

Proceedings of

National Consultative Seminar on ‘Section 41 of

PPV & FR Act, 2001: Rights of Communities’

(25-26 May, 2010)



Organized by

Protection of Plant Varieties & Farmers' Rights Authority

NASC Complex, DPS Marg, Opp. Todapur Village

New Delhi 110 012

Proceedings of the National Consultative Seminar on ‘Section 41 of PPV & FR Act, 2001: Rights of Communities’

A two days National Consultative Seminar on ‘Section 41 of PPV & FR Act, 2001: Rights of Communities’ was organized by Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers’ Rights Authority on 25th and 26th May 2010 in the Seminar Hall of NAAS, NASC Complex, New Delhi. The detailed programme and participants of the meeting is enclosed as Annexure I and II.

Welcome and opening remarks:

At the outset, Dr. P.K. Singh, Registrar, PPV&FRA welcomed the participants of the meeting and presented a brief overview of the PPV&FR Act and the Authority thereof. He informed the house that DUS descriptors of various crop species including field crops and horticultural crops (vegetables, fruits and flowers) have been notified / or are under notification for receiving applications. Also, Authority has issued certificate of registration to the breeders / farmers for more than 100 plant varieties in different crop species. Further, the Authority had recognized the communities through National Plant Genome Savior Recognition and now it has constituted Plant Genome Savior Community Award of Rs. 10.0 lakhs for their significant contribution for conservation of traditional varieties which are the source for gene mining and breeding programs. Simultaneously, it has become significant that if a community has contributed significantly in the development of a registered variety, such communities should get back the benefits as certain rights have been provided under Section 41 of the Act. He said that the main objective of the Seminar is to develop a road map for the procedures to be followed for receiving of applications, verification of claims, fixing of compensation/benefit sharing and mode of payment of compensation/benefit share, etc under the provisions of Section 41.

Dr. R.B. Singh, Ex Member National Commission of Farmers (NCF), gave his special remarks. He said that it is essentially required that the Authority recognize and

help the farming communities in getting the compensation/ benefit share for their contribution in protection and/or conservation of genetic resources utilized in the development of new varieties in many cases. He indicated that it is a very complex issue since it would be difficult to decide the owners of the varieties. He explained that the activity of conservation is done by the communities for two reasons, firstly for livelihood and secondly for the cause of humanity. As the maintenance of the conserved material is equally important so different hotspots has to be examined separately in terms of its environment, mode of cultivation and life style prevailing in that area before providing the money as benefit share. Local varieties/land races/genetic resources utilized for development of varieties may belong to several communities and multiple claims may come on surface. So, to avoid such difficulties it is important that Authority launches some programme / project for evaluation, characterization, documentation and database creation of material available with the communities. Moreover, PPV & FRA and NBA may come together to work out the solution to conserve the genetic resources of the country and stop genetic erosion.

Dr. S. Nagarajan, Chairperson, PPV & FRA said that though we are here to discuss Section 41 of the PPV FR Act, 2001 but instead of interpreting the Section 41 independently, it must be read with the provisions made in other sections of the Act which are correlated. He commented on the leisurely way the applicants are dealing with the columns related to the declaration of parental material ownership. He said that benefit sharing is of two types: First dealing with the registered plant varieties and second dealing with community rights wherein participatory plant breeding is involved. He asked the house to discuss several issues such as false denomination of parental lines, how to conduct an inquiry to justify the claims and methods/statistics to be involved for testing of genetic material. He said that for perennial crops alternate procedure is to be suggested and similarly for floriculture crop a different procedure is to be adopted.

Technical Session I: 'Legal Aspects of Benefit Sharing'

The Session was Chaired by Dr. A.K. Malhotra, Registrar General, PPV & FRA with Dr. A.K. Singh, STO and Dr. Susheel Kumar, STO, PPV & FRA as rapporteurs. Presentations were made by Sh. D.S. Rajganesh, Legal Advisor, PPV & FRA, Mr. Yashwanth Shenoy, Advocate, Mumbai, Dr. S. Balaravi, MSSRF, Chennai and Dr. H.S. Chawla, Professor & Nodal Officer, PIC, G.B.P.U.A & T., Pantnagar, Uttarakhand.

First presentation was made by Sh. D.S. Rajganesh, Legal Advisor, PPV & FRA on 'Outline of Section 41: Rights of Communities'. He presented that any person can file claims for benefit sharing within six months from the date of publication of the details of the registered variety (under Section 26) whereas communities / conservers can file for their rights of benefit sharing / claims under Section 41 and there is as such no time limit for filing such claims. The application for claims should be filed in the notified Centre of that area, which after verification would forward the application to the Authority for the settlements of the claims and benefit sharing with the applicant and the community. He informed that notification of Centres and limit of compensation is to be notified in the Gazette of India by the Central Government. He also pointed out the discrepancy in Act and Rules in terms of the type of variety to be covered under Section 41 and word 'new variety' indicated in Rule 68 and suggested that it should be replaced with 'variety'. He also suggested amending the 'Title of Form O-12' and said that since it is a legal matter, Legal Aid Centres may be built up at local body level to sort out the matter at grass root level. He stressed that compensation as well as penal damages should be given to the applicants.

After the presentation several suggestions came from the House such as:

1. First and foremost mandate is to work out the Centres to be notified for filing of applications at local level.
2. A proper format for filing an application needs to be designed.
3. Section 41 should be read in alignment of Section 18 which requires certain information to be provided while filing an application for registration. If

complete pedigree of the candidate variety is not disclosed, application may be returned / cancelled at the initial level.

4. It was stressed that before allocating the Centres, person/s dealing the Centre should be adequately educated/trained about the requirements of Section 41 and should have a sound knowledge of both traditional culture and biodiversity wealth of the area covered under the Centre.

Second presentation was made by Mr. Yashwant Chenoy on Rights of Communities. He suggested that a proportion of total benefit accrued by the owner of the registered variety may be fixed for resolving the issue of claims. He specified that in case of Section 26 there is a time limit for filing application for claims whereas under Section 41 there is not time limit for filing applications. He said that the terms compensation and benefit sharing should be interpreted separately. As literal meaning of compensation is something related to the services rendered, provisions should be made for one time payment and settlement of claims for compensation. Whereas, benefit sharing should be calculated on a percentage basis depending upon the profits made and should be valid till the term of protection of variety. Under **Section 26(2) of PPV & FRA, 2001**, on invitation of the claims under sub-section (1), any person or group of persons or firm or governmental or nongovernmental organization shall submit its claim of benefit sharing too such variety in the prescribed form within such period, and accompanies with such fees, as may be prescribed : Provided that such claim shall only be submitted by any – (i) person or group of persons, if such person or every person constituting such group is a citizen of India; or (ii) firm or governmental or non-governmental organization, if such firm or organization is formed or established in India whereas, under **Section 41(1) of PPV & FRA, 2001**, any person or group of persons (whether actively engaged in farming or not) or any governmental or nongovernmental organization may, on behalf of any village or local community in India, file in any centre notified, with the previous approval of the Central Government, by the Authority, in the Official Gazette, any claim attributable to the contribution of the people of that village or local community, as the case may be, in the evolution or any variety for the purpose of staking a claim on behalf

of such village or local community. He also pointed out the possibility of multiple claims filed by different communities, apart from the community whose genetic material usage is under consideration, who are separately and independently involved in conserving the genetic resource, even though the base material has not been taken from them.

After the presentation certain remarks were made such as:

1. The level of significance of evidences / contributions enclosed with the application is to be decided.
2. A regional Register of Communities and type of conservation activities carried out by such communities may be prepared which may serve as a document before taking up the cases.
3. As there is no time limit fixed for staking a claim, the Limitations Act, 1963 may operate to decide the cases.
4. There is an urgent need to decide the maximum limit for the claims, otherwise, uncertainty will lead to the increase in price of the seeds.
5. As there is no limit on time and the number of claims to be filed, complex situations may arise, when, after the distribution of the compensation amount to one community, another community files the stake. Thus, it may be necessary to finalize the time within which the applications can be received along with the maximum amount to be paid as compensation.

Third presentation was made by Dr. S. Balaravi, MSSRF. Chennai. He gave an overview of different communities prevailing in different parts of the country who are actively growing and maintaining the traditional varieties of different crops which have specific attributes / characteristics which can be utilized for the development of new varieties.

Fourth presentation was made by Dr. H.S. Chawla, G.B.P.U.A. & T., Pantnagar, Uttarakhand on 'Innovations in terms of Farmers' Varieties' He raised issues specific requirements for the filing of applications of farmers' varieties for registration.

Technical Session II and III:

The Session II was Chaired by Dr. Uppeandra Dhar, Member, National Biodiversity Authority, Chennai while Technical Session III was Chaired by Dr. K.D. Kokate, DDG, Agriculture Extension, ICAR. These Sessions were to discuss the administrative and technical aspects of Rights to Communities and develop a road map for implementing Section 41 of the PPV & FR Act, 2001.

Step 1: Identification of Centres:

It was suggested that since initially the number of claims would be less in number so the Head Office of the Authority can deal with the cases. At second stage, Regional Offices of the Authority may be asked to handle the applications and the scrutinized application with report may be sent to the Head Office for further action. At third stage, State Agricultural Universities, Zonal Research Stations and Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) in collaboration with the Regional Offices of the Authority may develop a network to handle the applications. If required, Gram Panchayats may also be incorporated in the system for dealing with at local levels. It was also suggested that already existing Centres/Organizations (such as ATMA, Legal Aid Centres, District Agriculture Departments, KVKs, and established NGOs) at grass root level may be facilitated to carry out the work.

Also, adequate awareness cum training programmes may be organized by the Authority to make the officials of SAUs, KVKs, Gram Panchayats and State Government competent enough to examine the applications (facts mentioned in the applications and significance of contribution claimed) with respect to the provisions / requirements of Section 41 of the Act and prepare the report to be submitted to the Authority for settlement of the claims. Authority should also prepare small write ups and pamphlets related to the benefits / provisions made under Section 41 and distribute to recognized communities. It was also suggested that students obtaining trainings under various SAUs/ICAR schemes should be involved to create mass awareness.

Step 2: Verification of claims

The quality of evidences enclosed / produced by the claimant is to be examined very carefully. Sometimes, at initial level farmers/conservers may only record their statement for their genetic material involved in the development of the registered variety. In such cases, a standard affidavit format should be devised by the Authority which the applicant must sign and submit along with the application for claim.

It is equally important that the Centre should have a database of communities prevailing in the area covered by the Centre and the type of material/genetic resource they are conserving / owning through generation. This would serve as a initial source of information for scrutinizing the application by the Centre. But the cases apart from the database may also be dealt by the Centre. For this purpose, a panel of expert including one member each from the Authority, concerned SAU, KVK and local farmer, can be formed.

Step 3: Level of Contribution

The level of contribution cannot be limited or defined same for all types of applications. It should be dealt on case to case basis. It was suggested that a reverse analysis may serve the purpose for defining the level of contribution. Depending upon the morphology of the variety, distinguishing characteristics, contribution of specific traits in the commercial value of the variety and out of 'n' number of varieties involved in the development of the candidate variety what is the contribution of the material claimed by the claimant. It was also suggested that before fixing the contribution efforts made by the breeder should also be taken into account.

Step 4: Who will do and how the inquiries will be made

Participants had different views for this aspect. Some suggested that a minimum of three members Committee should carry out the inquiry; some suggested that a pool of experts may be constituted and relevant expert may be called depending upon the type of case to be dealt with. It was also suggested that since overall liability vests on the Authority to settle the claims so it may not be a requirement and by only comparing the

data provided by the breeder and claimant, and after balancing the equation, decision may be taken by the Authority. If required, advice may be taken from the concerned expert.

Step 5: Time limit for disposal of cases

As under Section 41 there is no time limit for filing an application of claims but in such case also, the time of filing for compensation may not go beyond the time period of enforcement of protection period granted to the variety. In cases where more than one applicant file claims for the same variety, the community filing first should be given priority. It was also suggested that if there are more than one claimant, compensation may be distributed accordingly among the communities.

Step 6: Limit of compensation / Benefit share

It was suggested that depending upon the commercial value of the variety under question, compensation may be fixed. Commercial value may be checked on the basis of turn over of the seed production. It was strongly recommended by the participants that compensation should be fixed and one time payment may be made for settlement. There may be a possibility that applications for claims may come late. In such cases it was suggested that depending upon the commercial life spent by the candidate variety compensation may be fixed. It was suggested that a National level Committee of scientific experts and legal experts may be constituted to develop a guideline for deciding the amount of compensation to be paid.

Step 5: Disbursement of claims

It was unanimously suggested that an affidavit may be taken from the claimant for the amount of compensation disbursed to him and he shall judicially distribute the amount to the contributors among the community limits.

Major recommendations:

1. As the issue of Section 41 involves technical as well as legal frame works, the proceedings of this National Consultation may be once again thoroughly discussed in the second National Consultation to accommodate all the suggestions from the different stakeholders.
2. The Expert Committee may be constituted to finalize the maximum limit of compensation.
3. Initially, some selected KVKs representation different agro-biodiversity hot spots may be identified as the Centres where the applicants can file the claims.
4. The KVKs in consultation with the SAUs and ICAR institutions may be trained for the verification of claims.
5. There is a need to develop various formats for applications, verification reports, etc.
6. Provisions should be made for one time payment and settlement of claims for compensation. Benefit sharing may be decided on case to case basis.

BASE PAPER ON SECTION 41: RIGHTS OF COMMUNITIES
(For National Consultative Seminar)
P.K. Singh, D.S. Raj Ganesh and R.R. Pradhan
Protection of Plant Varieties & Farmers' Rights Authority, New Delhi

The PPV&FR Act, 2001 not only deals with the Plant Breeder's Rights but it also have provisions on Farmers' Rights, Community Rights and so on. These rights were made part and partial of the Act for recognizing the selfless service rendered by the farmers and the farming communities in conservation of the genetic resources, in improvement and selection of niche specific varieties and also in helping the scientific community in their endeavour to develop new high yielding and widely adapted varieties.

The section 41 of the PPV&FR Act, 2001 deals with the Rights of Communities. It states under:

Section 41(1): Any person, group of persons (whether actively engaged in farming or not) or any governmental or non-governmental organisation may, on behalf of any village or local community in India file in any centre notified, with the previous approval of the Central Government by the Authority in the official gazette, any claim attributable to the contribution of the people of that village or local community, as the case may be, in the evolution of any variety for the purpose of staking a claim on behalf of such village or local community.

Section 41(2): Where any claim is made under sub-section (1), the centre notified under that sub-section may verify the claim made by such person or group of persons or such governmental or non-governmental organization in such manner as it deems fit and if it is satisfied that such village or local community has contributed significantly to the evolution of the variety which has been registered under this Act, it shall report its findings to the Authority.

Section 41(3): When the Authority, on a report under sub-section (2) is satisfied, after such enquiry as it may deem fit, that the variety with which the report is related has been registered under the provisions of this Act, it may issue notice in the prescribed

manner to the breeder of that variety and after providing opportunity to such breeder to file objection in the prescribed manner and of being heard, it may subject to any limit notified by the Central Government, by order, grant such sum of compensation to be paid to a person or group of persons or governmental or non-governmental organisation which has made claim under sub-section (1), as it may deem fit.

Section 41(4): Any compensation granted under sub-section (3) shall be deposited by the breeder of the variety in the Gene Fund.

Section 41(5): The compensation granted under sub-section (3) shall be deemed to be an arrear of land revenue and shall be recoverable by the Authority accordingly.

Combining all the sub-sections, the complete process for taking-up Rights of Communities can be defined into following steps:

Intervention required		Step
Claim can be made at notified centres	↔	Claim made by any person, group of persons or any governmental or NGO on behalf of any village or local community in India.
		↓
How to verify the claim?	↔	Claim to be verified by the notified centre.
		↓
What is the level of contribution?	↔	Satisfactory report of the notified centre.
		↓
Who & how it will be done?	↔	Enquiry by Authority on the submitted report.
		↓
What will be the manner?	↔	Notice to the breeder in prescribed manner.
		↓
What can be the system?	↔	Filing/submission of objections by the breeder.
		↓
How to fix the 'limit' or	↔	Decision limit/amount of compensation to be paid.

'amount'?		
		↓
What will be the PPV&FRA's share?	↔	Deposition of compensation in the Gene Fund.
		↓
Mode of payment	↔	Disbursement of compensation to the claimants.

A perusal of the steps makes it necessary that:

1. A thorough **discussion** should be held **at National level** by involving all the stakeholders to incorporate the specific viewpoints.
2. The major points where the interventions/decisions will be required are:
 - a. Defining Notified Centres? How these centres will operate and what infrastructure support will be required to run these centres?
 - b. How the claims will be verified?
 - c. How to decide the level of contribution and the level of compensation thereon?
 - d. Who will perform the enquiry on behalf of the Authority and how?
 - e. Decision on the prescribed manner of issuing notice to the breeder.
 - f. Manner of proceedings to be undertaken to finalize the case.
 - g. Fixation of "limit" of compensation.
 - h. As the compensation is to be deposited in the Gene Fund before disbursement to the claimant, what will be the Authority's share as "operational cost" in the compensation?
 - i. What will be the mode of payment to the claimants?

Programme Schedule for National Consultative Seminar on 'Section 41 of PPV & FR Act, 2001: Rights of Communities'

Organised by: Protection of Plant Varieties & Farmers' Rights Authority, New Delhi

Venue: NASC Complex, New Delhi

Date: May 25-26, 2010 (Tuesday & Wednesday)

TENTATIVE PROGRAMME:

Day 1: May 25, 2010

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. REGISTRATION | : | 9.00 A.M. to 9.30 A.M. |
| 2. OPENING SESSION | : | 9.30 A.M. to 10.30 A.M. |
| Welcome and Issues for Discussion
Dr. P.K. Singh, Registrar (Farmers' Rights) | : | 9.30 A.M. to 9.35 A.M. |
| Special Remarks
Dr. R.B. Singh | : | 9.35 A.M. to 10.10 A.M. |
| General Remarks
Dr. S. Nagarajan, Chairperson | : | 10.10 A.M. to 10.25 A.M. |
| Vote of Thanks | : | 10.25 A.M. to 10.30 A.M. |

Tea: 10.30 A.M. to 10.45 A.M.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 3. TECHNICAL SESSION - I | : | 10.45 A.M. to 1.00 P.M. |
| Legal Aspects of Benefit Sharing
(Presentations from Legal Experts + Interactions)
Chairman: Dr. A.K. Malhotra, Registrar General
Rapporteur: Dr. A.K. Singh and Dr Susheel Kumar | | |

Lunch: 1.00 P.M. to 2.00 P.M.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------|
| 4. TECHNICAL SESSION - II | : | 2.00 P.M. to 5.00 P.M. |
| | | <i>(Tea Break 3.30 PM - 3.45 PM)</i> |
| Chairman: Dr. Uppeandra Dhar, Member, BDA, Chennai
Rapporteur: Dr. A.K. Singh and Dr Susheel Kumar | | |
| Administrative and Technical Aspects of Rights of Communities | | |

(Presentations by the Representatives of Seed Industries, Presentations by the Representatives of SAUs/ICAR Institutions and Interactions)

Day 2: May 26, 2010

5. **TECHNICAL SESSION - III** : 10.00 A.M. to 11.30 A.M.
Administrative and Technical Aspects of Rights of Communities
(Presentations by the Representatives of NGOs/Farmers' Organizations etc and Interactions)

Chairman: Dr. K.D. Kokate, DDG, Agril. Extension, ICAR
Rapporteur: Dr. A.K. Singh and Dr Susheel Kumar

Tea: 11.30 A.M. to 11.45 A.M.

6. **PLENARY SESSION** : **11.45 A.M. to 1.00 P.M.**
Chairman: Dr. K.D. Kokate, DDG (Extension), ICAR, New Delhi
Co-Chairman: Dr. A.K. Malhotra, Registrar-General, PPV&FRA
Rapporteur: Dr. A.K. Singh and Dr Susheel Kumar
Development of Road Map for Implementation of Section 41

7. **VOTE OF THANKS**

Lunch: 1.00 P.M. to 2.00 P.M

List of participants for the Meeting

S. No.	Name and Address
1.	Dr. S. Nagarajan, Chairperson, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
2.	Dr. A.K. Malhotra, Registrar – General, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
3.	Dr. P.K. Singh, Registrar, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
4.	Mr. R.K. Trivedi, Registrar, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
5.	Dr. Manoj Srivastava, Registrar, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
6.	Prof. R. B. Singh, Ex-ADG, FAO, United Nations Distinguished Professor, New Delhi
7.	Dr. S. Bala Ravi, MSSRF, Chennai
8.	Dr. H.S. Chawla, Professor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology Pant Nagar – 263145, Uttarakhand Mail: chawlahs_patent@yahoo.com
9.	Mr. Yeshwanth Shenoy, Mumbai
10.	Mrs. Archana Shanker, Senior Partner, Anand & Anand, New Delhi Email: archana@anandandanand.com
11.	Dr. Neeti Wilson, Managing Associate, Anand & Anand, New Delhi Email : neeti@anandandanand.com
12.	Dr. R. K. Gumber, Senior Cotton Breeder, Department of Plant Breeding & Genetics, PAU, Ludhiana
13.	Dr. M. Ramasami, Rasi Seeds (P) Ltd, Salem district
14.	Dr. Arvind Kapur, Rasi Seeds (P) Ltd, 273, Kamarajanar Road Attur -636102 Salem district
15.	Mr. I.S. Khairwal, Project Coordinator, AICRP- Pearl Millet Mandor, Jodhpur-342304 (Rajasthan)
16.	Mrs. L. Balasubrahmanayam, Head K & S Partners, Gurgaon Sr. Partner, Corporate Law Group 1101-104 kailash Bldg. 26, K G Marg N. Delhi – 1
17.	Mr. BS Dahiya, Former Director of Research, CCSHAU, Hisar
18.	Dr. Atul Kumar Tiwari, Astd. Professor, Dr. RML National Law University Lucknow-226012
19.	Dr. V.K. Gupta, NRC for Agroforestry Jhansi
20.	Dr. Malavika Dadlani, Head & Nodal Officer (Seeds) Division of Seed Science & Technology IARI New Delhi – 110012
21.	Mr. Rajib Kr. Kalita, Rain forest Research institute, Deovan Estate PO Sotai Jorhat – 785010 (Assam)
22.	Dr. Chander Parkash, Sr. Scientist (PB), IARI Regional Station Katrain Kullu Valley (HP)- 175129
23.	Dr. O.K. Sinha, Proj. Coordinator (Sugarcane) IISR, Lucknow

24.	Dr. T.S. Barman, Tocklai Experimental Station, Tea Research Association, Jorhat – 785008, Email: tsbarman@rediffmail.com
25.	Dr. R.S. Meena, National Research Centre on Seed Spices, Ajmer Raj. Ph: 09414840576, Email: rsm_nrcss@yahoo.co.in
26.	Dr. H.C. Pathak, Dr. & Dean PG, NAU, Navsari
27.	Dr. I.U. Dhuj, Associate Director of Research, JAU, Junagadh-362001
28.	Dr. D.K. Hore, Chief Germplasm Botanist, KSL, Jalna (M.S)
29.	Dr. K.H. Singh, Sr. Scientist, DRMR Bharatpur
30.	Mr. Santosh Kumar, AGM, Bayer Bio Science Pvt. Ltd
31.	Prof. M.M Anwer Ph.D., Director, NRC Seed Spices Ajmer, Rajasthan
32.	Dr. R.P. Singh, Director, Seed & Farmer, BAU Ranchi, Jharkhand
33.	Dr. R.N. Barwal, IARI R.S. Katrain Kullu HP – 175129
34.	Dr. K.V.Prasad, Floriculture, IARI, New Delhi
35.	Dr. T. Janakiraman, Head, Floriculture, IARI, New Delhi
36.	Mr. D. Calab Gabriel, Patent Attorney, K & S Partners, Gurgaon
37.	Mr. K. Muthu Selvam, Patent Attorney, K & S Partners, Gurgaon
38.	Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Asstt. Director, NSAI. Jharkhand
39.	Mr. N.K Dadlani, Director, NSAI New Delhi
40.	Mr. S. Kundu, DWR, Karnal
41.	Dr. Manju Arora Relan, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi
42.	Mr. Upeendra Dhar, Member National Biodiversity Authority, NASI- Senior Scientist Hemdand Uni. New Delhi-62
43.	Mrs. Madhavi Char, Mahyco, Jalna Maharashtra
44.	Mr. D.R. Choudhary, Joint Registrar, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
45.	Mr. Umakant Dubey, Deputy Registrar, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
46.	Mr. D.S. Rajganes, Legal Advisor, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
47.	Mr. R.R. Pradhan, Legal Advisor, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
48.	Dr. A.K. Singh, STO, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
49.	Dr. D.S. Pilonia, STO, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
50.	Dr. Sushil, STO, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
51.	Mr. Rajeev Talwar, SAO, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
52.	Dr. Amit Dixit, PVE, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
53.	Sh. Arvind, Computer Assistant, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
54.	Sh. Sanjay Gupta, Computer Assistant, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
55.	Dr. Ramesh Kumar, STO, PPV&FRA, New Delhi
56.	Dr. Daulat Singh, PVE, PPV&FRA, New Delhi