeat. That's why a plan of action must be implemented.

Proposals

In order to assert and make recognised the exercising of collective rights regarding seeds and so as to have a very diversified European agriculture, it's necessary to set up several systems within, alongside, or outside the official legal framework We therefore propose:

- ❶ The prohibiting of GMO crops in fields, of any form of exclusive right over seeds (patents etc.), and of any GURTS technique.
- ❷ Mandatory registration in the common catalogue (DUS, VCU, etc.) for any variety that is non-reproducible (hybrids, sterile male, etc.) and/or that stems from non-natural techniques (protoplast fusion, mutagenesis, in vitro, etc.) Indication of the selection techniques, including for hybrids, and of the origin of the varieties used must be required.
- ❸ The creation of a register of "conservation" varieties and landraces, for which registration must be free of charge. These varieties and landraces must be freely accessible or managed by collective rights. The non-DUS and VCU registration criteria must be chosen along with the farmers and consumers.
- ❹ The creation of local (town, etc.) collective registers, not necessarily accessible to all, but not subject to any form of exclusive right.
- ❺ The recognition of the right to exchange of limited quantities of non-registered seed varieties between peasants and rural communities, subject to respect of existing collective rights

Furthermore, we are implementing and will continue to implement:

- unrestricted access by peasants to resources conserved in public collections;
- the organizing of "in situ" conservation of biodiversity in peasants' fields and intervening with the official programs to enable its funding;
- the repeal of all the legal or biotechnological restrictions to the right of the farmers to resow the seeds they have harvested;
- the presence of farmers and consumers in the decision-making and management bodies concerning seeds;
- the promotion of peasant and organic farming as well as networks of local distribution; informing civil society about the importance of biodiversity;
- the forbidding of any contractual conditionality and the refusal that public aid be linked to the purchase of certified seeds;
- the recovery and diffusion of peasant knowledge about selection, conservation, and multiplication of seeds;
- the development of participative systems of research, selection, or management of biodiversity on farms;

- ⇒ the setting up of seed fairs and exchanges of seeds between peasants;
- ⇒ the continued marketing of varieties that fall within public ownership;
- ⇒ the setting up of norms concerning the marketing of seeds that are blends of species or varieties;
- ⇒ the right of organic farmers to use local biodiversity or that which is adapted to their cultivation systems, as a matter of priority over certified organic seeds.



International Experiences (Excerpts)

Zachary Makanya, Pelum (Kenya)

'In Kenya, farmers are becoming poorer and poorer, even if the country is in full economic growth. Our farmers are not poor because of the drought; they are poor because it's not wished that they escape from this poverty. The peasants must both unite and become informed in order to become stronger.

The African peasants must make themselves heard just as the European peasants on genetic matters, and take a stand and say that they don't want GMOs. It's necessary for them to know that our seeds cannot coexist with GMOs. We must also protect our ancestral knowledge, and the first thing that we decided to do to resist is to conduct a study so that the peasants set up strategies to protect their seeds.'

Jeanne Zoundjékpon, GRAIN (Benin)

'Under pressure from the World Bank, USAID, the CGIAR institutes and the African Development Bank, the governments of Africa are in the process of setting up laws relative to seeds in order to support the multinational firms, privatize the public system and marginalize, or even criminalize, the peasant seed systems. Most of these national processes are led and influenced by regional processes of harmonizing national laws.

In some countries such as Tunisia, Algeria and Kenya, the laws relative to seeds include, in the same bill, sections on plant-breeding rights. In Central and West Africa, the Bangui Agreement was revised in 1999 in order to respect the WTO directives.

Practically all over Africa, laws relative to seeds and to biosafety are taking very little account of the interests of farmers, due to the fact that the latter have been excluded from their development process. Faced with the limited number in each African country of experts on issues relative to the rights of farmers/local communities and to biotechnologies, the African Union, along with the support of some development partners, has drawn up a model law relative to the rights of farmers and local communities and another law relative to biotechnologies. These model laws were adopted by the heads of state summit in 2001. If they are used effectively by each country as working documents, they should make it possible to draw up national legislation that takes into account the interests of African peasants.'

Terry Boehm, NFU (Canada)

'The great majority of farmers use farm seed in Canada. It's only through collective wisdom that farm seed has been preserved, because it is the foundation of our agriculture. The farmers know that losing these seeds is putting into danger future generations.

But some see the seeds as a means to become rich, and, little by little, the genes and seeds have become property through contract systems. In 1999, UPOV set up mandatory plans of action to restrict access to seeds. We are trying to fight against them. The average age is on the increase in our campaigns, but there's nonetheless significant mobilization.

The problem today is that research is essentially focused on biotechnologies. In Bangkok, during the meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity in February 2005, the Canadian government put on pressure to eliminate the moratorium on Terminator. This technology is an insult to peasants, consumers, and nature itself.

For the moment we must live with GMOs; they are very much used if even if the seeds cost 15 times more than farm seeds. I hope that, thanks to the many global initiatives, we will resist.'

Francisca Rodriguez, Via Campesina (Chile)

'Via Campesina thinks that only food sovereignty can guarantee food security. The fight for seeds falls within this combat; we have launched a global campaign for acknowledgment that our seeds are part of a common world heritage. This international campaign is carried out along with the peasants and the indigenous communities, and along with their customs and their knowledge. Seed is peoples' heritage; they have always been freely available for all. Today, much of the seeds have disappeared or been sold at high prices. The multinationals are imposing high prices via patents or intellectual property policies. These limit access to the seeds by small-scale farmers/peasants and reduce the varieties available. The seeds are threatened by a registration system, which tends to take away the power of our peasants by transforming local landrace seeds into simple merchandise. This system that operates without consulting public opinion is an attack against life and imposes a process of death.

Peasants and Indian communities of Latin America are already carrying out quiet work to preserve their seeds. We are organizing awareness campaigns to strengthen the in situ systems manageable by farmers, stockbreeders, and women in particular. These systems have been weakened by the gradual disappearance of networks of exchange. We must guarantee seeds without compromise.'

Chukki Najundaswamy KRRS & Via Campesina, (India)

'The Indian farmers were the first to raise their voice against GMOs, according to the principles of Gandhi (civil disobedience, immediacy of action, fight for truth). In India, "seed" means "life"; thus, the fight for farm seeds means to fight for life. Since 1993, the peasants have been trying to resist and challenge laws democratically by applying the principles of Gandhi. They have set up seed banks and systems of exchanges.'

Satheesh Peryapatna, Deccan Development Society, (India)

'To give back part of biodiversity to peasants in the villages, biodiversity management committees have been created in the latter. Documentation systems and document collections on peasant knowledge and on seeds that can be used at the national level have also been set up.

In 2004, India passed a new law on seeds that, among other things, introduces the concept of mandatory registration for all seeds intended for sale. It also requires, to respond to the demands of the WTO, the liberalization of imports of seeds compliant with industrial standards and the encouragement of the use of certain seeds. This is the current tendency. That's why we must sound the alarm, because many landrace seeds are in the process of disappearing. The government is on a one-way track, and the universities are taking a big risk by doing research only in biotechnologies.

Women represent hope; they preserve many varieties that they keep in their homes. Villages have created their own seed bank, and thanks to these systems 10,000 new farmers have sprung up in three years. We don't need genetic engineering; we will produce what we need for ourselves.'



2. Obstacles in *norms* and Marketing

Observations

A certain number of rules and norms, whose justification can be found in various objectives (monitoring health risks, standardising industrial quality, guaranteeing the identification of varieties, etc.) currently represent obstacles to the rights of peasants to produce, reproduce, and exchange seeds:

➔ **The obligation to register varieties in the official catalogue.** The catalogue registration cost doesn't allow farmers to register a local variety representing a small volume of seeds. Furthermore, the registration criteria (homogeneity and stability, agronomical and technical value) rule out the landraces selected by the peasants.

➔ **Certain health norms.** In the case of wine-growing for example, or of certain fruit trees, potatoes or strawberries... health norms force the farmers to use plants that have come from certified clones or from in vitro breeding. For some species (sunflowers) it is mandatory to use chemically treated seeds.

➔ **The CAP.** Certain CAP aid (durum wheat premium, premiums for planting grapevines and orchards, etc.) are paid only if certified seeds or plants are used.

➔ **Marketing norms.** Marketing norms set to regulate production intended for long channels of distribution can in some cases apply to all the other channels via the extension of rules. This is how requirements for minimum sizes or for presentation exclude old varieties of fruits that are nevertheless attractive for local channels.

➔ **Contract of quality and traceability.** Cooperative system quality contracts require that the producer use certified seeds, thereby forbidding reproduction of seeds on the farm.

Obstacle 1: intellectual property rights (IPR)

The 1991 International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants totally denies the right of farmers to resow part of their harvest. This right is now only an optional, special dispensation to breeders rights. This dispensation is granted in return for the payment of a tax on farm seeds. It is paid to the seed companies to make up for the economic loss they claim to have suffered and to a fund for financing plant breeding activities. Today, this tax is applied in various ways

depending on the Member State. In November 2005, the seed companies, having joined together within the European Seed Association, noted that this tax is being established or collected with difficulty. They therefore asked the European Commission to set up special courts in each State to guarantee their 'intellectual property rights' and the elimination of this 'optional dispensation'. This means the end of the ancestral right to resow one's harvest.

Obstacle 2: mandatory registration in the catalogue for the dissemination of seeds

In order to be sold or exchanged, any seed (or plant) must stem from a variety registered in the catalogue. Farmers who have undertaken a process of seeking (agronomical and economical) autonomy for their systems of production resort to seeds stemming from varieties that are non-protected (in the public domain) or unregistered (maize landraces, ancient varieties of soft wheat, cauliflower races, etc.). These approaches imply limited seed or plant exchanges between farmers. However, this has become impossible today because of this mandatory catalogue registration.

Proposals

Faced with the question of intellectual property rights, the participants of the workshop:

- ➔ reassert the farmer's right to use freely and without charge all means of reproduction (seeds and plants) produced on the farm;
- ➔ consider that the State's duty is to propose independent public research for breeding reproducible plants adapted to society's expectations (quality food, environmental protection, health, etc.).

To overcome the obstacle to developing more autonomous and sustainable agriculture, the workshop participants propose the following measures:

- ❶ Free inscription along with more flexible criteria for traditionally grown varieties.
- ❷ Varieties whose protection ends shall be maintained for free and automatically in the catalogue and shall then fall into the public domain.
- ❸ The creation of free space for exchange between farmers for unregistered (local and landrace) varieties.

Quotes from the workshop participants...

'For barley for brewing, we can have contracts with cooperatives only by using certified seeds. And these cooperatives themselves sell these certified seeds...'

'In Brittany, one factory makes soy-based products. To guarantee supply of GMO-free local soy beans, the contract with the producer requires the use of certified seeds for the first year. The second year, we can use farm seeds, but we must conduct a GMO detection test. Farmers from a CUMA (farm equipment cooperative) have decided to mutualise their seed production.'

'The use of maize landraces is attractive for low-input sectors and in dry conditions. It's also an economic alternative with regards to the very high cost of maize seed. Yet, it's not possible to register these landraces, and their dissemination is therefore theoretically forbidden.'

'For me, the solution is not to do reproduction but creation. We must produce our own norms adapted to the production of seeds by farmers.'

'We have single European regulations, but they are applied differently. For example, in Austria, special dispensation exists authorizing the marketing of unregistered varieties.'

'In Switzerland, Prospecie Rara works together with the COOP store chain to market potatoes from landrace varieties that are not registered in the official catalogue. Faced with the reality of the quantities of consumer demand for such potatoes, these latter have been authorized.'

'In Germany, the key issue is the right to resow one's harvest. In our country, the use of farm seed is constantly increasing. The seed companies want to eliminate this right.'

Petition for the freedom of farmers to produce their own seed.

Following the European seminar “liberate diversity!”, delegates from 35 different countries came together in Poitiers on 27 November. They declared that the freedom of farmers to choose their seed is fundamentally threatened by the seed companies. The declaration made during the conference of seed-breeders on the reinforcement of their plant variety rights, which took place in Brussels on 4 and 5 October 2005, showed this clearly: It was strongly demanded that the special dispensation to plant breeders’ rights, which enables farmers to make their seeds, be abolished.

The delegates:

- ⇒ call for international recognition of the inalienable right of farmers to choose, produce, reproduce and exchange their seed;
- ⇒ reject the principle of linking agricultural subsidies, product quality controls or traceability to the purchase of certified or commercial seed;
- ⇒ reject the idea of co-existence with GMOs, which can’t be anything else than a trap to establish GMOs;
- ⇒ appeal to farmers, who are the foremost concerned, and consumers to sign and to distribute this declaration.

Adopted in Poitiers, November the 27th 2005.



3. Research and production methods

Observations

The orientations of agronomic research determine the seeds of tomorrow. The hyper-specialization of varieties to satisfy the needs of the agri-food industry is not satisfying the current needs of many peasants and consumers. This observation is all the more true for types of agriculture that can be characterised as autonomous, family-based, peasant, organic, using a low level of inputs, or food-crop producing; as well as for 'amateur' farmers or for new markets. The question is: how to reinforce research to support family agriculture and encourage short channels?

We need research on participative plant breeding for different types of agriculture:

- ⇒ integrated,
- ⇒ organic and biodynamic,
- ⇒ agro-ecological, rich in biodiversity,
- ⇒ adapted to short and local channels.

The needs and expectations of these different types of agriculture with regards to research are diverse. The proposals to make research better adapted and more appropriate to the peasant world are more or less radical in accordance with the type of agriculture practiced.

The main function of the job of the peasant is to provide food for the people. But that's not the only one. The peasant also participates in maintaining the landscape and in keeping up and renewing the ecosystems that enable production. He or she is also a producer of meaning and an actor of a culture.

All peasants need to re-appropriate control over production and to free themselves from the industrial system and from agri-food channels dominated by companies.

Agricultural research as it exists today is often limiting and can represent a formidable obstacle for the development of types of agriculture that are more autonomous, economical, non-polluting and that generate meaning and dignity.

1. Governance of the research

The management of research, its funding and strategic choices are increasingly controlled by companies and the needs of hyper-industrialized agriculture.

2. Regarding the structuring of research institutions

- Reduction in the number of subjects (economy, pedology, rural sociology, etc.) in the universities and institutes.
- Rise in power of molecular biology and biotechnological research that monopolize much funding and that influence policies.

3. Knowledge and science

- Reductionist subjects (for example, research on Terminator technology).
- The science of complexity and of complex and dynamic systems is hardly or not at all developed.
- Difficulty in creating new knowledge by combining peasant knowledge and modern sciences.

4. Way of working

- Lack of acknowledgment, disregard and marginalization of the knowledge of peasants and actors in the field.
- Innovations made in the context of the laboratory or in very controlled situations, followed by technology transfer unsuitable to the diversified and specific peasant realities.

5. Role of researchers

- As individuals, the researchers disassociate their work in the creation of knowledge from any responsibility for the ecological and social consequences of their findings.
- Many keep a big distance between themselves and the peasant world / reality (deep ignorance of the context and of the needs their work is supposed to meet).

Proposals

What are the possible responses for opposing a bureaucratic and privatized model of agricultural research? How can we transform and redirect agricultural research in a direction more in accordance with the needs of peasants and with democratic control over innovation?

1. Democratize institutional research

Set of processes and actions giving greater weight and voice to citizens in:

- defining the major orientations of research and funding;

- ⇒ the participative forms of knowledge production, such as participatory plant breeding;
- ⇒ the validation of learning and technologies;
- ⇒ the assessment of technological risks and of development policies.

2. Develop research and citizen innovation

⇒ We must start from the observation that, in several Southern countries, peasants have organized decentralized research networks controlled by the peasants. In each case, this is done without the support of institutionalized agricultural research.

⇒ What's at stake here is to rebuild a whole set of research based on the learning, needs, passions and curiosity of peasants for production of knowledge and technologies.

⇒ In this research scenario, researchers must be invited to work in partnership with peasants and other citizens.

⇒ Production of knowledge through use of networks and federations between researchers and citizens, within a more egalitarian and adapted framework of reasoning.

Even if formal research is not satisfactory, it cannot be ignored, as it's this research that makes decisions and technical orientations that are dangerous (such as Terminator technology). This happens due to the current lack of democracy.

Likewise, without citizen pressure, the little space available to researchers that carry out participatory plant breeding could disappear.

Proposals from peasants

① Form groups of peasants-researchers-other actors with regards to seed collections and banks: in order to bring out, disseminate, and re-appropriate knowledge regarding resources and to create new knowledge.

② Set up a European 'campesino a campesino' research network, in coordination with other networks in the world: exchange of knowledge, seeds, common trials, etc.

③ Multidisciplinary research approach to take into account the complexity of agro-ecosystems and the entire channel 'from the field to the plate'.

④ Take on one's responsibilities as a peasant: form of production, autonomy of seeds, etc.

⑤ Draw inspiration from and appropriate traditional knowledge wherever it has not been lost, thanks to work in an international network.

Proposals from NGOs

- ❶ It seems difficult to reform institutional research so that it corresponds to the real needs of society. We must therefore start by organizing ourselves into external research groups on specific objectives and by calling on researchers and including them into the participatory research approach.
- ❷ Join up with the informal international network of participative research.
- ❸ Find ways of becoming mobilized at the European level to take part in the Via Campesina campaign on seeds.
- ❹ The peasants of the North must take on their responsibilities by drawing inspiration from the actions of peasants from the South.

Proposals from researchers

- ❶ Counterbalance the research efforts between biotechnologies and more agro-ecological research.
- ❷ Organize a national and European lobbying force to influence the orientations of institutional research in the right direction.
- ❸ Involve peasants and citizens in the organs that make decisions on the major orientations of research.
- ❹ Be part of the decision-making bodies for research funding (citizens, peasants, etc.).
- ❺ Increase public research funding.
- ❻ Researchers must take on their responsibility at an individual level.
- ❼ Modify the criteria of evaluating research and the work of researchers, by involving peasants and citizens as central actors.



Decentralized-participatory plant breeding

CECCARELLI SALVATORE AND GRANDO STEFANIA
Germplasm Improvement Program, ICARDA

It is widely recognized that conventional plant breeding has been more beneficial to farmers in high-potential environments or to those who could profitably modify their environment to suit new cultivars, than to the poorest farmers who could not afford to modify their environment through the application of additional inputs and could not risk the replacement of their traditional, well-known and reliable varieties. As a consequence, low yields, crop failures, malnutrition, famine, and eventually poverty are still affecting a large proportion of humanity. Participatory plant breeding is seen by several scientists as a way to overcome the limitations of conventional breeding, by offering farmers the possibility of deciding which varieties better suit their needs and conditions without exposing the household to any risk. Participatory plant breeding exploits the potential gains of breeding for specific adaptation through decentralized selection, defined as selection in the target environment, and is the ultimate conceptual consequence of a positive interpretation of genotype x environment interactions. This article describes a model of participatory plant breeding in which genetic variability is generated by professional breeders; selection is conducted jointly by breeders, extension specialists and farmers in a number of target environments; and the best selections are used by breeders in further cycles of recombination. Farmers handle the first phases of seed multiplication of promising breeding material in village-based seed production systems. The model has the following advantages:

- 1) varieties reach the release phase earlier than in conventional breeding;
- 2) the release and seed multiplication concentrate on varieties known to be acceptable by farmers;
- 3) it increases biodiversity because different varieties are selected in different locations;
- 4) varieties fit the agronomic management that farmers are familiar with and can afford and therefore can be beneficial to poor farmers.

These advantages are particularly relevant to developing countries where large investments in plant breeding have not resulted in production increases, especially in marginal environments.

4. Contamination of seeds by GMOs

▶▶ Observations

From among the many controversies fuelling GMO current events in Europe, coexistence is a major one. It's a crucial topic for farmers producing their seeds on the farm: it threatens their freedom and their rights. Through its Recommendation of July 23rd 2003, the European Commission asked the Member States to take care of setting up measures of coexistence between GM and non-GM (organic and conventional), if they wish to do so. However, we know that coexistence is impossible: GMO contamination of seeds, which leads to a denaturation of cultivated varieties, is being increasingly observed in Europe and elsewhere in the world. This denaturation is found as much at the biological and agronomic level as in qualitative value and economic value. Furthermore, the legal status of contaminated varieties can change dramatically along with claims of intellectual property rights to crops grown from polluted farm-saved seeds.

Peasants have the right to sow the seeds they want and that they have chosen. However, this right is flouted by the growing of GMOs, which necessarily leads to contamination and denatures their varieties. The major responsibility for the contaminations and their negative consequences lies with the seed companies, which are the 'owners' of the genetic constructions. The political responsibility is to protect the rights of farmers through bans and moratoria. The responsibility of peasants is to organize resistance.

The measures that accompany GMOs, such as the distance between the crops and the new contracts to handle the contamination, are made to fit coexistence. Likewise, the Terminator seeds, which are supposed to avoid pollutions, are even more dangerous for the rights of farmers.

We must thus shift the debate on the rights of farmers over their seeds outside of the framework of coexistence and re-appropriate our fundamental rights. This entails giving back life to non-industrial agrarian systems - family, peasants, and organic - by focusing on control over seeds and the principles of autonomy, etc.

C
O
N
T
A
M
I
N
A
T
I
O
N

Proposals

Coexistence between the sectors is impossible. Contamination is a known fact. Faced with this fait accompli, several levels of action exist.

In terms of collective responsibility

① In Europe, two countries are heavily polluted: Spain and Rumania. Solidarity must be built up to aid the Spanish and Rumanian peasant communities to organize resistance.

② There is a responsibility towards the other countries of the world to maintain the balance of power with the European Commission and to keep an eye on the spread of the "European counter-model" (with regards to the policies of GMO promoters), which seeks to make people believe it's possible to organize coexistence between the sectors all over the world.

③ At the international level, participate as social movement organizations in the Cartagena Protocol negotiations on bio-security, to make socio-economic issues and the right of farmers be taken into consideration.

In terms of confrontation, impose the debate on all of society

① Through traditional means: communication, information on the denial of rights in order to make headway in legal case statements.

② By setting up activist relationships of an international brigade type for decontamination operations in Europe.

③ By creating new collective control tools to enlarge the struggle, by opening it up to consumers.

④ By hitting the multinationals in their wallet (by means of lawsuits?) to slow down their progress.

Regarding the no-GMO/GMO-free zone

There's debate about the usefulness of establishing these. The wish to defend one's territory from GMOs and to live in a GMO-free environment does not entail accepting sanctuary zones or the regions that are free from GMOs through electoral declaration, wishes, or policy. We must work collectively to impose the no-GMO zone and the measures to implement, thereby broadening the conscience of people able to organize to defend themselves.

Resolution to call for a ban on Terminator technology, because of its European and global impacts on farmers, food sovereignty and the environment.

Participants at the European Seeds Seminar, who came from 15 European countries and 20 countries in other continents¹, meeting in Poitiers, France on 26th November 2005, supported the international campaign to Ban Terminator technology - its development, testing and commercialisation².

Terminator, a technology requiring multiple genetic modifications, will stop farmers from being able to save and reuse seed. It is designed to prevent farm-saved seed from germinating so that farmers have to buy new seeds each season. It has been developed to increase corporate control over seeds by the biotech companies. Terminator directly infringes Farmers' Rights, undermines food sovereignty and presents a threat to farmers' livelihoods and agricultural biodiversity.

The participants at the seminar:

- opposed the use of Terminator or any other GURTs (Genetic Use Restriction Technologies) that would prevent farmers from saving and re-using seeds;
- called on the European Patent Office to revoke the patent on Terminator technology granted to Delta&Pine Land and USDA on 5th October 2005³;
- rejected the false claim that Terminator technology could permit co-existence of conventional and GM crops - it cannot be a biosafety tool;
- criticised the investment in research on Terminator technology, which diverts funds and effort from agriculturally useful investigation;
- called on peasants and rural peoples to actively expose and oppose Terminator technology and GM crops and intensify the struggle against imperialist globalisation and the agrochemical TNCs;
- Called on their governments to:
 - ban Genetic Use Restriction Technologies (GURTs) and Terminator;
 - defend the existing de facto moratorium on the development, testing and commercialisation of Terminator technology, in upcoming meetings of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in March 2006.

Adopted on 26th November 2005, by unanimous vote in the final plenary session.

¹ At the seminar there were about 140 participants from national and international farmers' organisations, NGOs, agricultural research organisations and national, regional and international civil society networks concerned with seeds, agricultural biodiversity, food and farming.

² See www.banterminator.org

³ The Terminator patent, EP 0 775 212 B1, was granted by the European Patent Office on 5th October 2005 to US-based Delta & Pine Land (D&PL Technology Holding Company LLC) and the United States of America, represented by the Secretary of Agriculture. According to further data bank research the patent has already been granted in similar versions in the USA, and further applications were filed in Australia, Brazil, China, Hong Kong, Japan, Turkey and South Africa.

International *steering* committee

Coordination Nationale pour la Défense des Semences Fermières, CNDSF, France

CNDSF is made up by *Confédération Paysanne*, *Coordination Rurale*, *MODEF*, the *Syndicat des Trieurs à Façon de France*, the *Fédération de l'Agriculture Biologique*, *Nature et Progrès* and the *Société des Agriculteurs Bio Dynamique*. CNDSF is a coordination committee that for the last 16 years has campaigned for the defence and recognition of farm seed. It demands the right for farmers to resow part of their harvest after having cleaned their own seeds.

In this battle, seed cleaners play an essential role in the preservation of farm seed, through their direct contacts with farmers. The members of CNDSF oppose any interference in laws; all technologies of appropriation; as well as the deceitful agreements and press releases whose objective is the extinction of farm seed, which leads to farmer dependency.

Contact CNDSF
 Zone Industrielle - BP 37
 16700 Ruffec, France
 Tel: +33 (0) 5 45 31 29 26 - Jean Pierre Delage
 Tel: +33 (0)1 43 62 71 34 - Olivier Clément
 Fax: +33 (0)1 43 62 71 34
 semences-ferm@infonie.fr

Réseau Semences Paysannes, RSP, France

Réseau Semences Paysannes brings together a variety of actors involved in initiatives to promote and defend agro-biodiversity and the right of peasants to accede to the latter: national development or trade-union organizations involved in the support of organic and peasant agriculture, craft and peasant seed producers, nurserymen, and organizations for the development and preservation of biodiversity. The 'Réseau' acts for the preservation of biodiversity and the preservation of peasant varieties as a means to increase cultivated biodiversity (agro-biodiversity), by trying to make up for the lack of recognition, as much at the scientific and technical level as at the regulation level.

Contact Réseau Semences Paysannes
 Cazalens 81600 Brens, France
 Tel: +33(0)5 63 41 72 86
 contact@semencespaysannes.org, <http://www.semencespaysannes.org>

Rete Semi Rurale, Italy

Network for the preservation of agro-biodiversity, especially the genetic and historical heritage of vegetable, food and cereal varieties. The network is made up of agronomists, historians, geneticists, local coordinators and farmers, etc. This network shares the concern about genetic and cultural erosion faced with the expansion of single-variety and transgenic monoculture, and it fights for the restoration of knowledge and the preservation of farm seeds.

Contact Rete Semi Rurale
 semi.rurale@libero.it

Centro Internazionale CROCEVIA, Italy

Centro Internazionale CROCEVIA is an Italian NGO founded in 1958 that works in the fields of international solidarity, volunteer service and development cooperation. The organization's main objective is to contribute to reinforcing solidarity between peoples involved in preserving their independence and to fight for self-sustainable development. Crocevia works for sustainable agricultural development and food sovereignty by providing information and documentation on the issues related to agro-biodiversity, GMOs and peasant seeds.

Contact

CROCEVIA

Centro Internazionale Crocevia
via F. Ferraironi 88/g - 00172 Rome, Italy
Tel: + 39 06/2413976
Fax: + 39 06/2424177
crocevia@croceviaterra.it

La Bibliothèque d'Echange de Documentation et d'Expériences, BEDE, France

BEDE's objective is to spread information and open up opportunities where knowledge, know-how, and experiences can meet together, speak out, and have exchange on GMOs and the alternatives that peasant agriculture offers faced with the model of industrial agriculture. BEDE organizes workshops and seminars, coordinates and helps reinforce networks, and produces educational material.

Contact

BEDE

47 place du millénaire
34000 Montpellier, France
Tel/Fax: +33 (0)4 67 65 45 12
bede@bede-asso.org

European Farmers Coordination - La Coordination Paysanne Européenne, CPE

This organization represents 18 peasant and rural organizations from 12 European countries (EU and non-EU). It was created in 1986, following European peasant gatherings. It stems from a dozen organizations that are working for an in-depth reform of agricultural policies in Europe and in the world, especially the Common Agricultural Policy (European Union). The CPE is in charge of informing its members of European policies (CAP, WTO, food) and of influencing the latter. It regularly takes part in awareness and action campaigns together with other partners. Since October 1998, it has been sitting on the Agricultural Consultative Committees of the European Commission.

Contact

European Farmers Coordination

Rue de la Sablonnière
18-1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel. +32 2 217 31 12
Fax +32 2 218 45 09
cpe@cpefarmers.org

GRAIN, International

GRAIN is made up of an international team spread out between Spain, the Philippines, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Great Britain, South Africa, Canada, Benin and India. Its objective is to promote actions against one of the main threats weighing on world food and the preservation of means of subsistence: genetic erosion. To carry out its objectives, GRAIN works to further:

- the protection and enforcement of community control for agricultural biodiversity,
- the promotion of agriculture rich in biodiversity,
- the protection of biological diversity.

Contact

GRAIN

Girona 25, pral., E-08010, Barcelona, Spain
Tel. +34 933011381, Fax +34 933011627
grain@grain.org

Red de Semillas, Spain

Working group for the development of organic agriculture in Spain and that brings together collectives and organizations involved in this field. It works essentially on the preservation of biodiversity (peasant seeds) and the production of organic seeds.

Contact

Red de Semillas

coord_redsemillas@agrariananresa.org - <http://www.agrariananresa.org/redsemillas/>

UK Food Group, United Kingdom

This network brings together NGOs working on the problems of food and agricultural security at the global level. It works on promoting sustainable and fair policies of food security, especially by reinforcing the ability of civil society to contribute effectively to discussions/debates on food security. UKFG represents more than 30 development, peasant, consumer and environmental organizations, all united by common interest for food security.

Contact

UKFG

UKFG, PO Box 100, London, SE1 7RT, UK

ABL, Germany

This network brings together NGOs working on the problems of food and agricultural security at the global level. It works on promoting sustainable and fair policies of food security, especially by reinforcing the ability of civil society to contribute effectively to discussions/debates on food security. UKFG represents more than 30 development, peasant, consumer and environmental organizations, all united by common interest for food security.

Contact

ABL

Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft e.V.
Bahnhofstraße 31, D-59065 Hamm/Westf., Germany
Tel: (02381) 9053170 and -171, Fax: (02381) 492221
info@abl-ev.de, www.abl-ev.de



List of participants

Algeria

- **AREA-ED**
 - LOUANCHI Meriem - m.louanchi@ina.dz / louanchi@no-log.org

Argentina

- **GRAIN**
 - VICENTE Carlos - carlos@grain.org

Belgium

- **Amis de la Terre Europe**
 - HOLDER Helen - Helen.Holder@foeeurope.org
- **Groupe des Verts Europe**
 - FOLLING Antje - fgraefe@europarl.eu.int
- **COAG Bruxelles**
 - GAONA SAEZ Susana - coag.bxl@skynet.be
- **CPE**
 - PIRIOU Solenne - cpe@cpefarmers.org
- **CPE / MAP**
 - PIRARD Raymond

Benin

- **GRAIN**
 - ZOUNDJIHEKPON Jeanne - jeanne@grain.org

Canada

- **Ram's horn**
 - KNEEN Brewster - brewster@ramshorn.bc.ca
- **GRAIN**
 - KUYEK Devlin - devlin@grain.org
- **National Farmer Union (NFU)**
 - BOEHM Terry - bmuller@msh-paris.fr / centaur2@sasktel.net

Chile

- **Anamuri / Via Campesina**
 - RODRIGUEZ Francisca - nico.verhagen@t-online.de
- **GRAIN**
 - MONTECINOS Camila - camila@grain.org

Congo

- **Plateforme sur la défense de la nature et des semences**
 - MBO Honoré Langi - langi5fr@yahoo.fr

Costa Rica

- **GRAIN**
 - RODRIGUEZ Silvia - silviar@ice.co.cr

Denmark

- **Free Farmers**
 - KONGSBAK Tao - takongdk@hotmail.com

Ecuador

- **Heifer Foundation Ecuador / GRAIN**
 - VALLEJO Maria Fernanda - fernandavallejo@heifer-ecuador.org

France

- **Acceuil paysan Dordogne**
 - LYPHOUT Colyne
- **AGRO BIO / Poitou Charentes**
 - BERNARDEAU Julien
 - DE LA PORTE René - rene.de-la-porte@wanadoo.fr
 - PAYEMENT Joël - joel.payement@wanadoo.fr
 - PELOQUIN François - fpeloquin@wanadoo.fr
 - ROUSTEAU Jean Marie - rousteau.fortin@wanadoo.fr
- **Asso. Kokopelli**
 - MEUNIER Didier - didier.meunier@libertysurf.fr
- **Asso. Longo Mai**
 - VERJANS Emmanuel - manuvert@yahoo.fr
 - WIAMER Martina - martina.w@voila.fr
- **CIVAM / Poitou-Charentes**
 - CAILLET Marc
- **Confédération Paysanne**
 - DUNTZE Nicolas (30) - duntzenico.la@wanadoo.fr
 - FONBAUSTIER Jean Pierre (41) - fonbaustier.jp@wanadoo.fr
 - MARTEAU Henri (53) - henrimarteau@wanadoo.fr
 - COMMAILLES Roger (58) - nievre@confederationpaysanne.fr
- **Confédération paysanne / CNDSF**
 - MANGUY Yves (16) - manguy.yves@wanadoo.fr
 - GERAY Michel (28) - michel.geray@wanadoo.fr
 - DUPOUY Thierry (32) - t.dupouy@tiscali.fr
 - BEAUVAL Valentin (49) - valentin.beauval@wanadoo.fr
 - BAILLY Jean Jacques (51) - jjm.bailly@free.fr
- **Confédération Paysanne / Poitou-Charentes**
 - BOSSAIN Thierry (79)
 - JULIEN Daniel (79)
 - PARADOT Philippe - ardearpc@wanadoo.fr
 - DEBIN Jacky (86)
- **Coordination Rurale / CNDSF**
 - ALLAIN Jean Luc - allain.jeanluc@wanadoo.fr
- **Coordination Rurale / CNDSF**
 - CAILLENS Florence - florence.caillens@coordinationrurale.fr
 - COMMERE Jacques - jacques.commere@wanadoo.fr
 - RIBAUTL Philippe - ribault.philippe@wanadoo.fr
 - SIMMONOT Jean Paul - jp51simmonot@aol.com
- **FNAB / CNDSF**
 - CAPLAT Jacques - jcaplat@fnab.org
 - GAUDIN Patrice - adap.bio@wanadoo.fr
 - LASSAIGNE Bertrand

- **MODEF / CNDSF**
 - CAZES Eric - cazes.eric@wanadoo.fr
 - DOTTO Christian
 - GAIGNEROT Alain - modef-national@wanadoo.fr
 - LAJOUS Jean Claude - jean-claude.lajous@wanadoo.fr
 - LAROCHE Jean Luc
 - RICHE Philippe
- **CNDSF**
 - CLEMENT Olivier - oclement@confederationpaysanne.fr
 - COUTY Jean
 - DELAGE Jean Pierre - jpdelage.triasem@free.fr
 - GAUMIER Bernard
 - LE POCREAU Gérard
 - BLANDIN Jean Claude
- **CNRS / MSH**
 - MULLER Birgit - bmuller@msh-paris.fr
- **CPE**
 - LOUAIL René - cpe@cpefarmers.org / rene.louail@wanadoo.fr
- **INRA**
 - BONNEUIL Christophe - bonneuil@damesme.cnrs.fr
 - GOLDRINGER Isabelle - isa@moulon.inra.fr
- **INRA SAD Armorique**
 - CHABLE Véronique - chable@rennes.inra.fr
- **INRA / UNITÉ TSV**
 - DEMEULENAERE Elise - demeu@ivry.inra.fr
- **Inter bio Bretagne / IFOAM**
 - LE LAGADEC François - francois@biomas.fr
- **OGM Dangers**
 - LIEPSKIND Anne
- **MAB 16**
 - MAROT Jean-François
- **MAB 16 / Poitou Charentes**
 - OLIVIER Céline - mab16@wanadoo.fr
- **CETAB / RSP**
 - BERTHELOT Jean-François
jean-francois.berthelot@wanadoo.fr
- **Biaugerme / RSP**
 - CATINAUD Philippe
info-semence@biaugerme.com
- **RSP**
 - KASTLER Guy - guy.kastler@wanadoo.fr
 - ZAHARIA Hélène - semencepaysanne@wanadoo.fr
- **ASPAARI / RSP**
 - SUPIOT Nicolas - nsupiot@wanadoo.fr
- **BEDE / RSP**
 - BERSON Anne - anneberson@yahoo.com
 - BRAC DE LA PERRIERE Bob
brac@bede-asso.org
 - MARROU Stéphane - stephanemarrou@hotmail.com
 - RAMOS Nathalie - bede@bede-asso.org
 - CHALLALI Nadia - secretariat@bede-asso.org
- **Germinance / RSP**
 - DELMOND François - germinance@wanadoo.fr
- **SPBLR / RSP**
 - MATHIEU Jean-Jacques - jeanjacques.mathieu@wanadoo.fr

- **Syndicat de Promotion Touselle / Confédération Paysanne 30**
 - FERTE Henri
- **Réseau IPAM**
 - KISS Csilla - csilla@reseau-ipam.org

Germany

- **ABL**
 - PORTZ Gerhard - korspeter@abl-ev.de / portz-moellerstedt@t-online.de
- **MISEREOR**
 - HERRMANN Brigitta - herrmann@misereor.de

Greece

- **AEGILOPS (Network for biodiversity and ecology in agriculture)**
 - LITSAS Demetrios - agrolits@otenet.gr

Hungary

- **Fondation Gaïa / Protect the Future**
 - SIMONYI Borbala - simonyib@vedegylet.hu

India

- **GRAIN**
 - BHUTANI Shalini - shalini@grain.org
- **DDS / GRAIN**
 - PERIYAPATNA Sathesh - hyd1_ddshyd@sancharnet.in
- **KRRS / Via Campesina**
 - NANJUNDASWAMY Chukki - chukki_krrs@yahoo.co.in

Iran

- **CENESTA**
 - RAHMANIAN Maryam - maryam@cenesta.org

Ireland

- **Growing Awaren / Save our seeds**
 - Mc KEEVER Madeline - madsmkcreever@eircom.net

Italy

- **CROCEVIA**
 - ONORATI Antonio - mc2535@mlink.it
 - GAIFAMI Michela - m_gaifami@tiscali.it
- **IAO / Rete Semi Rurali**
 - NONNE Maria Francesca - nonne@iao.florence.it / mariafrancescanonne@tiscali.it
 - BOCCI Ricardo - r.bocci@casignano.it
- **Semina / Rete italiana tutela biodiversita**
 - LIMENTANI Simona - simona.limentani@cornale.it
- **University of Rome "La Sapienza"**
 - PIERLUIGI Bozzi - p.bozzi@tiscali.it

Kenya

- **PELUM**
 - MAKANYA Zachary - makanya@pelum.net

Luxembourg

- **Biolabel Luxembourg**
 - ADAMS Frank - frank.adams@email.lu

Mali

- **CNOP / Fédération Organisation de Producteurs de Bananes**
- COULIBALY Mamadou Lamine - malaminecoul@yahoo.fr

Mexico

- **UNORCA**
- GOMEZ Alberto - comisionejecutiva@unorca.org.mx / albertogomez@unorca.org.mx

Netherlands

- **Corporate Europe Observatory**
- HOLLAND Nina - buen-aventura@gmx.net
- **ETC group / GRAIN**
- RIBEIRO Silvia - silvia@grain.org

Pakistan

- **LOK SANJH**
- ZIA Shahid - shahid_lsf@yahoo.com

Philippines

- **KMP**
- RAMOS Danilo - roda_g04@yahoo.com
- **MASIPAG**
- YAP Emmanuel - eyap2@yahoo.com
- **GRAIN**
- RIVERA Vlady - vlady@grain.org
- VELLVE Renée - renee@grain.org

Portugal

- **CPE / CNA**
- VIEIRA Joa - vandasantos@cna.pt

Rumania

- **Ministry of Agriculture**
- BAZGA Bogdan Ion - bogdan.bazga@maa.ro
- **National Federation of Organic Farmers**
- CRAIOVEANU Dan - dan@ngo.ro

Slovenia

- **Union of Slovenian organic farmers association**
- CERNE Mihaela - helenajurse@hotmail.com

Spain

- **COAG**
- GONZALES ATECA Mikel - mikelgateka@inicia.es
- **CPE / EHNE**
- QUINTANA Josu - Inguru@ehne.org
- **GRAIN**
- HOBBELINK Henk - henk@grain.org

- URKIOLA Aitor - aitor@grain.org
- **RED DE SEMILLAS**
- GONZALES Juan Manuel
- coord_redsemillas@agrariamaresa.org
- THOMAS Cécile - cels.thomas@wanadoo.fr

Switzerland

- **Berne Declaration**
- MEIENBERG François - food@evb.ch

Syria

- **ICARDA**
- CECCARELLI Salvatore - s.ceccarelli@cgjar.org

Thailand

- **Alternative Agriculture Network Thailand / GRAIN**
- YAIMUANG Supa - syaimuang@yahoo.com

Tunisia

- **Association de Développement Durable**
- ZAMMOURI Abdelhamid - addasso.tn@voila.fr / addzammouri@voila.fr

United Kingdom

- **HDRA / The Organic Organisation**
- SANCHEZ GIRALDEZ Helena
- hsanchez-giraldez@hdra.org.uk
- **Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)**
- PIMBERT Michel - michel.pimbert@iied.org
- **Littoral Arts / Reg Charity**
- HUNTER Ian - littoral@btopenworld.com
- LARNER Celia - littoral@btopenworld.com
- **SFFA / UK FOOD GROUP**
- HART Mikel
- **UK Food Group / ITDG**
- MULVANY Patrick - patrickmulvany@clara.co.uk
- **GRAIN**
- VAUGHAN Alexis - alexis@grain.org

Uruguay

- **ATALC**
- NANSEN Karin - urusust@redes.org.uy

Zambia

- **Zambia National Farmers Union / GRAIN**
- SIMWANDA Lovemore - ecaz@zamnet.zm / znfu@zamnet.zm

