Patents increasingly reduce the freedom to operate in plant breeding. Biotechnology companies are known to actively seek patent protection for their products, but it is the knowledge created by public universities and research institutes that is often protected. This is legitimised by policies of these organisations themselves, their public funders, or the contracts underlying public-private partnerships in research.

The trend to protect knowledge creates particular challenges for universities that want to contribute to reaching the Millennium Development Goals, such as Wageningen UR in the Netherlands. This was the reason for this university to collaborate with the Netherlands Centre for Society and Genomics to organise an international conference on April 10 this year, to discuss the main tensions in the current intellectual property (IP) landscape, and possible ways to address the increasingly restricted access to publicly developed technologies for use in research for development.

Breeding for development

The face of plant breeding research has changed significantly. This is not only due to the rapid translation of innovations in the field of genomics, but also to revolutionary changes in the legal and policy environment in which plant scientists and breeders are working. Biotechnology introduced the patent system into breeding research. Moreover, international agreements on biodiversity increased the importance of contractual arrangements to access genetic resources. Patents provide a temporary exclusive right to the inventor of useful technologies in those countries where the patent is accepted. While this is intended to stimulate innovation, it may also reduce access to technologies and increase transaction costs. The extension of the patent system into the field of plant breeding started in the 1980s in the USA and has extended to other countries since. The TRIPS agreement, the World Trade Organization and more recently bilateral trade agreements extend such rights to developing countries. Even though there is a broad consensus within the seed sector that intellectual property rights have a role to play in research for commercial markets, these legal systems also influence research for non-commercial use, i.e. ‘basic research’, research for non-commercial crops and research with the aim to reduce poverty and hunger. Several examples have been documented in the struggle to obtain all the licenses that are necessary for introducing technologies into developing countries. The dozens of patents resting on the nutritionally enhanced ‘Golden Rice’ is a well known example. Developed at universities in Switzerland and Germany it required a major commercial company (Syngenta) to disentangle the thickets of rights and negotiate licenses for all these patents in their use for the poor. Even though many more examples exist, most are not documented simply because no agreement was reached, or more commonly because negotiations failed to start because the patent holders did not show any interest to negotiate at all. It is not only the usual suspects, ‘the multinational’ that create such limitations to research for development. Universities also have patents and are not always eager to part with their rights for development oriented research. An example is the Xa21 gene in rice which codes for an important disease resistance and patented by the University of California, Davis, based on earlier research by the International Rice Research Institute in India and Mali. Only after lengthy negotiations and public arousal, did UC-Davis release the patent for development purposes and even developed a benefit sharing mechanism for profits derived from the commercial use of the patent.

The conference

“I would also urge Dutch universities and research institutes to adopt institutional IP policies that take account not only of valorisation of knowledge and incentives for researchers, but also the importance of access to knowledge and freedom to operate for development purposes”, said the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation Bert Koenders during his closing speech at the ‘Knowledge on the Move’ Conference, held in The Hague. Responding to this statement a conference was recently organised at Wageningen University and Research Centre (Wageningen UR), aptly titled: ‘Reconsidering intellectual property policies in public research - sharing the benefits of biotechnology with developing countries’. The meeting brought together participants from fields as distant as plant sciences, development studies and practice, research management and intellectual property practice, private sector seed industry, and civil society. The day discussed the role of public research organisations in supporting agricultural research for development in the light of the emerging restrictions to the freedom to operate. Wageningen UR plays an important role in genomics research in public-private partnerships, notably on potatoes and tomatoes. Contributing to the Millennium Development Goals is one of the priorities in its strategic plan. Wageningen UR was treated as a case study of the more generic questions arising at all public research organisations worldwide. The conference included presentations on changing trends of intellectual property (IP) management at Wageningen UR, the perspective of public funding organisations on the valorisation of research outputs, the limited freedom to operate as experienced by representatives of research for development, current practices of IP management in public-private partnerships, and potential strategies to increase the freedom to operate for ‘research and development’. The day also included a panel discussion with representatives from the Dutch potato breeding industry, ‘research for development’, civil society, and Wageningen UR management.

The outcome

The issue of IP in research was tackled from different generic angles, including ethics - the role of science and academia in society - and political economy, but moved quickly to more practical levels. It was argued that public research organisations generally use patent protection as part of three strategies; maintaining their position at the forefront of science through maximizing their own freedom to operate, strengthening their position in public-private partnerships, and obtaining a return on investment on their research through cash income. Humanitarian use licences have been used to make individual technologies available for research for development. Wageningen UR has done so in a couple of projects, but it does not have a corporate strategy on the issue. Ideally, such licenses are generic, rather than dealing with individual transfers. Defining what ‘humanitarian use’ exactly entails and how it can be enforced in case of misuse remains complex. Such open issues often require explicit action and communication to facilitate actual technology transfer. The strategies of the ‘Public sector Intellectual Property Resource for Agriculture’ (IPTRA) were presented as a model. IPTRA pools fragmented public sector IP and includes it in a searchable database, and bundles different technologies in packages to facilitate use. This is complemented by capacity building and IP research. It was argued that the model does not include a whole body of not patented knowledge. Open-source is another model for increasing access and reducing transaction costs. This model supports the sharing of innovations on the condition that any further improvements on the technology are also shared without costs. A philosophy of innovation in networks with weak-informal ties, as...
opposed to a linear organisational structure with formal contracts, would underlie an ‘open innovation system’. It was argued that the large genomic programmes develop into quasi open source communities through the inclusion of large numbers of partners that share their results. Open-source sharing can be complementary with a more conventional patent-like protection of other research data, making embarking on open-source systems a less radical departure from common practice. Despite various initiatives to promote open source strategies, the models do not appear to gain much importance in more product oriented biotechnology research.

In discussing, the limitations of current tr management in Wageningen, and the relevance of humanitarian licenses, patent pools, or open-source strategies, a number of other issues arose. First of all, patents in Europe represent only a minor mechanism for technology transfer. Increased access to information (publications) and various forms of capacity and institution building are important mechanisms to transfer technologies and facilitate their use. Secondly, the scope of the problem was placed in perspective by questioning the relevance of patents for plant breeding. Few patents are relevant in potato breeding where the private sector favours breeder’s rights which keep new plant varieties available for further breeding, and claims it does not to seek profit from poor farmers in developing countries. Finally, the crucial role of research funding organsi- sations was indicated, in setting the rules for the valorisation of public research outputs. While a general agreement on the importance of ‘science for impact’ was reached, it was argued that patenting is clearly not the only – nor always the most appropriate – way of valorising the outcomes of public research.

An outlook
The importance of patents in the field of plant breeding in the future is not very clear. If current trends in the expansion of the patent system continue, the restrictions on freedom to operate are likely to get worse. However, at the same time, recent developments can be observed in the major patent offices (notably US), questioning and challenging the current patent systems for biological systems. This may have very important consequences for the legal and policy environment in which public research institutes such as Wageningen embrace, and their public funding agencies operate, and therefore for the problems that have been discussed during this conference. Nonetheless, Wageningen must has to deal with and respond to the current tr landscape, and its limitations. Since the Institute is currently dis- cussing its corporate trv policy, the debate was considered very timely and useful. The outcomes of the meeting will be taken into account in this process and may fuel the debate in other universities in the Netherlands and beyond. //

NEW!! Individual seed selecting

Individual Seed Selection has arrived
Seed germination improvement! The basic quest of every seed technologist. Germination laboratory supervisors, seed cleaning experts as well as seed technologists, all have their own specific way of inspecting seeds. If they could define and standardise what the ‘trained eye’ can see, they would own a part of the holy grail to advance seed selection. This is exactly what Hoopman equipment & engineering b.v. can now offer.

Each seed is scanned. With a hi-tech software package it can measure such features as; Symmetry, Dents, Curves, Surface, Length, Width, Colour, Deformations, Mechanical damages, Twists, Spots etc. Once the characteristics of the ‘under average’ or ‘non performing’ seeds have been established, they can be sorted and eliminated by a mechanical sorting mechanism.

Please contact Jan Willem Hoopman at the ISF congress Tradingroom table 94) or at info@hoopman-equipment.nl
Hoopman equipment & engineering
Akkermateweg 5 a,
7122 LG Aalten
The Netherlands
T +31 (0)543 470 496
F +31 (0)543 479 072
info@hoopman-equipment.nl

First operationally complete system

The main focus of Rijk Zwaan is to be a reliable partner for everyone in the vegetable chain. Therefore we create top varie-

ties with high yields, disease resistance, perfect quality and good
flavour. But we go further and offer our partners services such
as sharing knowledge, tailor-made solutions and chain manage-
ment. With our seeds and services our partners can perfectly
match with the modern demands in the chain. Think about that!

Our reliability
is your match