



Proposed Plant Variety Rights Regulations: Summary of Submissions, Plant Variety Rights Technical Focus Group Meeting Notes and Hui Notes

1. Consultation on the *Review of the Plant Variety Rights Act 1987: Proposed Regulations* (the **Consultation Paper**) ran from 14 July 2021 to 1 September 2021 and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (**MBIE**) received 17 written submissions. Respondents included industry (including plant breeders and growers), Māori (including iwi) and the legal sector. A high-level summary of the submissions received is provided below.
2. As well as receiving written submissions, MBIE discussed the Consultation Paper at the Plant Variety Rights (**PVR**) Technical Focus Group meeting in Christchurch on 11 August 2021 and held a virtual hui on 25 August 2021 to discuss the list of non-indigenous species of significance. Notes from the PVR Technical Focus Group meeting and hui on non-indigenous species of significance are also provided at the end of this document.

Summary of submissions on the *Review of the Plant Variety Rights Act 1987: Proposed Regulations*

Options for the Regulations

3. New regulations are required to implement the provisions in the Plant Variety Rights Bill (the **PVR Bill**). The proposed options for developing these regulations, as stated in the Consultation Paper, are:
 - i. Draft a new set of regulations from scratch without reference to regulations developed for other legislation including other legislation administered by the Intellectual Property Office of New Zealand (**IPONZ**)
 - ii. Base the regulations, as far as possible, on relevant provisions of regulations developed for other legislation administered by IPONZ, in particular the Patents Regulations 2014 (the **Patents Regulations**). [*Preferred Option*]

There was general support for the preferred option

4. Submitters generally agreed with the preferred option of adapting relevant regulations developed for other legislation administered by IPONZ where possible. However, in doing so, a few submitters emphasised the need to ensure these are catered to plant specific requirements and take into account the nature of PVRs.
5. One submitter disagreed with this approach because the physical examination of living organisms is different to the desktop examination of patents.

Adapted Patents Regulations

6. Part 3 of the Consultation Paper provided an outline of the proposed new regulations. Where adapting provisions from the Patents Regulations was proposed, the relevant regulations were indicated.

The majority of respondents supported the proposed outline

7. The majority of submitters generally supported the outline of regulations to be adapted from the Patents Regulations set out in the Consultation Paper.

Several submitters made comments on specific proposed regulations

8. A number of submitters commented on specific proposed regulations that they disagreed with, supported or otherwise wished to comment on. For example, one breeder submitted that the restoration provisions are a worthwhile addition for balance and certainty to the regime. Another submitter disagreed with the proposed fee payment method because invoicing delays when filing on PRISMA can result in a loss of priority.
9. Even when considering the same subject matter, the focus of submitter's comments varied. For example, although multiple submitters commented on the requirement for coloured photographs to accompany applications, one submitter stated that the wording needed to clearly cover digital images, another expressed concerns about the accuracy of colour reproduced in digital files and another stated that these should only be required if the plant varieties have traits that are difficult to describe in words.

PVR Specific Regulations

10. The Consultation Paper highlighted aspects of the proposed regulations where there are no direct equivalent provisions in the Patents Regulations. The provisions discussed were those relating to denominations, examination and compulsory licenses.

Denominations

11. A denomination is a unique name that is given to a variety which is used to identify it if a PVR is granted. If the Commissioner objects to the denomination, the applicant must submit a replacement denomination within a period prescribed in the regulations.¹
12. The Consultation Paper presented two viable options for how this might be approached:
 - i. A replacement denomination must be provided within a set period
 - ii. No set time period for submitting the denomination.

Most submitters preferred that there be a set time period to provide a replacement denomination

13. The majority of submitters supported option (i), that alternate denominations must be submitted within a set period, with some emphasising this is important for certainty.
14. Only one submitter expressly supported option (ii), whilst a few others posed alternative or tweaked approaches. For example, a breeder suggested that there be no time limit while the application is under examination, but there should be one if all other criteria for grant is met.

Submitters that favoured option (i) considered that the set time period should be extendable but had varied opinions on the grounds for extensions and how long these should be

15. Submitters that supported a prescribed period for providing a replacement denomination considered that this time period should be extendable.

¹ Note that amendments to the PVR Bill following select committee consideration now require that the initial denomination be provided within the prescribed time after the application is made (rather than at the time of application) and these time periods will apply to both situations.

16. Whilst some submitters supported MBIE's approach of a three month period to respond, that is extendable by one month if needed, many put forth alternative timeframes including three month extensions, maximum 12 month extensions and even the ability for applicant's to submit their own upper limits when requesting an extension.
17. There were also mixed views on the grounds for an extension. A legal submitter suggested that the approach in reg 161(a) of the Patents Regulations be followed, i.e. a one month extension if it is reasonable in the circumstance, and longer extensions in exceptional circumstances. This contrasted with a submission from a breeder, which stated that this period should only be extendable in 'exceptional circumstances'.

Examination

18. Once a PVR application is made, the application is examined to determine whether or not the variety described meets the criteria for grant of a PVR. The Consultation Paper explored what regulations may be required for the examination process, specifically:
 - i. Time limits for:
 - providing information and propagating material for examination
 - paying trial and examination fees.
 - ii. Requirements surrounding growing trials where:
 - growing trials are conducted by persons other than the Commissioner and the trials must be conducted under conditions approved in writing by the Commissioner
 - two or more overseas test reports are available.

a) Time limits for providing information and propagating material for examination

19. The Commissioner may require additional information from the applicant in order to complete examination and may require the applicant to provide propagating material of the candidate variety. Propagating material may also be requested by the Commissioner for reference collections.

Most submitters supported setting time limits in principle

20. Most submitters who commented on this issue supported the principle of setting time limits for the supply of information and propagating material. Many submitters also agreed that there should be allowance for extensions.

Multiple submitters disagreed with specific time limits proposed

21. Multiple submitters disagreed with at least one of the proposed timeframes. These submitters focused primarily on the timeframes for providing propagating material.
22. In particular, some submitters considered that the initial 12 month period for providing propagating material would not be enough in certain circumstances, requiring a larger initial time period or more time in the form of extensions. Such circumstances included pest issues, climate issues or difficulty importing plants from overseas.
23. A legal submitter also suggested that the Commissioner should have the power to set deadlines and extensions of up to 24 months for propagating material in order to reduce the compliance burden on applicants in certain circumstances.

b) Time limits for paying trial and examination fees

24. Clause 48 of the PVR Bill requires prescribed fees to be paid within a prescribed period after the Commissioner requests payment. In the Consultation Paper, MBIE proposed that the prescribed period for paying the fees be two months and that extensions should only be available if the Commissioner is satisfied that there are genuine and exceptional circumstances justifying the extension.

Most submitters considered that a two month period for paying fees was reasonable

25. The majority of submitters considered that a two month period, following a request for payment, would be a sufficient and reasonable time to pay these fees.
26. One submitter disagreed with the proposed period and said that it should be longer, or extensions should be easier to obtain, emphasising that overseas applicants have long chains of communication which can cause delays.

Submitters generally supported that the prescribed period should only be extendible under genuine and exceptional circumstances

27. Submitters generally supported that the prescribed period should only be extendible under genuine and exceptional circumstances, but some did qualify this support. For example, one submitter stated that the grounds for an extension should not be more onerous than the restoration grounds and another stated that the length of time available for an extension should not be set and, instead, the applicant should submit an upper limit with reasons.
28. A legal submitter expressed concerns that 'genuine and exceptional circumstances' could be a high threshold to meet if it is held to mean out of the ordinary. In particular, they stated this should clearly cover situations where plant material is held up due to quarantine issues.

c) Requirements surrounding growing trials

29. The PVR Bill requires that a PVR cannot be granted unless there has been a growing trial. The Consultation Paper proposes that the regulations empower the Commissioner to set the conditions of a growing trial and, where the Commissioner chooses to rely on a growing trial conducted by an overseas authority and two more such reports are available, the Commissioner should determine which report to rely on.

Most submitters agreed that the Commissioner should set the conditions of a growing trial

30. The majority of submitters agreed that the Commissioner should set the conditions of a growing trial, but a few submitters proposed alternatives to this approach.
31. For example, one Māori submitter suggested that there should be agreement between the Commissioner, the applicant and, where relevant, the appropriate kaitiaki. Another submitter proposed that the carrying out of, assessment of, and reporting of, comparative growth trials should be done by qualified persons certified by MBIE, rather than MBIE itself.

Some submitters commented on the conditions proposed by MBIE and suggested other conditions

32. Several submitters expressed concerns about propagating material requirements, especially for comparator and reference varieties as these are often beyond the applicant's control. One submitter suggested that, if issues arose, these comparators should be excluded and others should be found or the comparison should be done 'on paper'.
33. Another submitter expressed concerns around confidentiality, security and the prevention of any unauthorised use or propagation of comparator varieties, suggesting that those who undertake growing trials must be bound by related conditions imposed by the PVR owner.

34. Outside of the conditions proposed, some submitters stated that there should be consultation with the applicant when setting conditions and some allowance for flexibility in this process. Two Māori submitters expressed that, where kaitiaki relationships exist, there should be a requirement to seek input from the relevant kaitiaki.

Most submitters agreed that the Commissioner should choose the report to rely on

35. Most submitters agreed with the proposed approach that the Commissioner should determine which overseas report to rely on where two or more reports are available. That said, many of these submitters qualified this support by emphasising the need for certain input and considerations when the Commissioner is making this decision.
36. For example, there were suggestions that there should be clear guidelines or criteria for deciding which report to use, scope for consultation with the applicant on which report should be used and a resolution process if an applicant disagrees.

Compulsory licenses

37. The PVR Bill provides that both the applicant for a compulsory licence and the PVR owner must be given an opportunity to be heard and leaves the procedure to the regulations. In the Consultation Paper, MBIE proposed that these regulations be based on the trade mark opposition procedure in the Trade Marks Act 2002, which has specific time limits imposed and processes to be followed.

Most submitters supported the proposed procedure for dealing with compulsory license applications

38. Most submitters generally agreed with the approach taken and the procedure specified. However, two submitters that disagreed with this approach argued that compulsory licence applications differ substantially from trade mark oppositions and that the patent opposition procedure would be more suitable.

A few submitters expressed concerns with the proposed procedure and suggested changes

39. Although there was general support for the proposed procedure, some submitters did express concerns or made suggestions for improvement.
40. For example, two submitters expressed concerns about frivolous applications, stating that the current fees needed to be higher to deter such applications. One of these submitters also emphasised that there needs to be a high bar for allowing an application to be filed.
41. Some submitters also raised concerns that the time periods set out for each stage (two months, extendible by up to three months) were not long enough, given the complexity of the information that might need to be supplied. On the other hand, one submitter argued that the proposed three month extension time period was too long as it would drag out proceedings.

Other Issues

Objections before grant

42. Section 6 of the Plant Variety Rights Act 1987 (the **PVR Act**) provides that any person can make objections in relation to a PVR application. However, neither the PVR Act nor regulations set out any procedure if an objection is made and the only time frame specified is for objections to the denomination.
43. In the Consultation Paper MBIE proposed that the PVR Act and regulations provide for a procedure and that this be based on the patents opposition procedure.

Most submitters supported the proposed procedure for dealing with objections before grant

44. There was general support for the proposed procedure, with submitters commenting that this is appropriate for PVR grants and contributes to the balance and certainty users of the PVR system are seeking. A submitter also affirmed that the requirement for 'a reasonable opportunity to be heard' had led to 'gaming of the system' by objectors.

A few submitters disagreed with the procedure proposed and suggested alternatives

45. A legal submitter expressed concerns with the proposed procedure on the basis that a post-acceptance opposition procedure may be more appropriate in some circumstances. In particular, applicants may incur significant costs defending an opposition for an application that is nevertheless refused on the basis of growing trial results.
46. One submitter disagreed on the basis that all time periods should be three months for consistency with the regulations and another suggested that the proposed procedure should only begin if the objector can establish the requirements of an objection are met.

Requests for propagating material or information from PVR owners

47. Clause 69 of the PVR Bill gives the Commissioner the power to request information or propagating material under certain circumstances. If the PVR owner² fails to provide the information or material within the prescribed period, without reasonable excuse, the Commissioner may cancel the PVR. The Consultation Paper set out two options for providing this information and material:
- iii. Set a minimum time period that must be specified by the Commissioner, but no upper limit
 - iv. Set a minimum and a maximum time period for complying with the Commissioner.
48. MBIE suggested a minimum time period of one month from the date of the request and a maximum time period of 12 months. Extensions were seen as unnecessary given that clause 69(4) prevents cancellation if there is a 'reasonable excuse' for not meeting timeframes.

Several submitters expressed concerns about the time periods proposed, particularly in relation to propagating material

49. Several submitters expressed concerns about the proposed time periods, particularly those for providing propagating material relating to a granted PVR. Although one submitter stated that the proposed minimum time period of three months may be reasonable in some circumstances (e.g. where this was readily available), many submitters stated that the 12 month maximum time period was too short.
50. Submitters were particularly concerned with the difficulty obtaining and providing propagating material in some circumstances. Reasons for delay identified included difficulty obtaining material from overseas, long propagation periods for certain plants, commercial factors, seasonal variations, bad weather and a lack of surplus material. One submitter also argued that the time periods under this clause should be consistent with the time periods for providing propagating material for examination.
51. By contrast, one grower representative agreed with the proposed maximum time period on the basis it is vital for this process to be expedient so decisions are also made expediently.

² Note that amendments to the PVR Bill following select committee consideration clarify that clause 69 also applies to PVR applicants (other than the applicant to whom the application under consideration relates), and that if that applicant fails to respond to the request, the application lapses.

The majority of submitters disagreed that the proposed time periods should not be extendible

52. Most submitters disagreed that the proposed time periods should not be extendible, particularly for propagating material. Submitters reiterated that they were concerned about the difficulty in obtaining propagating material and the resulting delays that this may cause.
53. A legal submitter argued the Commissioner should be able to accept a reasonable excuse from the PVR holder or issue an extension depending on the circumstances, emphasising the penalty for failure to comply (losing the right) is too high for a non-extendible deadline.
54. A breeder submitter also expressed it would be burdensome for PVR owners if they had to defend that they had 'a reasonable excuse' in each case, which also increases uncertainty.

Non-indigenous species of significance

55. The Consultation Paper raised the issue of when the regulations listing non-indigenous species of significance should be made. These could either enter into force with the Bill's non-Treaty provisions, or be left until the Treaty provisions come into force. The Consultation Paper also had an open ended question asking for comments on the proposed list.

There were mixed views on when the regulations listing non-indigenous species of significance should enter into force

56. Submitters had mixed opinions on when the regulations listing non-indigenous species of significance should enter into force.
57. A few submitters supported these regulations coming into force at the same time as the Treaty provisions in the Bill. One Māori submitter believed this would allow more time to consult with the relevant parties to ensure the list is adequate. Another submitter said this would mean drafting amendments or finessing criteria and provisions in either the Bill or supporting regulations could be dealt with consistently and contemporaneously.
58. Several other submitters said that these need to come into effect at the same time as the other components of the regulations associated with the Bill. Two Māori submitters who held this view both expressed concerns that there could be a multitude of applications filed in the time before the Treaty provisions come into force. A couple of submitters with this view also expressed that this approach would provide for more certainty.
59. One submitter proposed an alternative approach where these should enter into force after the Treaty provisions to enable further engagement with iwi and hāpu on the species they consider culturally significant.

Several submitters commented on the list of non-indigenous species of significance

60. Submitters representing Māori had concerns over the proposed list. One such submitter considered more consultation and analysis was needed to ensure the list accurately reflects what all iwi consider 'taonga species'. Two submitters did not support the list being exhaustive and expressed that, if this were to remain, the current definition should be broadened beyond species that arrived on the migrating waka.
61. On the other hand, non-Māori submitters, particularly those in the industry, tended to support a closed list for clarity and certainty.
62. Some submitters also commented on the entries in the list. One submitter suggested the potato orchid species '*gastrodia cunninghamii*' should be listed as an indigenous species, as it is unlikely to have been introduced to New Zealand on migrating waka. A few submitters also identified three scientific names on the list that were spelt incorrectly, namely, '*artocarpus altilis*', '*colocasia esculenta*' and '*cordyline fruticosa*'.

PVR Technical Focus Group Meeting Notes (11/08/2021)

Attendees

- 63. *MBIE*: Aidan Burch, Warren Hassett and Chris Barnaby.
- 64. *External*: see Table A below.

General points raised

- 65. Participants were concerned at the revised timing of the implementation of the regime and the lack of communication about this. They emphasised the implications this has for people preparing for changes to the regime, including overseas breeders.
- 66. Participants questioned what our Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership trading partners know about the delay to implementation of the regime.
- 67. Participants sought a commitment from MBIE that there would be an opportunity to comment on a draft of the regulations. This was considered particularly important if changes to the Bill following select committee affect the proposed regulations.
- 68. A number of participants also commented that they don't appear to be getting the pānui (despite still be 'active' subscribers on the PVR database).
- 69. MBIE has committed to:
 - Send round a clear communication updating all stakeholders on the revised timing of the implementation of the regime
 - Discuss the delay further with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and get their feedback on communicating this delay to our trading partners
 - Consult on a draft of the regulations, subject to Ministerial agreement, which we do not imagine being withheld
 - Send information about the upcoming hui on 25 August 2021 on the 'non-indigenous species of significance' to the Technical Focus Group participants
 - Extend the closing date for submissions on the regulations Consultation Paper to 1 September 2021 to accommodate the hui on 25 August 2021
 - Discuss using the PVR Journal and/or other IPONZ communication channels to share information (we note that this does already happen and IPONZ will circulate our pānui through their networks, though we will check with them to ensure this is working as intended).

Specific issues raised in relation to the regulations

Denominations

- 70. It was noted that the Consultation Paper assumes the PVR Bill will retain the provision requiring a denomination with an application, as it only discusses timelines in relation to resubmission of a denomination.

Time limits for paying trial and examination fees

- 71. Regarding paragraph 72 of the Consultation Paper, we were asked to consider how the proposal to extend the period 'in exceptional circumstances' interacts with the restoration provisions and were pointed to the patents regime.

Compulsory licences

72. As these provisions are being based on the trade marks regulations, we were asked whether the trade marks process worked in the case of the hops applications. It was noted that a significant amount of work went into these applications and the process was burdensome. We were therefore asked if this can be streamlined.
73. It was noted that the initial two month counter statement period is too short and there may be considerable consultation required to prepare this. Related to this, it was asked whether licensees should also be able to provide counter statements too as they have significant interest in the PVR and any compulsory licence application that may be made in relation to it.
74. It was also asked if we had considered a 'split hearing' model in which the questions of (i) whether a compulsory licence should be granted, and (ii) if so, what the conditions should be, were considered separately.
- MBIE responded that we considered the IPONZ hearings process flexible enough that this was not necessary.
75. A question was also raised about fees for compulsory licences which was referred to the PVR fees review for consideration.

Requests for propagating material from PVR owners

76. With regard to paragraph 120, concern was raised that only providing extensions to the prescribed period if there is a 'reasonable excuse' may not accommodate all the situations in which there is a delay outside of the control of the PVR owner.

Time limits for providing propagating material for examination

77. With regard to paragraph 46, clarification was sought that this (and the corresponding clause in the PVR Bill) only referred to material that is the subject of the application.
- MBIE confirmed that this was the intent.

Non-indigenous species of significance

78. We were asked what the process was for adding elements to the list and whether Karaitiana could share their research.

Requirements surrounding growing trials

79. It was noted that there is an expectation that applicants have the opportunity to have a conversation with the PVR Office ahead of decisions being made about growing trials.
- The Plant Variety Rights Office (**PVRO**) confirmed that this is what happens anyway and there is nothing that would prevent this occurring in the new regime.

Table A: PVR Technical Focus Group Meeting Attendees

Forename	Surname	Organisation
Helen	Bellchambers	<i>AJ Park Intellectual Property</i>
Emma	Brown	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Wendy	Cashmore	<i>Plant IP Partners Limited</i>
Thomas	Chin	<i>NZ Plant Breeding & Research Association</i>
Josie	Dawber	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Heidi	Jade	<i>Zespri Group Limited</i>
Joy	Lin	<i>AgResearch Ltd</i>
Andrew	Mackenzie	<i>Plant IP Partners Limited</i>
Luke	Merson	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Morgan	Rogers	<i>T&G Global Limited</i>
Catherine	Snelling	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Jo	Stephens	<i>Gourmet</i>
Louisa	van den Berg	<i>BLOOMZ New Zealand Ltd</i>
Andy	Warren	<i>BLOOMZ New Zealand Ltd</i>
Malcolm	Woolmore	<i>Kiwiflora</i>

Non-Indigenous Species of Significance Hui Notes (25/08/2021)

Attendees

80. *MBIE*: Aidan Burch, Chris Barnaby, Warren Hassett, Maria Bialostocki and Shweta Sharma.
81. *External*: see Table B below.

Purpose

82. The focus of the hui was on the proposed list of 'non-indigenous species of significance' set out in the Consultation Paper. Alongside indigenous species, PVR applications for varieties derived from this group will also have to be considered by the Maori Plant Varieties Committee.
83. The PVR Bill defines these as species that came to New Zealand on the migrating waka, and requires them to be listed in regulations. The proposed list is based on research carried out by Karaitiana Taiuru.

The Hui

84. Following a karakia and introduction, Karaitiana Taiuru gave an introduction to his research.
85. Chris Barnaby (head of the PVR Office) made some comments on the list. He noted that some had PVRs in the past, but kumara is the only species with current PVRs.
86. Comments and questions from Māori attendees in the discussion that followed include:
 - How do we define 'taonga'? There are other crops that could also be considered taonga that have arrived since the waka.
 - A general approach to 'taonga' is needed. What is taonga is up to iwi/hapū/whanau to determine. Following Wai 262, they are the ones who will provide the evidence of the kaitiaki relationship.
 - Karaitiana's focus on whakapapa as a key determinant for which species are taonga was acknowledged.
 - The Māori potato is clearly taonga and so a way needs to be found of including this. (MBIE comment: the challenge here is the lack of botanical uniqueness, they are still an example of '*solanum tuberosum*'. Risk that all potatoes have to go through the Māori Plant Varieties Committee.)
 - If there is consensus that Māori potatoes qualify as a species of significance, then this opens up the definition to a much wider group of plants than those that came on the migrating waka.
 - Opposed to a list of what's in (and, therefore, out). While this doesn't give comfort to breeders it seems the best option to be consistent with the rights of indigenous peoples being protected rather than not being protected because their plants of significance didn't make the list in time. If you think the PVR regime/Bill isn't capable of handling the issues then perhaps the Crown should park the regime and the Government put more resource into addressing the issue to give everyone the necessary certainty.
 - Need to think back to Wai 262 and the need to acknowledge kaitiaki relationships with taonga species.
 - These issues demonstrate the limitations of this legislation. What is needed is a new approach to taonga species in the round.

87. Key comments and questions from plant breeders in the discussion that followed include:

- Will new varieties of plants that result from breeding activities also be considered taonga?
- Main concern is around providing certainty for breeders. Could something become 'taonga' in the future?
- Concerned that a wider group of plants could be considered taonga in the future.
- If new species were to be added to the list, there would have to be criteria for this and consultation would be necessary.
- Does not agree with an option to add new species to this list. The list needs to be settled now.

Table B: Non-Indigenous Species of Significance Hui Attendees

Forename	Surname	Organisation
Keith	Armstrong	<i>Global Oats Limited</i>
Emma	Brown	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Manu	Caddie	<i>Rua Bioscience</i>
Sydney	Clarke	<i>Tairawhiti Pharmaceuticals Ltd</i>
Heidi	Dungey	<i>Scion</i>
Paula	Fore	
Rio	Greening	<i>R&D FARMS</i>
Shannon	Harnett	<i>Nuffield</i>
Tony	Hendrikse	<i>Eurogrow Potatoes</i>
Kathryn	Hurr	<i>New Zealand Plant Producers Inc.</i>
Gary	Jones	<i>NZ Apples & Pears Inc.</i>
Tui	Kaumoana	<i>UniServices</i>
Donna	Kerridge	<i>Kahui Rongoā</i>
Sally	King	
Riki	Kotua	<i>Wakatū Incorporation</i>
Toni	Love	
Bridgette	McLellan	<i>Delegation of the European Union to New Zealand</i>
Aroha	Mead	
Luke	Merson	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Donnacha	O Suilleabhain	
Nate	Parker	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Maanu	Paul	<i>ONZM JP</i>
Ana	Penteado	<i>The University of Notre Dame, Sydney</i>
Morgan	Rogers	<i>T&G Global Limited</i>
Jane	Ruka	<i>Waitaha Executive Grandmothers Council</i>
Catherine	Snelling	<i>The New Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited</i>
Karaitiana	Taiuru	
Nikki	Templeton	<i>AJ Park Intellectual Property</i>
John	Tiatoa	<i>Wenua Rangatira</i>
Lynell	Tuffery Huria	<i>Raukura IP Limited</i>
Louisa	van den Berg	<i>BLOOMZ New Zealand Ltd</i>
Andy	Warren	<i>BLOOMZ New Zealand Ltd</i>
Kaahu	White	<i>Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu</i>
Rachel	Witana	