MEETING MINUTES

Public-Private Partnership for pre-breeding
Steering Committee

Meeting: 3rd Public-Private Partnership for pre-breeding (PPP) Steering Committee (SC) meeting
Purpose: Decide on funding of projects; decide on Rules of Procedures for SC
Date: 14th December 2011
Time: 10.00-14.00
Place: NordGen Alnarp, Sweden

Participants: Country representatives:
Lars Landbo, Pdir, DK (LL) absence notice
Tuula Pehu, MMM, FI (TP)
Thoroddur Sveinsson, LBHI, IS (TS)
Magne Gullord, LMD, NO (MG)
Anders Nilsson, SLU, SE (AN) (SC chair)

Plant breeding entities representatives:
Idun Christie, Graminor, NO (IC)
Kurt Hjortsholm, Sejet, DK (KH)
Annette Olesen, Lantmännen, SE (AO)
Marja Jalli, MTT, FI (MJ)

Nordic Academia representative:
Roland von Bothmer, RvB, SLU, SE (RvB)

Secretariate:
Árni Bragasson, NordGen (AB)
Morten Rasmussen, NordGen (MR)

Absence notice: Lars Landbo

Minutes: Morten Rasmussen

CC: Mads Randbøll Wolf, NCM, Eva Jorup Engström (EJE)

Agenda:
1 Opening of meeting AN
2 Agenda, (justeringsperson) AN
3 Minutes from last meeting AN
4 Presentation of compiled draft proposal for Rules of Procedures MR Information
5 Rules of procedures for SC AN Decision
6 Received external evaluation & Compiled SC evaluation MR Information
7 SC Evaluation of proposals AN Decision
8 Status on project funding from the different Nordic countries: Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Denmark and Finland EJE + Information Country representatives
9 Possible remnant funds after 2013 AN Discussion
10 Securing project material & information Material in Transition (MiT Note) MR Information
11 Contract and reporting procedures MR Discussion
(Draft general principles presented for comments)
Internet based communication platform for PPP MR/MF Information

(Draft presented at the meeting)

Next meeting, time, place:

Preliminary proposals: Telephone meeting 18th, 20th, 23rd, 24th, 25th or 26th January, from 13.00-14.00 pm.

Any other business

i. Note from Kurt Hjortsholm on pre-breeding definition (circulated paper)

Circulated documents:

25 Meeting Minutes 2nd meeting 7th Nov. 2011
26 PPP_ProjectEvaluationFormula_111107_Ryegrass.
27 PPP_ProjectEvaluationFormula_111107_Barley.
28 PPP_ProjectEvaluationFormula_111107_Apple.
29 PPP pre breeding Lolium-final(1).pdf
30 External evaluation of PPP project proposals for scientific quality, project evaluation formulas 1, 2 and 3
31 Notes on external evaluation of PPP project proposal for scientific quality, 1, 2 and 3
32 Draft agenda PPP SC 3rd meeting, 14th Dec. 2011
33 Note from Syngenta re. future for PPP

Attached documents:

34 PPP_ProjectEvaluationCompiled_111207
35 PPP_ProjectEvaluationNotes_111207
36 NMR Reseräkning-2011 (travel cost reimbursement formular)
37 PPP SC member list 111107
38 PPP_SCRulesOfProcedures_111206_draft5
39 Material In Transition APPENDIX IX of report Adopted2008
40 PPP_Item10_InformationNote_111214
41 PPP_Item11_Decision_111214_draft1

Circulated at the meeting:

42 Note form Kurt Hjortsholm: Præforædlining.

Minutes:

1 Opening of meeting AN

AN opened the meeting at 10.30.

2 Agenda, “adjustment person” AN

Item 6 and 7 was exchanged with item 3 and 4. KH requested a topic for AOB on definition of the concept pre-breeding, paper was circulated. Agenda was accepted. Magne Gullord was elected for “adjustment person”.

3 Minutes from last meeting AN

Minutes from last meeting was accepted.

4 Presentation of compiled draft proposal for
MR presented compiled latest draft for Rules of Procedure. LL requested to include a paragraph on “Conflict of interests”, a text suggested by NMR lawyers was proposed.

5 Rules of procedures for SC

A preliminary text for a paragraph on “Conflict of interest” was proposed with additional explanatory comments. The text is to be checked by NMR lawyers and a new version circulated to SC for final decision at next SC meeting.

6 Received external evaluation & Compiled SC evaluation

It was decided to discuss each project proposal at a time. MR would give introductory comments, and SC would discuss and take decision.

7 SC Evaluation of proposals

Project proposal 1, Apple

*IC did not participate in discussions neither in funding decisions as Graminor takes part in the proposed project.*

MR presented compiled evaluation of project proposal 1. No comments on budget details. SC discussed the proposal. It was commonly agreed that the proposal was good, clear and well made.

RvB commented that including training and education - as recommended by external evaluation - should be suggested as a component for future work. This was commonly agreed amongst the SC members. RvB and AN further welcomed the opening for participation from the Baltic states.

TP requested clarification of MTT’s role in the project.

MJ explained that further details would be provided in the internal Finnish funding process.

SC decided unanimously to fund project proposal 1, Apple

Project proposal 2, Barley

MR presented compiled evaluation of project proposal 1. The proposal is somewhat less developed, and clear overview could be improved as budget details. SC discussed the proposal. It was commonly agreed that the topic raised was very important, and that the proposed collaboration shows good confidence between participants. However mode budget details would be required, and more precise wording and project plans would be preferred.

TS stated that LBHI may be interested in further participation.

RvB answered that especially Iceland had an opportunity to include a Ph.D. into this project, and hence introduce the educational aspects as well.

MJ proposed to strengthen and define the Nordic aspects in the application, to show which part of the project that makes the groups stronger as such.

AO explained that the project should be considered as a starting point for further collaboration and that this could be clarified.

KH stressed that the breeding companies have been clear and agreed to fund their part on the topics raised, if severe changes to the substance of the project should be requested, participants may not wish to continue.

IC agreed and stressed that the PPP process is still fragile.
RvB suggested that SC should give recommendations to the applicants in order to resubmit a revised proposal, stating that the topic and problems addressed are of high importance.

AN stressed that the project is highly relevant for the breeding community, however if there are weakness in the proposal, therefore he proposed that decision on funding should be postponed, giving the applicants all possibilities to improve the application. This was not to be understood as any negative comment, however further clarification is needed.

IC, AO and KH did not participate in funding decision as all takes part in the proposed project.

SC acknowledged the importance of the topic addressed in the application for the breeding community, and the high relevance of the project.

SC decided to postpone decision on funding of project proposal 2, Barley. Secretariat was requested to compile comments, adjust with SC chair, and request applicants to resubmit a complemented proposal before 15th February 2012. Funding decision will be taken at next PPP SC meeting shortly after this.

**Project Proposal 3, Ryegrass**

MR presented compiled evaluation of project proposal 3, and remembered the SC that a version of the application signed by all partners was distributed after deadline. No further comments to content or budget.

SC discussed the proposal. It was commonly agreed that the proposal was good and well described.

AN noted the remarks from external evaluation regarding WP 5.

IC informed that the breeders have had objections to this comment. AO and TS supported this point of view.

TP expressed that it was a good proposal, well founded with strong links.

IC and AO did not participate in funding decision as they take part in the proposed project.

AN suggested to support the proposal as is. This was unanimously agreed

**General comments to all project proposals:**

RvB recommended including topics of training and education for later calls. This was commonly agreed amongst the SC members. MR suggested as this is not explicitly mentioned in the Agreement (Avtal) that this may even be discussed with the funding structures for the PPP at a later stage.

AN and RvB expressed hopes for a stronger integration of collaboration partners outside the Nordic Region, especially the Baltic states, in future calls.

KH, supported by RvB, expressed interest in having the WP coordinators present at the SC meeting to present their proposal in future calls.

It was decided that a consortium agreement from each of the 3 project groups should be requested as of February 25th, this was including proposal 2 on barley.

- **Break for lunch from 12.40-13.20** -
MR informed that the project funding money has been received from SE (100%) and Norway (90%, 10% pending until 2012 when Rules of Procedures are finalized). The funding from Iceland has been requested, and is expected to arrive before January. Funding from DK is still in process of clarification; however this is expected to be solved.

TP informed that the Finnish funding is in process for 2012. 70.000€ are planned to be applicable in the Nordic system and further 70.000 € applicable only in Finland. The total Finnish contribution is unchanged.

IC asked concerning the Estonian funding. MR explained that NordGen was informed that the Estonian funding is a national funding, also a 50%/50% funding, targeted at collaborating with the PPP projects of the Nordic countries. Estonian project work would hence be funded from this source.

It was decided that renewed total funding sheet should be provided from the secretariat to the SC.

AN informed that if the total PPP frame had not yet applied app. 3,5 mill DKK. These funds could either be suggested to be applied in a new call, to extend funding for existing projects, or to be put aside for activities in 2014.

It was agreed to put aside the remnant funding for activities in 2014, clarifying this with the individual ministries.

MR presented the “Material in Transition” category for seeds and information as explained in the distributed material, and suggested to propose project partners to secure material and information developed in the projects at NordGen applying this system.

SC agreed that this should be intended.

MR presented the distributed decision Item on general principles.

SC would like to decide on possible revised project plans, and postpone reporting to end of January, this including preliminary economical reporting. SC accepted the general principles with these changes.
AN asked when project contracts could be expected ready. MR suggested to keep these as simple as possible, applying the presented models from SLF as a model, having one page and the application as a reference document.

This was accepted by SC.

MR mentioned that consortium agreements for each project should be developed, including agreements on specific rights and obligations as to developed material and information, before a contract could be signed. Formats of consortium agreements would be decided by each individual project group.

SC decided that consortium agreements from each project should be requested to be received in due time for distribution to SC before next meeting

Deadline for consortium agreements 25th of February was decided under Item 7.

12 Internet based communication platform for PPP  MR/MF Information
(Draft presented at the meeting)

Jonas Nordling gave a very short introduction to Google applications and suggested this as a platform for communication for the SC, providing links for external interest, a restricted area for SC members and storing/sharing internal documents. The system requires that SC members create a Google account, however own e-mail addresses can be applied.

SC expressed positive interest, and NordGen will continue the process, keeping the dialogue with SC.

13 Next meeting, time, place:
8th March at NordGen, Alnarp from 10.00 – 14.00

14 Any other business
   a. Note on Pre-Breeding, Kurt Hjortsholm, joint understanding

KH explained the distributed note, and his concerns regarding the need for a common, understanding of the concept of pre-breeding. All traits that cannot immediately be introduced into breeding programs belongs to the pre-breeding scope, this also includes technology and methodology. It must be regarded always a dynamic, evolving system.

RvB and AN commented that the same understanding is reflected in the report on Nordic plant breeding.

MJ and TP commented that pre-breeding always should be understood broadly.

The SC supported KH’s wording.

The meeting was closed at 14.05.
Morten Rasmussen

Adjustment

Magne Gullord