
Comments received from Steering Committee members

Lorenzo Maggioni

On-farm concept meeting, Maccarese, 10 March 2015

The process

- **April 2013** - Task Force nominated to develop a concept for on-farm management and conservation of landraces
- **21 May 2014** – Draft concept sent by TF to Secretariat
- **End July 2014** – Deadline for comments by Steering Committee
- Comments received from Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands and United Kingdom
→ **no consensus for endorsement**
- **September 2014** - ExCo Decision to organize meeting

Bulgaria

Comments related to both concepts (CWR and landraces)

1. Agreement with the concepts
2. Proposed method is clear, simple and easy to implement
3. European Network of unique material for in situ and on-farm conservation is appreciated
4. Ambitious objectives require adequate funding

Czech Republic

1. Both concepts are like “political programmes”
2. Need for an information system that would connect to the ex situ info. system
3. Differences among regions of Europe require different ways to operate → in Czech Republic no on-farm landraces, but conservation could be connected to education in demonstration fields

Finland

- All fine, no comments

Germany-1

1. A proper discussion is missing on **conservation vs. management** (i.e.: how to decide what should be statically conserved and what should be dynamically developed on-farm)
2. **Scope** of on-farm + participatory breeding + adaptation of landraces to climate change **vs.** modern plant breeding/agriculture should be explained and justified → clearly **identify the appropriate niche** for on-farm c/m

Germany-2

2 – Scope

- Is participatory plant breeding a political aim in Europe?
- If yes, for which crops should the approach be used?
- In which way shall the use of on-farm management of landraces for the adaptation to global changes be carried out, e.g. natural selection?
- Is there scientific evidence how far the approaches mentioned in the draft are superior to modern plant breeding?

Germany-3

3. Interface between in situ (CWR) + on-farm landraces M/C and genebanks to be clarified:
 - a. Role of genebanks: regenerate or re-collect?
 - b. Who is responsible for testing viability and integrity of material?
 - c. How is all financed?
4. Doubts about the MAPA concept (there are stakeholders outside of these areas).
5. Location of on-farm c/m should not be relevant (i.e. marketing opportunities)
6. Problems with definitions of different classes of varieties -> unclear and not practical

Germany-4

7. Missing aspects related to legal requirements (e.g. the new seed legislation):
 - a. Access
 - b. Availability
 - c. Knowledge

8. **CANNOT ADOPT THIS DOCUMENT, BUT SUGGEST FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE BASIC ORIENTATION OF THE CONCEPT**

The Netherlands

1. CBD/IT definition of “on-farm conservation” is not concerned with “conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats” but rather to “maintenance and recovery of viable populations of domesticated and cultivated species ...”
2. ECPGR should not deal with ecosystems level, only genetics level (otherwise many more additional stakeholders)
3. Doubts about the concept of MAPAs and the criteria for defining them = many landraces etc. do not require to be linked to (most appropriate) location (unlike CWR)!

CONCEPT CANNOT BE ADOPTED AS SUCH AND MORE FUNDAMENTAL DISCUSSION IS NEEDED

United Kingdom-1

1. Document is very light on supportive evidence
2. Lack of a coherent and balanced overview of the state of play across Europe and issues/regions where special focus is needed are not identified
3. Need to create strategic partnerships and alliances for lobbying and fundraising is not articulated; not sufficient to rely only on ECPGR
4. A roadmap is missing

United Kingdom-2

6. Document is too long and lacking in focus
7. Title is confusing (conservation of what?)
8. Agriculture and mankind wrongly presented as part of nature
9. Examples only related to Italy
10. Collaboration with D&I Network while drafting concept document is not sufficiently evident
11. Interface between in situ/on-farm/ex situ was highlighted; better integration with crop WGs is needed
12. Identification of diversity hotspots is positive (scheme of EU MAPAs). This should be developed into a workplan

United Kingdom-3

13. Missing regional picture of status of development of National Inventories of LRs maintained on-farm; overview of achievements across EU required
14. Too focused on general processes and missing on handling unique and important accessions
15. A required activity initially should be the development of national inventories. Data would allow further objective decisions on MAPAs regarding uniqueness and threat status of material
16. A summary of both formal and informal international strategies and initiatives is recommended
17. Strategy for safety-duplication is not addressed
18. Legal aspects are missing (ABS – Nagoya Protocol - Treaty)

NGO

1. Appreciated the inclusion of home and community gardens within the scope
2. On-farm c/m is an opportunity as an alternative to main crops
3. Role of NGOs is not appropriately captured
4. Role of nurseries and small seed producers is not made explicit
5. Wonders about MAPAs, whether they should necessarily include both CWR and LR and doubts on the concept itself: lot of diversity is conserved independently from location
6. Questioning the concept of preserving the identity of unique material at the expense of increasing the chances for inter-crossing