



**ISF WORLD SEED CONGRESS  
RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL  
26 – 28 JUNE 2012**

**Contents**

OPENING CEREMONY .....	2
Report of the Open Meeting of the Breeders Committee .....	7
Report of the Open Meeting of the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee .....	11
Report of the Open Meeting of the Phytosanitary Committee .....	14
Report of the Meeting of the Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Section.....	16
Report of the Meeting of the Field Crops Section .....	21
Report of the Meeting of the Forage and Turf Crops Section .....	26
Report of the Meeting of the Seed Treatment and Environment Committee .....	28
ISF GENERAL ASSEMBLY .....	31
28th ISF Golf Championship .....	37
Host Countries of Future Congresses .....	37
Countries represented, Number of Delegates and (Accompanying Persons) .....	37
ISF BODIES AND PERSONALITIES 2012-2013 .....	38
Board of Directors.....	38
MEMBERS OF SECTION BOARDS .....	40
Field Crops Section .....	40
Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Section.....	40
Forage and Turf Crops Section.....	40
MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES .....	41
Breeders.....	41
Trade and Arbitration Rules .....	41
Phytosanitary.....	41
Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com) .....	41
MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/SUBSECTION .....	42
Sustainable Agriculture.....	42
Intellectual Property .....	42
Sugar and Fodder Beet Subsection .....	42
LIST OF PRESENTATIONS MADE DURING THE RIO CONGRESS .....	43
LIST OF DOCUMENTS ADOPTED DURING THE RIO CONGRESS .....	44
Adopted by the General Assembly.....	44
Adopted by the Vegetable & Ornamental Crops Section.....	44
Adopted by the Field Crops Section.....	44
STATISTICS .....	45

## OPENING CEREMONY

Windsor Barra Hotel & Convention Centre

Tuesday, 26 June 2012

---

- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies, **Ms. Renata Jabali**, welcomed the participants and introduced a group of musicians and dancers from the Samba School.
- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies gave the floor to **Mr. Ywao Miyamoto**, Chairman of the National Organizing Committee:

“Distinguished authorities that honour us with their presence;

Companions of the seed segment;

ISF members, family, staff and friends;

Welcome to Rio de Janeiro, ISF World Seed Congress!

Man’s long journey, through the face of the earth, has been marked by an impressive evolution. That now, in the beginning of this millennium, reaches a most unusual speed.

Besides being witnesses, we are today the actors ourselves in a changing world. Technology is expanding vertiginously, influencing all areas of knowledge, and improving the quality of our lives.

In this changing world, where do we identify the beginning of it all?

The seed is the beginning, since food is the primary base of man, and his primary source of health.

In the vegetable world morphology: the seed is the structure included in the fruit that leads to the embryo therefore the keeper of life, and the assuring factor of its renewal.

In the farming activity: the seed is the mother of inputs. It is unique, with characteristics adapted to the diversity of each region.

It is the origin of changes, with the power of assuring the quality of food, its best taste and its best nutritional value.

In the same way that bricks are essential for the construction of a building, all available resources for agriculture that needs to be competitive are worthless if there are no seeds with a high genetic potential.

Starting from empiricism and the exchange with neighbours up to some years ago, the world managed quickly to produce superior quality seeds, inclusively substituting cultivations susceptible to various diseases, to others more resistant. This represents an inalienable heritage. Being for people and research, and production structures of which, in the world where we live, we cannot do without.

In this reality, agribusiness represents the biblical seed that fell on fertile soil and prospered.

The biggest challenge that the seed sector assumes is to give continuity to the seed producers’ mission, searching the due recognition of their importance by the political agricultural authorities in all countries.

One should highlight that, even though the planted area in the world was kept, production reaches record levels, thanks to the high genetic potential seed that increases productivity.

Therefore, the seed is the key to the treasure, or in other words, it is the bridge to novelty.

Facing the unrelenting globalization, we need to preserve what we have already achieved and at the same time, broaden our actions, since the genetic quality of the seed permits for the productive sector to occupy the forefront position which it holds today, taking from the same piece of soil, so much more than what our ancestors did.

And our children and grandchildren deserve to inherit the fruit of the tireless work of researchers, who have been uncovering nature’s secrets.

Society as a whole should be very proud of the position which agricultural science occupies in the world of agribusiness.

Let us value the sector, let us keep a high level dialog with the government, with the farmers’ representatives, with all sectors connected to seeds.

As president of the National Organizing Committee of this congress, I call for all involved in this activity to definitely set the image of seeds as the soul of agriculture.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate ISF - the International Seed Federation for the realization of this event, which will certainly be a great success, as in previous years.

Congratulations!

I would also like to thank all segments with which we have the opportunity and privilege to work with.

Thank you very much! Enjoy the event.

We are waiting for you with arms wide open!”

- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies gave the floor to **Mr. Geraldo Berger**, ABRASEM:

Mr. Berger made a presentation Seed and Sustainable Agriculture in Brazil. He mentioned that the Brazilian economy had shown a consistent growth and had improved its social indicators in the last 20 years. It was the world’s 6<sup>th</sup> economy. Agriculture was among the most prominent and most promising industries, which created 22% of the Brazilian GDP, and employed 39% of the work force. He highlighted that the share of renewable sources in the Brazilian energy matrix was 45%

which was more than three times the rest of the world. The Brazilian seed market was estimated at 2.62 billion USD. With the strong opportunities from export markets, Brazil was poised for rapid growth. There was 70 million ha of cropland, 125 million ha of pastures and more than 100 million ha of new potential. Corn and soybean were the most important crops. A comparison of the crops grown in 1991 and 2011 showed that there was a large increase in soybean and sugarcane, and small decreases in bean and rice. Grain area and production in MT had both increased, with certified seed, technology and biotech being the main drivers. Applying high yielding biotech varieties showed there was a huge growth potential as compared to open pollinated varieties. With regards to vegetables it was Asia leading the growth curve, with South America lagging far behind.

- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies introduced a group of male and female athletes, who made a demonstration of **Capoeira**, a form of Brazilian martial art that combines elements of dance and music.
- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies gave the floor to **Mr. Truels Damsgaard**, President of ISF.

“Ladies and gentlemen,

Welcome to Brazil, welcome to Rio de Janeiro and welcome to the ISF Congress 2012. I'm sure we will have some busy and exiting days, and possibly nights; in the various sessions; on the trading floor and at the designated watering holes throughout the city of Rio.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the organizing committee for all the hours put into the arrangements. Especially I would like to thank Mr. Ywao Miyamoto, the chairman of the organizing committee, for a job well done. During the course of preparation we had to change the dates of the ISF congress as the dates first agreed coincided with the 2012 Rio +20 Summit. Turning around a big event like the ISF congress puts some pressures on the people involved in its organization, but I feel the organising committee has worked diligently to make it successful.

This year we convene in one of the world's charging economies. Brazil is characterised by large and, in many aspects, well-developed agricultural, mining, manufacturing and service sectors. Today Brazil ranks no. 8 in the world measured in terms of GDP. This development has to a large extent been fuelled by greater presence on the international markets as a major commodity-based exporter. Dominant agricultural commodities include coffee, soybeans, wheat, rice, corn, sugarcane, cocoa and citrus. Brazil also is a major beef exporter and, not to forget, a major player in bio ethanol.

Not only Brazil, but the South American continent as such, offers opportunities for the seed industry. The farming community gets more and more professional pushing up harvest yields due to, among other things, adaptation of better and technologically advanced varieties in a wide range of crops. In the animal sector we also see increasing outputs. It is not for nothing South America has been characterized as the world's food chamber.

But Brazil is much more than this. Brazil has a lot to offer the world, and to underline this, Brazil will host the world soccer championship in 2014 as well as the Olympics in 2016.

As a seeds man with quite a few years in the seed industry; let me just say that nothing compares to natural grass; don't even think of artificial turf. It will only let you down.

It has indeed been a busy year since the 2011 congress in Belfast. Quite a lot of things have happened in the different sections and committees. Allow me to highlight but a few topics and outcomes.

The breeders committee has worked on a revision on the ISF position paper on intellectual property. A lot of efforts have been put into the process. Several hundreds of amendments have been suggested to the document, which underlines how important the matter of IP is to the ISF members and, thus, to the seed industry at large. The final draft document has been circulated to ISF members ahead of the 2012 congress for review and will be up for adoption at the general assembly later this week.

A second beacon of the year has been the work to modernise the ISF Trade Rules. Two years ago the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee, also known as TARC, started the process to review the trade rules and align the rules to generally accepted standards of international commerce. During the review process, several drafts have been passed around for comments by ISF members. It is the goal that ISF congress 2012 will adopt the draft ISF Trade Rules and thereby replacing the current rules adopted in Antalya, Turkey in 2009.

In addition to the work on the trade rules, TARC initiated a process to review the ISF Procedure Rules for Dispute Settlement, also referred to as arbitration rules. So, still no peace for the wicked.

Finally, I would like to mention the ISF position paper on a single access and benefit sharing regime, which is also put forward for adoption at the general assembly. ISF opts for an administratively simple and consistent multilateral system, to facilitate access and exchange of plant genetic resources for plant breeding coherent with the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Seed applied technologies have gained significant momentum in recent decades. Today, much seed is enhanced to protect against diseases or pests or to secure better establishment of the plants with the aim to secure a better and more reliable crop.

The technologies are many and diverse. The sharp increase in use of seed applied technologies has left regulatory bodies and agencies a bit on the back foot; nationally, regionally and globally. The result is a very complex regulatory environment with limited alignment across borders. The consequence is costly and time consuming approval procedures with specific national, or at best regional, demands for testing and documentation. The potential benefit for farmers, industry and indeed societies are not being fully exploited.

As ISF we are concerned about the effects of lack of regulatory harmonization on international trade. In recognition of the importance of seed applied technologies, hereunder the increased focus we need to have on regulatory matters, the ISF Board of Directors proposes to the general assembly to change the statutory status of the seed technology committee to become a standing committee in its own right. We propose to change the name to Seed Applied Technology Committee, to be abbreviated to SAT-Com; how we love those abbreviations, they create a tribal language separating true seed men from the others!

The change to a standing committee implies that the chairman of SAT-com will become born member of the ISF Board of Directors. To effect this change we will need to amend the ISF Articles of Association & Internal Regulations, which we hope the general assembly will agree to.

Looking ahead, feeding the world in the decades to come continues to be a challenge given that the world's resources are under great pressure. There seems to be no quick fix solutions. To gain access to more arable land suitable for cropping is part of the solution; to increase productivity of arable land already under plough is of course also part of the solution. But equally important is the presence of an environment enabling rural development, investments, R&D, world market access, functioning of local markets etc. Many enabling factors are depending on various government policies.

With a favourable enabling environment the greatest opportunities to unlock yield and production potential are in areas like South America, the SNG countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. In these regions it is possible to expand cultivated farm land and to increase productivity. Also, large parts of China offer good potential. Whereas in North America, Western Europe and Oceania yields are already high and there is not much new cropping land to access.

The lack of enabling environment in large parts of Africa seems to be a significant issue for the continent's ability to increase agricultural output despite the fact that many areas offers good soil and favourable climatic conditions.

The FAO study "How to feed the world in 2050" stroke an optimistic note, concluding that "the required increase in food production can be achieved if the necessary investment is undertaken and policies conducive to agricultural production are put in place."

So, where does ISF come into the picture?

It is clear that we as the seed industry offers great opportunities to increase the productivity of the land, among other things, through our investments in plant breeding and biotechnology in a strive to sell and market highly productive varieties under variable environmental conditions throughout the globe. We contribute strongly to the enabling environment.

With the significant development prospects for production areas like SNG countries, South America and China ISF can play a key role within our field by supporting the enabling environment in these countries. Stable and sound regulatory frameworks, including full recognition of plant breeders' rights and associated intellectual properties, are imperative for us as plant breeders, producers and marketers of enhanced seed varieties. In turn it will help to unlock yield potential in said countries. I believe that ISF as the spokesman for the global seed industry needs to focus even more on this task in the years to come.

This rounds up my address at the ISF Congress opening 2012. Again I would like to thank the members of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors for very good corporation throughout the year, the members of the various sections and committees for their dedication and hard work, as well as the ISF secretariat and Marcel for making my life as President as smooth as possible.

Finally, I would like to thank the organizing committee for making the congress possible also in 2012.

Thank you for your attention."

❖ The Master of Ceremonies gave the floor to **Mr. Marcel Bruins**, Secretary General of ISF, who provided the Progress report of the ISF Secretariat.

M. Bruins started by saying that a detailed 6-page progress report had been sent to all members six weeks before the congress, and he would be presenting only a few highlights in his speech. He showed a world map on screen indicating the 78 countries where the 228 members of ISF are residing. In 2011 the international seed trade was

estimated to be around 8.3 billion USD and the total WW formal seed market around 45million USD. A survey among ISF's national seed associations had shown that the association's membership consisted of over 7500 companies active in the seed sector, and through their national associations were represented by ISF.

He was happy to show that again a large number of companies and associations had decided to become member of ISF. In the last 5 years (2008-2012), the average number of new members was close to 22, whereas in the period 2003-2007 the average was 12 new members per year. The major developments in 2012 were a complete revision of the ISF View on Intellectual Property, a complete revision of the ISF Trade Rules, the Seed Treatment Committee would be transformed into a regular ISF Standing Committee with the name Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com), and the GM Vegetable database would go on-line. With regards to the last development, he added that this database was unique in the sense that it listed information on field trials and market releases of GM vegetable and related species. The database had over 13.000 entries. This information coming from the public domain was currently widely scattered in multiple sites and reports. The purpose of the database was to provide easy access to information to (vegetable) seed companies which would help them in their QA management and minimize the risk of adventitious presence of third-party GM material in their seed. A demonstration of the interactive features was planned during the Vegetable and Ornamental Crop Section Meeting on Wednesday, 27 June.

Since Aug. 2011 the ISF newsletter ISF-INFO had come out 5 times, with 118 articles on 79 pages. This meant that the output of information to ISF members had more than doubled. He also drew attention to the Seedsmen's Professional Liability, as provided for by Iris Insurance brokers and underlined the fact that any miscellaneous professional liability for seedsmen is no substitute for the Lloyd's Seedsmens Errors and Omissions Insurance Policy.

He reminded the audience that all of the work and documents presented at the congress were the result of strong and efficient teamwork by the ISF Secretariat. He was privileged and proud to be at the head of this hardworking ISF team, but realized that often they were not in the spotlight and often did not get the recognition they deserved. Therefore he asked for a warm round of applause for his colleagues of the ISF secretariat. They received a long round of applause.

He then announced the new ISF movie "SMART FROM THE START" dealing with the creation of new plant varieties. He encouraged all to embed

this video again into their own websites to increase further distribution of the video. He wished all a good congress with lots of good business deals, lots of networking and also lots of fun.

The movie "SMART FROM THE START" was shown on screen and received a round of applause by the audience.

❖ Mr. Damsgaard called **Mr. Orlando de Ponti** on stage to award the ISF Honorary Life Membership to him for his exceptional service to the Federation.

He presented a short bio to introduce Orlando de Ponti. Born in 1945 in Almelo, the Netherlands, Orlando de Ponti graduated in 1971 as Agricultural Engineer at the Wageningen Agricultural University in Plant Breeding, Genetics, Plant Protection and Horticulture. In 1980 he obtained his doctorate from the same university.

From 1971 to 1991 Orlando de Ponti worked in Wageningen, the Netherlands, for the Directorate for Agricultural Research (DLO) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. First as a plant breeding scientist at the Institute for Horticultural Plant Breeding (IVT-DLO), then as Head of the Vegetables Breeding Department at the same institute and finally as Director of the Research Institute for Plant Protection (IPO-DLO).

In 1991 Orlando de Ponti made the change-over from public research to industry, when he accepted the function of Managing Director Research and Development and member of the Management Board of Nunhems B.V., Haelen, the Netherlands. In May 2008 he became Senior R&D Advisor with Nunhems B.V until his retirement. Furthermore, Orlando de Ponti held various advisory positions in academia and industry.

Orlando de Ponti was President of the ASSINSEL Vegetable Plants Section from 1997 to 2002. As such he served in the ASSINSEL Executive Committee for the same period. He was Chairman of the ISF Breeders Committee from 2002 to 2006. He was Vice-President of ISF from 2006 to 2008 and became President of ISF from 2008 to 2010. He was the first ISF President with a research, breeding and technology background and was also the first ISF President from the vegetable sector of the industry.

Mr. de Ponti received the Certificate of ISF Honorary Life Membership and the ISF special pin from Mr. Damsgaard, while his wife Mrs. Jola de Ponti received a bouquet of flowers from Mrs. Dorte Johansen. They were warmly applauded.

Mr. de Ponti thanked Mr. Damsgaard for the award.

- ❖ The Master of Ceremonies introduced **Mr. Georges Pontikas**, Chairman of the National Organizing Committee of Greece.

“Honorable President of ISF

Honorable General Secretary

Honorable President of the Brazilian Seed Association

Honorable President of the National Organizing Committee

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are here in Rio today trying to believe that our dream comes closer and closer to reality.

Yes, we are here to promote our ISF congress in Athens in 2013 and to take over the responsibility of organizing this event next year. The dream of our Board of Directors and our members will come true making us feel proud under the difficult conditions in which people in Greece live due to the tough financial situation.

People around the globe are talking about the Euro-crisis and focusing their criticism on Greece but for us that are privileged to work in the Agricultural sector, the Crisis is the biggest opportunity we have ever had.

Living in Greece, every day, we feel that citizens, politicians & entrepreneurs believe more & more that this crisis is the opportunity for the growth of the Greek agriculture.

Dear friends, I strongly believe that people not only in Greece, but in Europe as well, have to think again about the power of this sector to lead us to the exodus from this difficult situation.

Agriculture is the Pillar of our Economy and Seed is the Pillar of Agriculture, so we can conclude that SEED is the Pillar of our economy.

Today Greece is a high value market for propagating material. Greek farmers saw high value seed with a high value treatment in almost all crops.

Greek farmers are known for their high investment in their agricultural holdings, a fact that has a negative impact on production cost, so this makes them in striving to achieve the best yield and quality to maximize their profits.

So seed is providing the base for the best quality and yield and Greek farmers are ready to pay, and for this reason Seed Sector in Greece gets the opportunity for profit maximization, when at the same time consists the consultation body for the Greek farmers.

Wheat, Cotton, Corn, Forage crops, Pulses and delicious Vegetables form the Greek agricultural map, making a seed market value approximating 300 Mio USD.

Beside the various annual crops, we produce best

quality of olives, olive oil, fruits and wine. Olive tree and goddess Athena are the symbols for our city Athens. Wine is the key element that joins us with the spirit of ancient Greece and god Dionysus. This spirit is a key element in building business relationships and the city of Athens with its unique facilities is ready to welcome you in 2013.

We are sure and we want to ensure all of you that we are doing our best for a unique unforgettable event in a secure and relaxing environment.

Our Board of Directors, our National Organizing Committee, our Professional Congress Organizer, our Seed Association Members, and our volunteers are ready to serve you, to host you, to help you in making the best deals ever, meeting your partners under the best conditions.

Greece welcomes you to envision the future of Agriculture in May 2013.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank ISF members, the President, the Executive Committee, Marcel and his team for their trust and support in organizing the 2013 congress in Athens. We really have an excellent collaboration towards the successful organization of our congress.

Please now join me in wishing to our good friends here in Brazil a great success for this congress.

Enjoy it!”

A video presentation invited all the participants to attend next year’s congress in Greece.

- ❖ The Opening Ceremony was closed and refreshments were served in the Convention Centre.

\* \* \*

## Report of the Open Meeting of the Breeders Committee

Held on Tuesday, 26 June 2012

Chairman: **Mr. Jean-Christophe Gouache** (FR)

### 1. Call to order, antitrust statement and adoption of the agenda

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 13.00 hrs and welcomed all according to the attendance list 136 participants from the following 29 countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe. He issued a special welcome to the ISF guests from APSA, ESA, SAA and ISTA, OECD, UPOV.

There were a few modifications to the draft agenda. Ms Robynne Anderson was unable to attend the meeting and make the presentation on Rio+20, so Marcel Bruins of the Secretariat would do that. Mrs Anke van den Hurk was also unable to come to Rio, so Radha Ranganathan of the ISF secretariat and Niels Louwaars would take over those presentations.

### 2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting (Belfast Congress Report, pp 5-11)

These minutes had been adopted by written procedure. There were no further comments.

### 3. Impact of trait vs. germplasm development

The Chairman then invited Mr. Dirk Jan Kennes of the Rabobank to the floor who made the presentation 'Competition for farmers' spending power intensifying'. He stated that the demand growth exceeds the supply growth and that food had become more expensive since 2007. There was also a heterogeneous global farming landscape with on average very large farms in South America, Russia, Ukraine, North America and Oceania, medium sized farms in the EU27, and a very fragmented farming structure in Asia and Africa. The main issues were that crop farming needs to intensify sustainably which meant increasing crops per ha., per drop of water and per kg. of nutrient. Capital intensity needs to increase; an enabling environment is crucial and managing risks (inputs, prices, production and marketing) is important. On top of that it would be necessary to enable entrepreneurship in a consolidating world. Looking from the perspective of a bank, the investment themes were the rising land prices and the emergence of the rural entrepreneur, which adopts innovations to increase productivity.

The competition for farmers spending power intensifies, with significant regional differences. The land prices had increased 30% over the last 5

years, which is not a problem for the farmers who own their land, but is a problem for the farmers who rent or lease their land. Recent studies indicate that more & more farmers were farming on leased land.

Labour is being replaced more and more by mechanization and farm equipment will evolve electronically. This means that machines will become more 'intelligent' and as such, much more a management tool. This in turn will lead to the fact that the farm equipment turn-over time will become shorter, and as such will increase its share in the farmers spending.

Having seen many innovative solutions for soil improvement the speaker believes there is big growth potential for such new products to come on the market. At the same time this will also compete with other more traditional inputs for the farmers spending power.

And as a last topic he indicated that there was a re-balancing going on of germplasm traits and agrochemicals in the farmer's toolbox. Farmers in the regions that are most heavily hit by weed resistance were using more agrochemicals (more diverse & more volumes). He advised the seed industry not to ignore these developments, and to act accordingly.

The speaker was thanked with a big round of applause.

A question was raised whether the increase in fertilizer price was mainly due to the price increase of oil, as it seemed that especially nitrogen-based fertilizer had been following the price of oil. According to the speaker this was indeed partly true, but the price spike happened at same time when shale investors came on the market and natural gas prices dropped by a tenfold. So it can be concluded that the fertilizer industry benefits by taking significantly higher margins. He added that many of the data were gathered from the US corn industry, and data from the Brazilian soy industry might give different conclusions.

### A. Intellectual Property

#### 4. Revision of ISF View on IP (12.101-a)

The Chairman reminded all of the process, which had started several years ago. And last year at the Belfast congress it was concluded that we would adopt a new ISF View on IP at the Rio Congress. But in order to get that job done, it was needed to find consensus and where necessary take a higher viewpoint (the so-called helicopter-view). The document up for adoption was document 12.101 which had been sent out 6 weeks before the Rio congress.

The aim of the open meeting of the Breeders Committee (BC) was to have debates, exchange ideas, give explanations, and potentially bring forward any amendments to the General Assembly

where the vote will take place. The Breeders Committee, consisting of 15 members had given direction to the revision process and that direction had been validated by the ISF Board of Directors. During this open meeting of the BC, both the Chairmen of IPC and BC were to be the gatekeepers of the line, direction and mandate that was provided by the BC and by BoD.

The process that had been followed was in line with the conclusions drawn in Belfast, and in line with the direction as given by the BC. The ultimate goal was to produce and adopt a new paper in Rio, and to come to a balanced position that was acceptable for all members, even if the paper was not the ideal paper for many of the members. To work on a 30+ page document, more rounds of consultation among ISF members had been organized.

He then asked Stephen Smith, Chairman of the ISF Intellectual Property Committee (IPC) to provide a recap of the drafting and consultation process that had led to the current version. S. Smith thanked the members of IPC, BC and ISF members in general for their participation in this process. It was important to note that the 1st consultation with all ISF members had started more than 6 months ago. The draft document had gone out twice to all members (in December 2011 and April 2012), which had resulted in several hundreds of proposed amendments from several members (9 members in the 1st round, and 11 members in the 2nd round). Subsequently a small team of S. Smith, T. Johnson, JC Gouache and M Bruins had reviewed all proposed amendments in this 2nd round of comments and had classified them in different categories accepting or rejecting them in line with the direction given by the BC. After that M. Bruins had answered individually to all proposers and provided feedback on their amendments with the reasons why their amendments had been accepted or rejected. This process then led to document 12.101, which was sent out 6 weeks before the Congress. Five members had sent in amendments, which had been captured in document 12.101-a. The same small team then classified these amendments again into three categories merely to serve as a tool to deal with the large amount of amendments. These three documents had been shared with all members on the 15th of June (documents 12.101-aa with 3 categories). The Secretariat indicated that around 1100 person hours had been spent on the document and a little over 400 amendments had been taken care of in the last half year.

The Chairman of the IPC indicated that the amendments in 12-101-a were categorized in exactly the same spirit as provided by the guidance of BC and by the same team as earlier in the year. Amendments in category 1 were merely improvements of English; amendments in category

2 were improvements but no substantive changes and amendments in category 3 were outside the broad consensus and deserved special attention. The small team had added some small changes in the category 2 document (highlighted in yellow) to improve consistency throughout the text.

After discussion the participants agreed with the proposed amendments in category 1 and category 2, with the exception of the proposal to replace 'an existing' with 'a competitor' (in the Executive Summary on page 4 and on section 1.4.2, 2nd §). It was therefore agreed by all participants that these amendments would be put forward for adoption during the General Assembly.

The meeting then went on to discuss the amendments that has been classified in category 3. The Chairman explained that the small team had reviewed the amendments with the view whether these were in line with the direction as given by the BC and whether they had the risk of unbalancing the careful balancing act that ISF was undertaking. The word 'balance' in this context was referring to different opinions and not to different forms of protection. He then asked the main contributors in this category (Barenbrug, BDP, Pioneer and Plantum) to provide an explanation of their amendments. Several participants took the floor and complimented the IPC, the BC, their respective chairpersons and the ISF-Secretariat for the hard work done and getting this far.

A comment was raised as to which 'conditions' the text was referring to in 2.4.2. Other comments were made by participants who expressed their concern with some of the wording and proposed not to adopt some of the amendments. The Chairman provided explanations as to why these amendments had been classified in category 3. Several other participants added that they could have proposed more amendments in the 3 week commenting period, but their company or association had refrained from doing so to facilitate the adoption in the General Assembly. The language in the document would need to be language that the average breeder can understand. With the fast developments in technology, several participants considered the current paper a living document, which could be reviewed in a number of years to take into account technology development.

The Chairman also added that there were several hot topics where opinions of some ISF members were diverging, and that was where the paper had to take a higher ('helicopter') view. He then asked the 4 members who had provided amendments, but which had ended up in Category 3 to indicate if they were willing to withdraw their proposed amendments.

A representative of Pioneer indicated that he was willing to withdraw its amendments, if other

proposers were also willing to withdraw their amendments.

A representative of BDP indicated that it was not yet willing to withdraw their amendments, but understood the responsibility, and asked for more time, until the General Assembly. This would then be done irrespective of the other organizations.

A representative of Plantum indicated that he felt the responsibility of facilitating the adoption and was willing to withdraw almost all proposed amendments, except the change of 'considered' to 'implemented' in the 3rd § of the section 'Patents for plant related inventions' in the Executive Summary and the last § of 2.4.2 ('To compensate...'). He would like to have added to the minutes of the BC that Plantum had agreed to withdraw most of its amendments for the sake of the process, and not necessarily because they could agree to the withdrawal.

The representative for Barenbrug indicated that he had to talk with persons from the company and he would provide their answer before the General Assembly.

To facilitate preparation by other members, these 4 members were asked to provide their definitive answers with regards to the withdrawal of their amendments within 24 hours.

*[Between the open session of the BC and the General Assembly, the four parties who had proposed "Category 3 amendments" met and worked together with the Chairman of the BC. Provided that a small amendment in 2.4.2 would be made, proposed and adopted by the GA in addition to the category 1 and 2 amendments, it was agreed that they would then withdraw all other amendments. Subsequently, the process went ahead as agreed above and the paper was adopted by the GA]*

## 5. Rio+20 Conference: main outcomes

As Ms. Robynne Anderson was unable to attend this meeting, M. Bruins made the presentation. The objective of the Rio+20 Conference was to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, to assess progress to date and the remaining gaps in the implementation of the outcomes of the major summits on Sustainable Development and to address new and emerging challenges. The Rio+20 Conference had ultimately led to a declaration titled 'The Future We Want', of 53 pages containing 283 articles. He highlighted some of the text from the declaration that was relevant for agriculture and in particular for the seed industry.

He also presented some of the draft texts in the months before the Rio+20 Conference which had seen much better versions, but which had been deleted in the political tug of war negotiations. The resulting text was rather bland, and did not

mention anywhere modern agriculture, or input factors such as fertilizers, crop protection products or seeds.

ISF did not have the resources to be present in this Rio+20 Conference, and clearly the seed industry had lost some ground in several of the text proposals. With appropriate attention in the preparation phase and presence on the ground during the Conference it may have been possible to limit such textual damage. Therefore towards the end of his speech, he also presented some go forward thoughts: How does ISF manage its engagement in these processes? What are the reputational risks of ISF not participating in such processes? And how do country members of ISF engage their governments? These would be questions that should appear on the agendas of the relevant ISF bodies in the near future.

The speaker was thanked with a round of applause.

## B. Sustainable Agriculture

### 6. Access to genetic resources and benefit sharing

#### Why ISF wants a single regime

The Chairman then invited Radha Ranganathan to the floor to introduce the draft position paper 12.102. ISF has been talking about the issues of access, benefit sharing, conservation, use and IP already since 1996. The most recent ISF paper on these topics dated back to 2008. The concerns with the recently adopted Nagoya Protocol were that it lacks an agricultural and plant breeding perspective and there is ambiguity on its scope. In addition there were some new elements in the Protocol which are not suitable for the plant breeding sector e.g. the benefits may include monetary and non-monetary benefits, including but not limited to those listed in the Annex (Art. 5.4); a permit or its equivalent as evidence of the decision to grant prior informed consent and of the establishment of mutually agreed terms (Art. 6.3e); there is reference to check points (Art. 17a(iv)); and an internationally recognized certificate of compliance is to serve as evidence that the genetic resource which it covers has been accessed in accordance with prior informed consent (PIC) and on mutually agreed terms (MAT) (Art. 17.3).

She concluded with the key features of the new ISF's position paper on ABS: it reiterates that a sectoral approach is necessary; it repeats why a multilateral system works best for all genetic resources used in plant breeding; it recognizes the breeders' exception as benefit sharing; it recommends the Nagoya Protocol has complete coherence with the International Treaty (IT); it refutes the requirement for a certificate of compliance, as the sMTA (of the IT) provides

sufficient evidence of PIC and MAT and it rejects the need for check points.

She then indicated that only Plantum had provided some amendments to the draft paper which had been sent out as 12.102-a. From the side of the Secretariat she added that the proposed amendments were largely editorial to improve the text. In the last sentence of the 2nd §, 'Nagoya Protocol' was mentioned twice, and it was agreed that the 2nd mentioning could be deleted. This paper plus amendments and one deletion would now go forward to the General Assembly for adoption.

### **ISF activities: the Nagoya Protocol and the International Treaty**

Ms Ranganathan provided a brief update on the work in the SAC. She said many SAC members had participated in the many meeting on ABS in the past 12 months.

During the last 12 months, SAC members had organized a visit to Rome to talk with the FAO-IT Secretariat and with representatives of the Global Diversity Trust Fund. SAC members had also participated in several other meetings, e.g. with representatives from the Brazilian government to talk about its ABS implementation, with the Japanese authorities to talk about their implementation of the IT, and in meetings at the periphery of other larger events. And in each of those meetings, the position of the seed industry had been brought forward. It might seem that the developments sometimes moved at a glacial pace, but she reminded the audience that every small step was progress. For the seed industry it was important to be present at all important meetings where the seed industry felt it could influence the process.

As we speak SAC Members were travelling to India for meetings on the implementation of the sMTA and the Nagoya Protocol. The meeting on the sMTA was relevant in view of the ISF paper just approved where the industry speaks of "a" standard material transfer agreement rather than the sMTA in use under the International Treaty. The choice of words was deliberate as ISF was active in a working group established by the IT Secretariat with the goal of improving the text in the sMTA. The speaker was thanked with a round of applause.

A participant informed the audience that during the recent Rio+20 Conference a meeting had taken place on the International Treaty with participation from the private sector, and interesting proposals had come out of that meeting. He proposed that the ISF Secretariat seek contact with the FAO-IT Secretariat and look for ways to cooperate. A representative of ESA mentioned that the European Union was planning to implement the Nagoya Protocol. He asked for strong commitment

of all the seed industry at national, regional and international level to educate people about the potential detrimental effect on the seed industry if it was implemented as proposed. He underlined the importance for the seed industry to participate in all the relevant meetings.

The Chairman called upon all ISF members to support these processes and outreach efforts and dedicate one or more of their staff to help out the ISF and regional Secretariats.

### **7. Whither the European debate on new breeding techniques?**

As Mrs Anke van den Hurk was not able to attend the Rio Congress, the Chairman invited Mr. Niels Louwaars to the floor to make this presentation in her stead. He gave an update about the different techniques that had been analyzed by an EU Working Group with the main question whether these were going to result in being regulated as GMO according to EU legislation (EC2001/18). Other analyses on the socio-economics, detection and regulation outside EU and on safety had been carried out by the JRC and EFSA in Europe. The joint outcome of these analyses would determine deregulation and labeling requirements.

The speaker was thanked with a round of applause.

A participant wanted to know if this was mainly an EU position, or if there were similar developments in other parts of the world. The speaker did not have a full overview, but a Canadian representative added that in Canada it is the product that is regulated, and the process that was used is not relevant.

It was clarified that the report does not say whether a technique leads to a GMO regulatory status or not, it merely states that these techniques may be exempt of certain parts of the regulation. New Zealand had started to debate cis-genesis, but had decided to wait and review the developments in other countries. As this was already a global issue, it was proposed that ISF could also consider taking a position similar to ESA. It would be placed on the next BC agenda.

## **C. General Items**

### **8. Other business**

There was no other business to discuss.

### **9. Closing the meeting**

There being no other business to discuss, the Chairman thanked the Chairpersons of the IPC and SAC, Mr. Stephen Smith and Mrs Anke van den Hurk. They were warmly applauded. He further thanked the IPC and SAC members and the ISF Secretariat for its support and the colleagues in the BC for their direction to the SAC and IPC. He closed the meeting at 18.00 hrs.

## **Report of the Open Meeting of the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee**

Held on Wednesday, 27 June 2012

---

Chairman: **Mr. Huib Ghijsen** (BE)

### **1. Call to order, antitrust statement and adoption of the agenda**

At 08.00 hrs the Chairman, Mr Huib Ghijsen, called the meeting to order and welcomed 60 participants representing 23 countries (Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, United States and Uruguay), and guests of Regional Seed Associations (APSA, SAA) and International Organizations (ISTA, OECD).

The antitrust statement that was circulated with the congress document was accepted by delegates.

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

### **2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting (Belfast Congress Report, pp 14-16)**

The minutes of previous meeting had been approved by written procedure.

### **3. History of the ISF's trade rules and their objectives**

Mr Bernard Le Buanec was invited give a talk that he had prepared about history and purposes of ISF trade rules. The speaker reminded that international seed trade is governed by international treaties like the health treaties, the certification agreements, the bio-safety protocols. These treaties are transposed into national laws; the industry must comply with these laws; the ISF Rules can be considered as private laws that provide additional support and regulation to trade.

For the history, in 1924 when the first Congress of the seed industry was organized in London, a group of seed men agreed to develop a set of rules to prevent dispute in international trade; in 1928 the French delegation submitted a first draft that was proposed for adoption in Paris in May 1929. At that time, the Rules applied only to herbage seed, since the main international trade of seed was forage crops. ISF Rules for international arbitration procedures followed one year after. After WW2 the rules were revised and updated regularly until 1986. Since after 1950 new Sections were created, each of them had developed its own set of rules. Only in the year 1986 there was the proposal to merge the common features of each set of rules and to develop specific rules answering to the peculiarities of each group of crops.

After seven years of discussion and proposals the ISF Rules were adopted in Nairobi in 1993; the

specific rules were completed in 1994. For the first time ISF rules for all seeds were published in the same booklet. This was also the last time the Rules were published in print.

For the second part of the speech - purposes of the Rules - in the view of the speaker, the objectives of the Rules are to harmonize terms and conditions, to provide guidelines for arbitration and to be of help when writing contracts.

The harmonization is mainly on the meaning of the terms commonly adopted in international trade and on the main usages; the aim is to facilitate the understanding between the contracting parties and prevent useless discussion.

The second objective of the Rules is to assist arbitration; the code letters ISF in a contract are equivalent to an arbitration clause; the Rules are used by the arbitrators to judge the behaviour and responsibility of the parties, they are the base for arbitration and arbitrators judge in equity. For the third objective - help writing contracts - if the structure of the Rules is followed when preparing a contract no important aspects of an efficient commercial agreement will be overlooked and possible conflicts will be minimized.

Concluding his talk, Mr Le Buanec reminded that international trade rules based on usages were at the origin of the International Seed Federation and that the Rules are an essential feature of the ISF activities. They must be kept as simple as possible and the role of traders and brokers in their revision, when needed, is essential.

A participant asked if the help writing contracts should be seen as a service provided by ISF possibly at a cost. The answer was that the ISF should not be doing the work for the contracting parties but the Rules are structured in a manner that their logical flow should be a guide for preparing a good and complete contract.

Another participant commented that the Rules have to be adapted to the evolution of economy. The speaker agreed that adaptation is necessary but anticipation is not a good choice.

Since there were no other questions, the Chairman thanked Mr Le Buanec who was applauded by the meeting.

### **4. The ISF Rules and Usages for the Trade in Seeds for Sowing Purposes**

When the Chairman moved to the review and discussion of the new text of the Rules Mr Le Buanec asked to clarify that all the comments that were reported in the annotated text as his, were submitted by him before the official period as simple comments to the attention of the TARC and were not an intention to amend the Rules. He proposed to withdraw all the comments under his

name. The Chairman thanked for this important clarification.

The discussion was then on the amendments proposed by ISF members.

First comment was about Article 1.1 which stated: "The Rules and Usages for the Trade in Seeds for Sowing Purposes -"ISF Rules"- shall apply in national and international seed trade contracts unless otherwise agreed by the parties". The proposal from the Member was to change "...unless otherwise agreed..." to "...when expressly agreed..." since this gives an opt-in rather than an opt-out option.

From the floor it was commented that this is a complete change of the spirit of the Rules; this change will require ISF to communicate to all world seed trade that the spirit has been changed. Such a modification creates a completely different situation from the present one and forces parties to take additional action to agree consequently making things more complex.

Another participant indicated the preference to the opt-in option since if the words "...otherwise agreed..." remain it will mean that for all member seed companies by virtue of their membership in ISF these Rules will be automatically incorporated in every contract they write unless they opt-out. This is a dangerous situation.

A delegate commented that having an opt-in methodology is a better option since it gives the companies the possibility to use the Rules in a contract and not in another by explicit agreement depending on circumstances. Also, this option will have the merit of placing the Rules in a positive rather than negative light.

The recommendation for change was taken and will be proposed to the general Assembly.

Next proposed correction was for Article 2.2 "The Vienna Convention (UN CISG 1980) is excluded under these Rules": it has been proposed to change "...is excluded." with "...does not apply.". This amendment was accepted.

In Article 4.1 the suggested deletion of the words "...proposal or "quotation" (hereinafter mentioned as proposal)..." was accepted. The proposal to change "Offeror" to "Seller" and "Offeree" to "Buyer" was not accepted since the Chairman explained that in this phase of the contract there is not yet a buyer and a seller but an offering and an interested party.

The member who submitted this request for change commented that these terms are not used and in the international trade of seed there is no consistence with following text where buyer and seller are used. The Chairman explained again that the parties become buyer and seller when the contract is concluded.

A participant suggested explaining in the definitions the term "quotation" and the term "proposal" since between the two there is difference that may be not well know by traders.

In Article 4.1 the TARC had accepted to use only the word "quotation" and to list it further down in Annex 1, the glossary of terms.

For Article 7.1 the TARC made an editorial improvement "A statement made by or other conduct of the Offeree indicating assent to an offer is an acceptance" instead of "A statement made by the Offeree or other conduct of him indicating assent to an offer is an acceptance". The proposal of the TARC was approved.

Comment received for Article 7.3 asked to clarify the time validity of an oral offer. From the floor it was commented that if there is no definition in the validity of an oral offer there will be room for issues. Experience says that oral offer should have a validity of 24 or 48 hours.

The Chairman informed that TARC had discussed this in previous meetings and agreed this is a difficult issue to define. It would be subject to further debate before the General Assembly.

In Article 15.1 it was proposed to add "seed liter" among the measure units for selling seed; the TARC chose to use the words "by seed volume" for consistency with other terms in the sentence. This change was approved by all.

In Articles 15.2 and 16.1 there is mention of "more or less" and "+/-". a member proposed to be consistent and have only one of these forms used. The TARC chose to use "+/-" instead of "more or less" and the text has been amended accordingly. The proposal of the TARC was approved.

During the comments period before the Congress a member requested to delete the defined percentage of insurance in the Article 25; the Chairman and the Secretariat explained that the ISF Rules make reference to Incoterms®, these internationally recognized terms clearly state that insurance must cover 110% the value of the goods. Also, it was explained what "deductible" means and that it is correct that this amount remains on the insured.

Remarks were made on the Article 32.2 suggesting to write "according to C" instead of "predefined quantity" for consistency and precision. The text was modified with "according to 31.2(c)" and accepted. Also text in Articles 32.1 and 31.2 was adjusted for harmonization.

Article 47 corrected the reference to Art 44 instead of 51.

There had been discussion on the sentence in Article 66 "free access to them by the buyer" The TARC suggested improving the text with "and

provided the buyer is able to access the seed"; there were no comments therefore accepted. The same editorial improvement was made in Art. 70.2 and 84.3.

The new text of Article 76 spells "... seed testing report not older than 180 days prior to date of shipment ...". Of two ISF Members one commented in favour and one against; other Sections have indicated concerns on extending the validity of a testing report. The Chairman proposed to go back to the text of current Rules. A delegate in the meeting room said that for cereals 180 days is perfect and to be in favour changing to 180, other Sections may decide to have different duration. After debate it was agreed to reintroduce 90 days for the forage and turf group and leave 180 days for other crops.

The proposal to include in Article 84.5 the condition that "the Buyer must also keep records with regard to the use of the seeds and, in the event of resale of the seeds, with regard to its buyers" found resistance in the TARC and with several ISF Members because it is felt that it is not a common practice and not appropriate. It was agreed to delete this last sentence.

In Article 87.1 about binding arbitration, an amendment submitted proposed to replace the words "shall be finally settled" with "can be settled amicably or by mediation and conciliation as provided for in the ISF Procedure Rules for Dispute Settlement, but can always be settled by binding arbitration" the TARC proposed to improve the language and delete "but can always be settled" changing to "or". This should indicate the members that the opportunity of amicable settlement exists and should be considered. This change was not rejected.

The proposal submitted by the Dutch Member Association to move Article 12.2 into Article 87.3 was not accepted by the TARC. Also the submitting Member agreed with this decision.

There being no further amendments in this document to be discussed, a participant in the room asked to clarify the procedure that was going to be implemented for the adoption of the Rules. The Chairman explained that the amendments and the corrections agreed in this meeting will be again brought up one by one to the General Assembly and subject to approval.

## **5. Arbitration: statistics and cases**

Next agenda item was an update on arbitration in the previous 12 months.

The Secretariat reported that the members' Arbitration Chambers responding to the survey were 20 out of 23. There were 3 international arbitrations: 2 domestic ones and 2 inquiries

without follow-up. 3 of the 5 arbitrations were closed amicably.

Countries managing arbitration cases were: Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy and Switzerland. The reasons for requesting arbitration were: licensing agreement validity; fulfillment of the contract; validity and enforcement of a contract and truthfulness to type.

One case was overruled by common justice because the losing party claimed there was no evidence of the arbitration agreement; this decision has been appealed the Chairman informed. This last case shows the importance of having an arbitration clause agreed in writing.

## **6. Others business**

Aiming at supporting diffusion and promotion of the ISF Rules and Usages in Trade the Chairman shared with participants the idea discussed and proposed by the TARC to organize a seminar or a workshop for the Members. The objective would be to give more information and exchange experiences about the Rules and their practical implementation because there has been the feeling that the Members may still have questions on the use of them. Such event may be organized after a Congress and will include both Trade and Arbitration Rules.

The floor commented that the idea is appreciated but time is an important aspect to keep in mind: the congress being already organized over 3 days, the proposed initiative will mean adding a fourth one. Another participant suggested having short sessions of one hour in the trading room at the end of every day of the congress. The Chairman recommended the participants to submit more ideas: the TARC will consider them all and work to make this educational activity happen in the best and most suitable way.

## **7. Closing the meeting**

Since there were no other business to discuss, the Chairman thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the meeting, for all the editorial work on the text and for the coordination with ISF Members for the success of the new Trade Rules text; he thanked the participants for their presence and useful contribution to the discussion and called the meeting to a close at 09:50h.

\* \* \*

---

## **Report of the Open Meeting of the Phytosanitary Committee**

Held on Wednesday, 27 June 2012

---

Chairman: **Mr. Roeland Kapsenberg** (US)

### **1. Call to order, antitrust statement and adoption of the agenda**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10.30 hrs and welcomed 92 delegates from 22 countries (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, South Korea, Netherlands, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, UK, US and Uruguay) among whom were guests from regional seed associations such as AFSTA, APSA, ESA and SAA, and the international / intergovernmental organizations ISTA and OECD.

The ISF anti-trust guidelines were noted and the agenda adopted as presented.

### **2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting (Belfast Congress Report, pp 14-16)**

The participants were reminded that the report of the meeting in Belfast in 2011 was adopted through a written procedure.

### **3. An overview of recent activities undertaken by ISF**

In providing an overview of the activities undertaken by ISF Roeland Kapsenberg spoke of the role of the Phytosanitary Committee: to identify the situations where ISF needed to become active, determine a mode of action, develop and present ISF's position on the phytosanitary issue(s) identified. He categorized the different modes of action as being pro-active and reactive, that of co-ordination, acting as a resource of information and guidance, and lastly issuing alerts.

ISF had been proactive in building a strong case at the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) for an international standard on seed. ISF had also been given a place on the (still-to-be established) Expert Working Group that will develop the standard. ISF had also been proactive in developing crop specific pest lists that could be used to harmonise phytosanitary regulations on seed as well as a reference for the technical annexes that the seed industry would like to see developed as technical annexes to the standard on seed.

ISF had been reactive in providing comments, scientific and technical input on Brazil's Normative Instruction (NI) 36 and the newly proposed NI, Australia's new measures on tomato seed and on EPPO's diagnostic protocol on Pepino mosaic virus. It had co-ordinated industry wide activities on seed health, the seed industry's response to NAPPO on its draft regional standard on seed, the visit of an industry delegation to Brazil in February 2012 and presenting industry viewpoints and

activities at the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. In each of the activities ISF had informed, communicated and alerted the industry, and in some instances national plant protection offices, of changes in regulations and requirements.

In concluding he called upon the audience to inform the Phytosanitary Committee of the issues that needed to be addressed by ISF and asked them to work with ISF to find solutions. Many of the phytosanitary problems were crop specific and required company input while some were broad covering all species, such as the ISPM revisions. Nevertheless, an industry wide consultation was necessary to develop a global industry position. If the involvement of ISF's membership in the different activities undertaken was inadequate, it meant fewer topics being addressed or a bigger workload on a few people and a risk of getting incomplete or incorrect information on ISF's position to regulators.

His take home message to the audience was to participate in the industry efforts to harmonize and simplify phytosanitary regulation and to appoint qualified personnel to the relevant committee in their national seed associations. A quick audience survey revealed that only a few of the attendees to the Open Meeting were directly involved in the preparation and processing of the phytosanitary status of seed lots.

He thanked the members of the Phytosanitary Committee for their help and support during the past 12 months.

### **4. Brazil's quarantine system for seed - regulations and infrastructure**

The Chairman thanked Mr Coutinho, Director of Brazil's Department of Plant Health (DSV) for accepting the invitation to be a part of the ISF Congress and taking the time to address the floor on Brazil's quarantine system for seed. He informed the floor that questions would be taken after the presentation made by the ISF Secretariat on the seed industry's view point on Brazil's proposed phytosanitary regulations currently notified to WTO SPS.

Cosam Coutinho informed the audience that in his talk he would attempt to present the regulations and infrastructure that was necessary to facilitate the movement of seed into the country without compromising the rules of quarantine and phytosanitary vigilance. He explained the legislative background to the regulations for importing plants and parts of plants for research and commercial use, as well as rules for registering and approving quarantine stations at three levels based on their physical infrastructure, professional qualifications of the staff and methodologies used. There were currently 12 quarantine stations in the country (some

established by private companies), 275 agronomists and 206 veterinarians employed in the service, and 106 inspection points dotted along the 26,000 km of borders of Brazil.

He described the normative instruction 6/2005 that provided the framework for the regulations currently in use. It exempted plant products, for instance seed, with a history of importation from 12 Aug 1997 to 16 Jul 2005 from a specified country of origin and specific use from a pest risk assessment (PRA). Seed of new crops or seed coming from new countries of origin required a PRA to be completed before they could be imported into the country.

This had, however, resulted in many hundreds of PRAs that had to be completed and Cosam Coutinho explained the process by which PRAs were made. DSV had also developed strategies to clear the backlog of PRAs and was hopeful that these measures would speed up the development of PRAs, reduce the amount of time between request for a PRA and publication of a normative instruction with pest specific phytosanitary requirements.

As requested by ISF he spent the last few minutes talking about the new normative instruction that had been notified to WTO SPS. Its main objective was to facilitate the import of seed by a simple process which also provided the necessary guarantees needed to prevent the entry of pests into the country. He mentioned the concern the industry apparently had with the provision concerning chemical treatments for arthropods. He had spoken to his colleagues in the Ministry about it and they were attempting to find an alternate measure that gave the same guarantee.

The last date for comments was 9 July 2012 and so far only New Zealand had commented, and the comments also included the chemical treatments for arthropods. He concluded his presentation by saying he couldn't say how long it would take to address all the comments that may come in but his ministry had already anticipated a period of some months in which to deal with them.

##### **5. The industry view point on Brazil's new Normative Instruction**

Radha Ranganathan thanked C Coutinho for having briefly introduced the new normative instruction that Brazil had notified WTO SPS about on 10 May 2012 and wished to implement later in the year. The proposed regulations established a list of quarantine pests associated to seed of different crops. This was a departure from previous normative instructions that did not specify which pests associated to the crops would be regulated. They recognised field inspection as an acceptable phytosanitary measure and made no mention of re-testing every incoming seed consignment on arrival.

She went on to speak of some of the provisions. Concerning the 57 pests that Brazil wished to regulate and associated with 69 crops in 215 pest-host combinations, she told C Coutinho that ISF would be willing to share the references to published literature that suggested that for pests reported not to be present in Brazil, the crop was not a host for 7 pests in 19 host-pest combinations, and from 39 pests in 152 host-pest associations where the crop was a host for the pest, seed was the pathway for the introduction/spread of only 21 pests in 43 host-pest associations.

With respect to chemical treatments for arthropods already mentioned by C Coutinho, she said the industry was concerned for a wide variety of reasons. Insects in vegetable and ornamental seed were comparatively rare and chemical treatments were known to reduce seed quality and germination and differences in the registration of chemical treatments in Brazil and country of origin was likely to be a problem. Besides, modern seed cleaning methods used by the industry today are very effective in removing plant and soil debris that could harbour insects. She informed the audience and C Coutinho that ISF would be sending its comments in more detail to DSV.

She concluded by saying that DSV's mission – as presented by C Coutinho in his presentation was very similar to that of the seed industry: prevent the entry and spread of pests and diseases to protect agriculture, human health and the environment.

Cosam Coutinho was asked to what extent DSV co-operated with the industry on preparing PRAs. He replied that collaboration with the industry and institutions outside the government and NPPOs was part of the strategy DSV had adopted. So if a company asked to initiate a PRA DSV was willing to accept all the information related to a PRA the company provided. He was asked if chemical treatment for arthropods was mandatory for every shipment or was required only when the insects mentioned were found during inspection. He clarified that chemical treatment was not mandatory. He also added that insects were in principle not a big concern, as not many survived the processing seed underwent after harvest and repeated that his staff was looking at alternatives.

In response to a general comment that shipments were sometimes refused entry on arrival because of weed seed, such as *Matricaria* spp., that was not regulated and was not on the quarantine list, C Coutinho said the status of a pest could change due to various reasons and recommended that companies ask their NPPOs to verify the status of a crop with DSV before the shipment was made. He repeated that there were a number of PRAs that were pending and DSV was doing its best to clear the backlog.

To a question about whether seed produced in Brazil could move from the state where produced to another for commercial use without any phytosanitary restrictions, C Coutinho said for regulated pests some states in Brazil may impose some additional requirements.

At the end of the question and answer session, the Chairman thanked C Coutinho for his presentation and his willingness to enter into a dialogue with the industry.

## **6. PSTVd and import restrictions on tomato seed**

Bill Fuller gave the participants a report on the situation in Australia with respect to phytosanitary regulations concerning PSTVd and the import of tomato seed.

Although small by world standards, tomato is one of the most important processed fruit and vegetable commodities in Australia. Potato spindle tuber viroid (PSTVd) was a serious disease in tomato and eradicated in Australia. After outbreaks of the disease were traced to imported seed emergency measures were introduced in June 2008 and the difficult requirements had led to the volume of tomato seed imports decreasing by 80 – 90%. In June 2011, Biosecurity Australia (BA) proposed changes to the 2008 measures, and after submissions from the Australian industry and ISF, new measures (with some concession for small seed lots) came into force in January 2012.

The industry was still in disarray due to the demanding requirements for testing 20,000 seed in subsamples of 400 but imports had resumed using a combination of overseas and local testing although imports of many smaller volume varieties had dropped due to cost.

The future as he saw it was fewer varieties would be imported into the country, the possibility of small domestic production, some more disruptions as New Zealand's anticipated requirements were not in harmony with the Australian ones (tomato seed often went through Australia to New Zealand), a meeting between the Dutch and Australian NPPOs to see if BA's method could be compared with the one developed by NAKT (an activity where ISF has helped a lot in getting to this point).

In drawing some lessons from the process, B Fuller was of the view that high level scientific input, as provided by ISF/ISHI-Veg, at an early stage of the risk assessment process was critical in forming the opinion of the NPPO. A uniform message from the industry followed up by well conducted face-to-face meetings with the authorities accelerated the process of reaching a positive outcome. In the Australian case, the process had been slow, at times frustrating, and had yielded small incremental improvements.

When asked on what role ISF could play in the near future on this matter B Fuller replied that in his view there was little more that could be done on the import regulations for tomato seed, unless there were more changes to the rules. But there was still work to be done in harmonising New Zealand's proposed import restrictions on tomato seed with Australian requirements as tomato seed often went via Australia to New Zealand.

## **7. Other business**

There was no other business raised.

## **8. Closing the meeting**

In calling the meeting to a close, the Chairman thanked all the speakers, especially for giving examples of how ISF interacted with regulators, in some instances on a topic that was very specific to a part of the industry while others were broader.

\* \* \*

## **Report of the Meeting of the Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Section**

Held on Wednesday, 27 June 2012

---

Chairman: **Mr. Anton van Doornmalen** (NL)

### **1. Call to order, anti-trust statement and adoption of the agenda**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 13.30 hrs and welcomed 152 participants from 27 countries (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine, United States and Uruguay) and especially guests from AFSTA, APSA, ESA, ISTA, OECD and UPOV.

ISF's anti-trust statement was noted and the agenda adopted.

Before moving to the business of the day the Chairman kept with the tradition of speaking a few words that carry a message. This year he asked the audience to "think vegetables". In restaurants or even at home the main choice of a meal was either meat or fish. But in view of the public debate on the consequences of rising meat consumption in the world, he spoke of encouraging people to eat more vegetables. He called for the launch of a movement – Think Vegetables – that would change the way one thought of food.

### **2. Report of the last Section Meeting in Belfast**

There were no comments on the report of the last Section Meeting in Belfast.

### 3. Election of Board Members

In a change from the previous years when this item was dealt with at the end of the meeting, the Chairman said he wished to introduce new nominees to the Board. Of a total of 11 nominees five were new to the Board and as they were in the audience they were easily presented to the Section: Lorena Basso (Argentina), Franck Berger (France), David Malan (South Africa), Vicente Navarro (Spain) and Mary Ann Sayoc (Philippines). The other six had served a previous term on the Board and were being re-nominated: Fabrizio Ceccarelli (Italy), Amnon Eshet (Israel), Arpad Pavelka (Hungary), Hiroshi Sakata (Japan), John Schoenecker (US) and Alison Tian (China). A round of applause signalled the election of the nominees to the Board for a term of two years.

He thanked the outgoing members for their contribution: Julian Arnedo (Spain), Brian Featonby-Smith (South Africa) and Bruno Carette (France).

### 4. The vegetable seed industry in Brazil

Steve Udsen presented the vegetable seed industry in Brazil against the background of general developments in the country. In the nineties Brazil was plagued by galloping inflation (> 500%), high interest rates (> 1000%) and low growth in gross domestic product (GDP). But a change in macro-economic policy in the mid-nineties changed the situation dramatically. Riding on the back of an average GDP growth of 4% per year Brazil had also seen an impressive agricultural growth: from 1996 to 2008 the contribution of the vegetable seed industry to the GDP expanded by an average 8% per year. The availability of land, water, and labor, combined with rapid socioeconomic shifts – rural to urban migration, growing middle class and improvements to the distribution of income – had all contributed significantly to this growth.

He was of the view there was more growth on the horizon for Brazil but there were also obstacles such as low investment in infrastructure (roads, railway, waterways), burdensome tax code (currently there were 70+ taxes), an opaque legal system, low investment in education and red tape that could hold it back.

The total vegetable market in 2011 at grower prices was worth USD 240 million with the share of hybrids at 72%. Of a total of 800,000 ha under vegetable cultivation, around 270,000 ha were cultivated with open-pollinated varieties of which 70,000 ha under watermelon and 40,000 under onion. He estimated that a 100% conversion to hybrid varieties would represent an increase of 60% in market value. One of the many obstacles to growth that was specific to the seed industry was phytosanitary regulations. He traced their evolution over the period that the vegetable seed

industry grew at an average rate of around 8% per annum and highlighted some of their features that acted as an impediment to the development of the industry. In concluding his presentation mentioned the visit of the ISF delegation earlier in the year to engage with the authorities in a discussion of the challenges the industry, especially the vegetable sector, faced in meeting the current phytosanitary requirements.

### 5. An approach to harmonize phytosanitary requirements

Continuing on theme the previous speaker had introduced in the concluding minutes of his presentation, Gerard Meijerink informed the audience that between 2008 and 2010 the value of internationally traded vegetable seed – materials for R&D and trials, parent lines for seed production and commercial seed – had increased by 20%. However, anticipating and meeting phytosanitary requirements that varied by country of destination and country of production involved high compliance costs, complicated planning and complex administration for companies. A rough study of the additional declarations that companies in the Netherlands needed to be able to export tomato seed, for instance, showed the number required per country varied from zero to 20 and differed in form for the same pest. They concerned 64 pests of which 50 were not relevant to the crop (tomato) or for which seed was not the pathway, i.e. the means that allowed the entry or spread of the pest.

In an effort to harmonize phytosanitary requirements some vegetable companies in ISF had jointly begun to prepare a list of pests associated with the seed of a vegetable crop and for which phytosanitary measures were justifiable. For every pest for which seed was the pathway information on detection, mitigation measures in the form of seed treatments and the most appropriate additional declaration(s) were also included and backed by references to articles in reputed journals. The goal was to develop science-based crop specific pest lists that the industry could use as a reference in discussions with national plant protection organisations (NPPO). A first draft of the pest list for 12 vegetable crops were ready which when checked and peer reviewed would be posted on the ISF website.

G Meijerink was asked if the pest lists included insects and mites. He explained that the lists initially included all pests but keeping in view the expertise available and the scope of the task, weeds were excluded.

### 6. ISF's database of genetically modified events in vegetable crops

Bruno Carette explained the background to the database before demonstrating its features. It was created for the sole purpose of providing

information to vegetable seed companies that would facilitate developing quality assurance (QA) management procedures to minimize the risk of adventitious presence of third-party GM material in seed. The database was unique in the sense that it gathered in one space information on GM events that, although in the public domain, was widely scattered in multiple sites and reports and not all easily accessible to ISF members. A disclaimer emphasized the public nature of the information and limited ISF's liability. An important aspect of the database was that it would be updated twice a year for new events.

He then went on to demonstrate features of the database using real life questions that a company may ask, such as was there a need to design a QA program for zucchini varieties when all the company's seed production was done in Italy, Israel and Chile. He explained that the working group had focused on events dating from 2005 and after with the result that all the information older events were not in the database. Some deregulated events did not appear in the database depending on the regulatory process and how the country concerned classified deregulated events. Some specific situations like the production of US deregulated events in Chile (where they are not deregulated) were also not reflected at this stage in the database.

So although some more work remained on the database, it was planned to give access to ISF Members late in summer. He gave a brief outline of the next phase of the work - detection - and informed the audience he was resigning from the chairmanship of the working group. He thanked the working group, Radha Ranganathan and Bert Uijtewaal who chaired the sub group responsible for developing the database.

## 7. Tomato hybrids

Introducing the presentation on market trends in Asia the Chairman said it provided the context to the guidelines ISF had developed on handling a dispute over the unauthorised use of a proprietary line as a parent of a tomato hybrid variety. Unauthorised use of a parent line or the infringement of an intellectual property right represented a potential loss of revenue and return on investment for the original breeder.

### Market trends in Asia

The vegetable seed market was developing faster in Asia than in the other continents due to rapid conversion from local open pollinated varieties to value-added hybrids. In his presentation Arvind Kapur estimated the value of the vegetable industry in Asia to be more than US \$ 3 bn. In India alone the vegetable seed industry was worth USD 560 million. Only 15% of the total area was cultivated with tomato hybrids in 1996 when the first tomato hybrids were introduced to the market.

Today the area had grown to more than 85%. A total of 85 MT of tomato seed was sold by various companies and around 380 tomato hybrids adapted to different regions and with a wide range of disease resistances and quality traits were in the commercial chain. As hybrid seed production was still based on hand emasculation and pollination, parental lines were exposed to misuse by fly-by-night operators. The guidelines provided a mechanism by which investments in breeding could be safeguarded.

A Kapur explained the relatively recent law in India on the protection of hybrids and parental lines. Before a registration certificate for a hybrid was issued, parental lines had to be submitted as guard samples in case of dispute and for compulsory license applications. Hybrids already in the market could also be protected as an extant variety or variety of common knowledge. However, what was still unclear was if a line used only in the production of the hybrid could be registered as an extant or a new variety. The law was also unclear on the scope of protection available to the developer for extant varieties and what kinds of re-use were allowed.

There were questions from the audience on the Indian law on parental lines being put in the public domain after protection of the hybrid had expired and its compatibility with ISF's position that parental lines were the property of the breeder and should not be used even in further breeding.

### Guidelines for handling a dispute over the use of a proprietary parent line in a tomato hybrid

As a lot of effort goes into breeding and selecting the right combination of parent lines for hybrids, the unauthorised use of a parent line by a competitor represents a potential loss of revenue and return on investment for the original breeder. To be able to detect the unauthorised use of parental lines of tomato, ISF had initiated a study in three parts using 1100 functional SNP markers developed specifically for tomato to establish a threshold of genetic distance between a tomato hybrid and its parent lines.

Based on the study, the Simple Matching Percentage (SM%) was used as an index of genetic similarity to measure the match between alleles in the hybrid and the inbred line. The threshold was set at 99.90%. In other words, if the molecular method specified in the technical protocol gave an SM% of 99.9 or higher, the breeder of the protected parental line could launch an enquiry that required the breeder of the putative infringing hybrid to provide evidence that the proprietary line was not a parent of the hybrid variety.

In anticipation of the guidelines being adopted by the Section at this meeting, they had been sent to all ISF Members with the Congress documents.

Marcel Bruins presented a summary of the clarifications sought by some ISF Members during the comment period. As they were of a technical nature concerning the threshold that necessitated some additional work, he asked the Section to delay adopting the guidelines till 2013. In the meanwhile the Working Group would re-analyse the data and present its findings to tomato breeders for their consideration.

This proposal was approved.

### **8. Disease Resistance Terminology**

The revised version of the ISF paper *Definition of the Terms Describing the Reaction of Plants to Pests and to Abiotic Stresses for the Vegetable Seed Industry* was presented to the Section for adoption.

Disease resistance played an important role in vegetable breeding, crop production and integrated pest management practices. It was carefully described based on tests carried out with well-characterized isolates in controlled environmental conditions so that resistance claims were specific to biotypes, pathotypes, races or strains of the pest in question. However, in the deployment of a resistant variety in different markets, the level of resistance was sometimes affected by several factors. The presence or emergence of new pathotypes, biotypes, races or strains in some production areas resulted in the level of resistance in the field differing from what was claimed. The paper was revised to explain this natural phenomenon and to elaborate on the "limits" of a resistance claim.

R Ranganathan also explained editorial changes that had been made to the paper which comprised replacing "pest or pathogen" in the text by "pest" to be consistent with internationally accepted terms used by the Food and Agriculture Organisation, replacing the two levels of resistance "high/standard" and "moderate/intermediate" by "high" and "intermediate", respectively to correspond to their given acronyms HR and IR. Lastly, the last section of the paper was split into two to avoid combining two opposing thoughts, *use and avoid*.

All these changes and the modifications proposed by ISF Members during the comment period were discussed and agreed to by the Section except for the addition of the word "isolates" in the third paragraph of the introduction. A new proposal was not accepted due to procedural reasons and more importantly because it would result in the paper being inconsistent with the one adopted by the European Seed Association and in use by companies based in Europe.

The revised paper as presented by the Secretariat and with the deletion of the word "isolates" was adopted by the Section.

### **9. Looking forward: the ornamental sector in ISF**

As the active participation of the ornamental horticulture industry in the Section was relatively recent, Matt Kramer gave a general introduction to the sector, which he emphasized was a global one with local challenges.

He then gave an example of how the ornamental sector had leveraged its membership and representation in ISF to the advantage of both the breeders and consumers. Downy mildew caused by *Plasmopara obducens* a destructive foliar disease of the common garden impatiens (*Impatiens walleriana*), the second largest seed produced bedding plant in the world, had devastated the industry in the US and Europe in the past two years. As the extent and scale of the problem was new to the ornamental industry, companies were unsure on how to communicate with their customers.

The use of common terms based on the definitions adopted by this Section were used in communications in the form of webinars developed jointly by two large companies – itself a unique situation – late in 2011 and early 2012 to inform retailers, plug-producers, customers, growers and other breeders of the situation and the efforts made by the industry to address the problems. There had been no claims for damage this year and M Kramer attributed it in part to the common terms used in the webinars to successfully communicate that the problem was industry wide.

He presented the ornamental sector in Brazil which was worth USD 0.4 billion at the grower level and USD 2.2 billion at the consumer level. Production was concentrated in Southeast Brazil with 64% of all acreage, 89% of all green houses and 50% of net shades. Brazil was not a large exporter in the ornamental segment. Like the agricultural sector in general, the ornamental market was poised for growth despite two main issues, pest risk assessments (PRA) and the national registration of cultivars, that inhibited the import of seed into Brazil, limited the exposure of products to markets and stifled innovation.

Looking beyond Brazil to the industry worldwide, M Kramer concluded that the ornamental sector faced much the same problems as the vegetable sector: market access, access to genetic resources and intellectual property.

### **10. Evolution of the tomato and broccoli cases: possible direct and indirect impacts on the vegetable seed industry**

Bernard Le Buanec presented a summary of the tomato and broccoli cases, developments since the last Section meeting in Belfast and their potential consequence on the seed industry. At the heart of the two cases was interpretation of article 53(b) of the European Patent Convention, viz.,

what constitutes an “essentially biological process”. The Enlarged Board of Appeal (EBA) had considered the question and handed its decision in December 2010: if a process involved sexually crossing the whole genomes of plants and subsequently selecting plants it was “essentially biological”; but if such a process contained an additional step of a technical nature that introduced or modified a trait in the genome that was not the result of the mixing of the genes of the plants chosen for sexual crossing, then it was not excluded from patentability under Article 53(b).

Based on this decision, the patentees in both cases submitted new claims just on the products. In October 2011 the product claims in the broccoli case were accepted by the opposing parties. However, in the case of the tomato patent, the question whether claims on a product without any reference to a patentable production process were allowed was referred back to the EBA in November 2011. The decision of the EBA on whether the referral was admissible could take up to two years.

B Le Buanec was of the view that a decision by the EBA that allowed claims of products resulting from non-patentable essentially biological processes would lead to a paradoxical situation, as patenting of plant varieties was not allowed in Europe. It would be sufficient to patent a plant with certain specified characteristics to control all varieties with the same characteristics. This would, he argued, circumvent the spirit of the laws of intellectual property protection in Europe. The impact of the decision would be important for the vegetable seed industry and for the seed industry in general in terms of patentability of native traits, access to genetic resources and plant breeding.

He concluded his presentation by citing positions taken by some seed associations (European, German and French) and parliaments (European and German) following these cases: endorsing EBA’s 2010 definition of “essentially biological processes” and calling for the principle to be applied to resulting biological material. He recommended ISF to remain vigilant and ready to react in case of a new hearing by the EBA, and develop a position paper as the subject matter was important for the seed industry.

To a question on whether the expiry of a patent on a process impacted the patentability of a product derived using the said process, B Le Buanec said he didn’t see any link. The deciding factor was whether the process used was essentially biological. He was also asked what ISF was going to do in the circumstances to persuade the EBA that the product of an additional technical step that was outcome determinant should provide the basis for patentability. This was the position ISF took some years ago in a submission to the EBA, which the EBA rejected. B Le Buanec replied that in the

case cited, the technical step involved was the use of molecular markers, which the EBA probably decided wasn’t “instrumental” in the development of the product. He conceded that ISF hadn’t explained what it meant by instrumental.

On the remark that in a recent case in the Netherlands the judge had ruled that the product derived using an essentially biological process could not be patented as it rendered the exclusion of essentially biological processes from patenting meaningless, B Le Buanec said the decision was in line with the general mood in Europe.

As it was ostensibly the last time that B Le Buanec was going to make a presentation to the Section, A van Doornmalen asked the audience for a big applause.

#### **11. Biological and microbial pesticide seed treatments: what the future holds for vegetable crops**

Phyllis Himmel gave the Section an introduction to biopesticides and their use as seed treatments. Due to the intensifying pressure on pesticide end users, the ever growing regulatory oversight on chemical pesticides and the rising cost to discover and develop a synthetic molecule, the interest of the seed industry in biopesticides was increasing. This was evident from the number of buyouts, mergers and collaboration between seed companies and those in biopesticide research and development.

Biopesticides were natural products derived from plants, micro and other organisms that represent the lowest risk category of pest management products. They were safe to use (non-toxic, non-polluting, no residue), effective (improved plant health, synergistic with some chemicals, lower pest resistance) and gave a high return on investment (higher yields, faster EPA approval, quicker development). Biopesticides were of two kinds: microbial (metabolites requiring little or no additional processing) and biochemical (processed metabolites requiring proof of non-toxicity to target pests). They could be used alone, in rotation or tank-mixed with conventional chemicals to control pests (insects, nematodes and fungi), enhance plant health and increase yield.

She informed the audience of commonly used bioinsecticides, bionematicides and biofungicides that were used more often in conventional than organic production systems and this trend was expected to continue. It was also expected that more biopesticides than new chemicals would be registered in the coming years. There were numerous websites that provided information on developments in biopesticides and educational material on use.

To a question from the audience on whether the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits

Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity was likely to have an impact on the development of biopesticides, she briefly replied saying it would but its extent had to be debated. No other questions were taken due to lack of time.

## 12. Any other business

There was no other business.

## 13. Closing the meeting

Before closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked R Ranganathan and others in the Secretariat for preparing the meeting. He also informed the audience that the Vegetable and Ornamental Crop Section Board was considering how to increase the capacity of the Secretariat to manage the work that the vegetable industry wanted ISF to do on its behalf. The Section would be kept informed of the outcome of the deliberations in the Board.

He thanked all the speakers and called the meeting to a close.

\* \* \*

## Report of the Meeting of the Field Crops Section

Held on Thursday, 28 June 2012

Chairman: **Mr. Christoph Amberger** (DE)

### 1. Call to order, antitrust statement, adoption of the agenda

At 08.00 hrs the Chairman, Mr C. Amberger, opened the meeting of the Field Crops Section. He welcomed 128 delegates representing 27 countries (Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay), Regional Seed Associations (AFSTA, APSA, ESA, SAA) and International Organizations (ISTA, UPOV).

The antitrust policy of ISF was accepted by participants without objections; the agenda of this meeting was adopted as circulated, without additions or comments.

### 2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting (Belfast Congress Report, pp 20-26)

No further remarks were made to the minutes of previous meeting, approved by written procedure.

The Chairman informed that the agenda that had been prepared was intense and rich of new themes involving new crops that have not been discussed in other meetings. He reminded to the meeting the priorities that the Section Board had set: intellectual property (IP), innovation, public relations, information and education, free

movement of seed, statistics. He linked them to the presentations in the agenda. Before moving ahead, Mr Amberger thanked Mr Silmar Peske for the hard work done supporting the organization of the Congress and winning expert speakers to report on the specific crops and agriculture of Brazil.

### 3. Field crops and doing business in Brazil

Mr André Savino (Director of Soybeans Business at Syngenta Brazil) gave a speech about: "Field Crops Market and Business Dynamics in Brazil".

Brazil has two main agricultural regions; the Centre (approx 14.5 million ha) where large growers operate and the South (11 million ha) managed mostly by small and medium growers. The profile of Brazilian growers is usually segmented according to their annual purchase potential of inputs: those defined "mega growers" purchase more than 1.2 million US\$; the "big" are between 800 thousand and 1.2 million; a "medium grower" has an expenditure between 200 k US\$ and 800 k US\$, and a small grower buys below 200.000 US\$ a year. Growers believe in the potential of new genetics and traits and are willing to plant the most modern available germplasm, therefore they are good customers to the seed industry.

Agriculture represents 22% of the Country GDP. The field crops segment represents 60 to 70% of total agricultural area and reaches a value of 1.8 billion US \$ in 2007; today this value is estimated to have almost doubled and it is forecasted to continue growing up to 4.8 billion US\$ in the next 5 years especially due to the increase of soybeans; this crop is facing great success thanks to the introduction of new well adapted early varieties and new traits. The progress of soybeans has been impressive: 27.3 million hectares in 2007, 40.5 in 2012 and a projection of 46.2 in 2017.

The yield of soybeans has increased by 84% in 20 years vs. only 28% in the USA; the national average production yields in 2011/12 (3.0 t/ha) puts Brazil first in the world. Also other crops have had an impressive progression: corn +129%, cereals +93% and cotton +300%. Availability of new varieties and technologies developed nationally are at the base of this success. Rationalization of pasture land has made available large surfaces where crops grow successfully and even double cropping is possible like soybeans followed by corn.

There are 3 models in soybean seed market: breeding companies with a vertical business type develop, multiply and sell their germplasm; licensing companies that license varieties to multipliers who sell to growers; combined companies that breed, multiply and sell their elite varieties directly and license other varieties to distributors and coops. The first group covers

approx. 8% of the certified seed sold, another 70% is covered by companies of other segments and the remaining 20-22% is seed self-produced by growers (farm saved or white bag). Licensing represents 68% of the annual consumption of bagged seed. There are two types of licensees: in the Center, in the “Cerrado”, licensees are mostly large growers, farming oriented, who see an opportunity for capturing value; in the South licensees are mainly cooperatives, business oriented, that see in seed production an opportunity to complete the offer to growers

Concluding his speech, Mr Savino reminded that in Brazil agriculture and mainly field crops will continue growing; the main target remains yield increase; for staying in business it is important to have germplasm, technology and access to the market (cooperatives and farmers); local seed companies and dealers must be kept involved.

The Chairman thanked Mr Savino and opened to questions from the floor:

There was a question on what the situation of GMOs in Brazil is, if anybody can grow without any control and what is the situation of conventional - “GMO free”- soybeans production. The answer was that the use of GM soybean seed represents 90% of total, currently only the first generation of RR is authorized, the so-called “RR2” in combination with a BT trait is expected to be launched soon. Conventional soybeans are grown in the remaining 10% of surface; traders and elevators pay a premium for such grain to keep price competitive. Growers are not much willing to continue growing conventional because the yield is not as high as that of GM varieties and the premium price does not cover the difference. It is expected that this small segment will continue to exist because there is a request.

Another participant asked what the reasons for 84% increase in productivity were. The speaker said that the introduction of germplasm from abroad and the subsequent adaptation and local development of imported genetics to Brazilian conditions have played the biggest role in increasing productivity. Adoption of modern farming practices and availability of pesticides and fertilizers have completed the set of tools in the hands of farmers.

One more question was aimed at knowing what the land availability is without touching the forest. It was replied that according to unofficial analysis there are up to 200 million hectares of agricultural land - mainly pastures - that can be used for field crops by only rationalizing its use for cattle raise.

#### **4. Rice in Brazil: Research development and cultivation**

The second speaker, Mr Ricardo Blohm Bendzius (General Director Ricetec Mercosul, Brazil), gave a

presentation about: “Rice, a seed market to be explored”.

More than 90% of world rice is cultivated and consumed in Asia. Production and consumption will change in the next years due to the modification of diets as a consequence of an improved economic situation of populations.

Modern technologies will accelerate the change of growing areas and rice markets. Hybrid rice was created in China in 1976. The main driver for adoption of hybrid rice is yield (up to 20% higher than conventional varieties). Hybrid rice seed is being widely adopted in North America and in China; India is getting more and more interested as well as South America.

Mechanized production of hybrid rice seed is similar as for other species; key factors are: good management of the split at planting; matching of flowering period between male and female plants; selection of growing areas to manage weather conditions (temperature); adoption of appropriate agronomic practices to maximize the pollination potential of males and increase the yield of females.

Outside Asia, Mercosur is the most important region for production and consumption. In Brazil, rice is the third crop as far as seed sales; it represents 120 million US\$.

Two markets can be identified: upland, where the crop is grown with little availability of water, and lowland, where rice is grown in wet conditions. In the South America the use of certified seed is very much differing from country to country: 98% in Uruguay, 20% in Argentina. In Brazil this percentage goes from 26% in Mato Grosso to 70% in Santa Catarina.

According to Mr Blohm Bendzius, important success factors for a hybrid rice seed company to stay on the market are: continue to innovate, work with the distribution chain to enforce IP protection and traceability and persist with growers’ education. In future, with the introduction of GM rice, sound stewardship activities and legal enforcement of patents will be necessary. There are still many opportunities for improvement; new traits (for instance insect resistance) in addition to the most used Clearfield resistance; yield enhancement; optimization of water consumption; seed treatment; to work with grain millers to accept new varieties, with equipment manufacturers to jointly develop drilling machines that can optimize standings and reduce seed rate.

The Chairman thanked Mr Bendzius and gave the floor to participants who made several questions:

- Are there hybrid rice varieties available for upland cultivation? - Yes, in Brazil there is one available already in Mato Grosso.

- What is the hybridization system in use for rice seed? - The system is based on conventional crossings based on CMS material; there are 2 ways and 3 ways hybrids.

- It is said that hybrid introduction is still not very successful in some Asian regions due to grain quality, is it correct? - This may be correct; pro-capita consumption is decreasing but quality of grain becomes more and more important Asian consumers prefer sticky, South Americans soft, tender and released grain. In addition, the processing chain of a region is developed to work with rice varieties that exist and are consumed there, it will take time and efforts to work with processors to have them adapt their industrial methods to new characteristics of hybrid varieties.

- GM rice has been mentioned as future possibility, some additional details? - There are breeding programs for GM rice, some are already public other are still not completely disclosed; the main lines currently advanced are herbicide resistance (Liberty Link) and insect resistance (Bt).

- A delegate from Argentina underlined that yes there is a huge difference in the use of certified seed between his country and Uruguay but the two national seed laws are completely different so the enforcement of the law and limitation of farm saved seed are completely different.

## 5. Soybeans in South America

Mr Rodolfo Rossi (Director of Research Nidera Argentina) was invited to speak about "Soybean in Latin America".

In the international economic environment South America is said to be "the food reserve of the world". At present a huge portion of the production is soybeans. It is the main source for proteins in all kind of food and feed processes. Brazil and Argentina are the world largest producers and suppliers of soybean grain and soybean oil; they are also becoming main suppliers of bio-diesel with 40% of oil transformed to Diester. China is today the main importing country of soybean grain with more than 50 million tons per year plus several million tons of soy oil.

The increase of production in the past 15 years was analyzed in three selected countries: in Argentina it grew 287%, in Brazil it went up 198% and in USA 40%. The adoption of new better adapted varieties and of GM technologies jointly with the increase of acreage devoted to this crop are the reasons of this growth. It is expected that the world soybean demand will further increase. Asia will be demanding more soy for food and feed, Europe mainly for feed; in addition the consumption for agro-fuel from soy will gain importance. Productivity (higher yields, less input) will be the key for success.

Mr Rossi explained that other than widely reported in Brazil agriculture and namely soybean cultivation does not touch significantly the Amazonian rain forest, it is still at more than 80% of its original size. Soybeans are grown in farmland that is being switched from extensive pasture to modern (mostly no-tillage) cropping; double crop is common with soybeans drilled in the straws of a field where corn was harvested thus reducing water and energy consumption and preserving the natural environment.

He gave an example for Brazil: currently for the amount of meat produced in Brazil more than 120 million hectares are necessary; increasing the efficiency of cattle rising at the level of Argentina, more than 25 million of these hectares will become available for other crops.

The evolution of crop techniques and the "tropicalization" of soybeans allowed the extensive and rudimentary occupation of the "Cerrado" to be replaced by an activity based on technology, with economic, social and environmental sustainability.

Herbicide resistant GM Soybeans in South America represent 83% of total soybeans grown in Brazil and between 95 and 100% in Uruguay Argentina and Paraguay. The adoption of this technology was extremely fast: starting from zero in 3 or 4 years it has reached the maximum in each country.

A list of 10 benefits of RR soybeans for farmers was shown on screen: from higher yield to better management of weeds, from cost reduction to less impact on environment.

The economic benefits of biotechnology in Brazil are calculated at 3.6 billion US\$: 78% of this amount goes to soybeans, 18% to corn and 4% to cotton; 63% of these benefits are cost savings. In Argentina, the benefits of planting Glyphosate resistant soybean are estimated at 65 billion US\$ 73% of which goes to farmers, 21% to taxes and duties and only 6% to the providers of technology and seed.

The enforcement level of IP protection in the 4 main soybean producing countries in South America is widely different and depending from the specific protection mechanism. Argentina and Paraguay are at 40%, Brazil at 82% and Uruguay at 95% for germplasm protection rates; for biotech traits Argentina and Uruguay are at 0% Brazil and Paraguay at 95%.

Closing his presentation and to emphasize the role of research and innovation Mr Rossi showed a chart prepared by P. Golbitz at Illinois University and explained that for the projected world demand of soybeans of year 2020 almost 140 million hectares will be needed but with a 1% additional yield improvement delivered by research the current acreage of 100 million hectares would be sufficient to cover those needs and with a 2%

growth of production, that quantity could be produced with less land than today.

A delegate asked of resistant weeds arising where herbicide resistant crops are broadly adopted. The answer was that weeds resistant or tolerant to glyphosate are a concern and that there is a series of actions being implemented: additional GM resistance traits, return to old products, adoption of herbicide combinations, better education on use of herbicides, rotation of crops and of herbicides.

Another participant wanted to know the reasons for higher soybean yields in Brazil compared to the USA. Mr Rossi replied that in the USA yield remained almost flat in the last 15 years and soybeans are often seen as “a crop between two corn crops” whilst in South America soybeans is the main crop

One last question was about the future introduction of insect tolerant traits and the possible refuge area that will be adopted. The speaker said that so far a 20% refuge area is anticipated but could be reduced to 10%.

## **6. Update on international programs and initiatives on wheat**

Then Grégoire Berthe (General Manager of Céréales Vallée) provided an update on International Programs and Initiatives on Wheat addressing the need to increase the global efforts in wheat breeding.

The “Wheat Initiative” is a public international research initiative for wheat improvement. It has been endorsed by G20 member states to improve food security. This initiative has been supported by research and funding organizations of G20 and non-G20 countries. The objective is to identify synergies by developing an open communication between research and technology development programs. Wheat is a worldwide key crop providing calories and proteins to populations of developed and developing countries. Investments are disproportionately low given the importance of this species. The tasks of the initiative are to link the research and breeding programs around the world, to detect what needs to be done and to coordinate the efforts and to develop databases and common protocols.

A kickoff meeting of the organization took place September 2011; a governance structure has been created; a centralized information system has been implemented; a website created and a strategic plan produced. The Initiative needs supporters and members, annual fees are reasonable and affordable, companies and institutions are welcome to participate and sustain this activity. Mr Berthe is available to provide more information and details.

The second part of the presentation was about sequencing of the wheat genome. The Sequencing

Consortium is designed to accelerate wheat improvement to be adaptable to deliver products and tools to breeders. Launched in 2005 the Consortium is co-chaired by 6 scientists from Australia, USA, France, Switzerland and Japan; it has 23 financing sponsors. Sequencing is important to deliver tools to scientists to develop breeding programs. The size of wheat genome is 40 times that of rice, is hexaploid and has plenty of transposal elements: the analysis is extremely challenging. The combined strategies are: physical mapping of individual chromosomes, survey sequencing of chromosomes and the sequencing itself. At this date the chromosome sequencing is completely funded and should be completed by 2013, surveying is almost achieved but sequencing is not that advanced: the objective is to gather missing funding and commitment from different countries to finalize the sequencing.

The floor was open to questions.

A participant reminded that few years ago there was a report on a hybrid wheat initiative and asked if this initiative is included in this new one presented. The speaker replied that it is completely different, the Wheat Initiative is a public coordination of programs around the world; the Hybrid Initiative is still running independently and is not yet included maybe it will in the future.

A delegate said that a publicly financed wheat research is very interesting but there is the risk that focus is lost in the translational work to get knowledge transformed into germplasm that can be commercially used. Mr Berthe replied that in the program there is a section devoted to study and propose how to transfer knowledge into practical research.

Another question was aimed at knowing if there is any effort done in re-synthesizing wheat by using original ancestor species. The answer was that yes there are programs aimed at reinitiate the mixture between the three genomes but it requires coordination and agreement on efforts required to widening the availability of germplasm.

The Vice Secretary-General of UPOV noted that the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) had recently adopted a new policy on IP and asked if it could have a positive impact on enabling the research of CGIAR centers, including CIMMYT to get into farmers’ hands. The speaker answered that yes, it is a positive sign.

## **7. Conclusive report of the Working Group on Royalty Collection**

Mr Frank Curtis, Chairman of the ISF Working Group on Royalty Collection and Breeders Remuneration was invited to present the Conclusive Report of the survey on wheat royalty collection systems.

Opening his speech, Mr Curtis thanked the co-editor, Malin Nilsson for the editorial work, the authors from each participating country for the factual support given furnishing data and information, the ISF Secretariat and the Chairman of the Section, Mr Amberger, for the support given to this project.

He then moved to give an overview of what the publication will look like and its structure. The table of contents has 3 first sections dedicated to: concepts of intellectual property in seed, how it is protected and how royalty collection works; a review of the current and prevailing IP protection mechanisms where other protection systems are discussed besides plant breeder's rights; an analysis of the situation in the 14 participating countries: tools for enforcement like certification systems, enforcement systems and prevailing agriculture techniques which have an effect on IP protection. The fourth section is a detailed review of the situation in each of the 14 participating countries.

The speaker said that key findings of this project were that between territories there are important differences on the amount of royalties collected and consequently on the level of funding research; that the presence of a sui generis IP protection system on its own it is not enough to ensure an efficient collection of royalties, the most efficient territories have enforcement tools to enforce IP like for example mandatory certification, national seed laws or voluntary FSS reporting systems.

Having completed the survey on wheat the Working Group will look at soybeans because this is a similar self pollinating crop, it is present in different areas of the world and the issues are similar.

The following observations and questions were brought forward:

The Vice Secretary-General of UPOV congratulated ISF and the WG for the excellent work done and observed the usefulness of these findings for current and future UPOV members. He suggested making the report available in languages other than English. The Section Chairman confirmed ISF's willingness and availability to prepare the document in other languages which shall be done in direct collaboration of National Associations under the supervision of ISF. A delegate commented that it would be useful to make the document available in electronic pdf version for easier and faster circulation.

The Chairman asked the meeting for a formal approval of the document which was given by applause and authorized for circulation.

Mr Amberger added that the members of the Working Group have devoted considerable time and effort for merit of the Association and its

industry members. He thanked the members for this commitment and especially Frank Curtis for the excellent result achieved.

Next item was the proposal to create a new Working Group for Innovation in Wheat. The Chairman informed that the Field Crops Section has among items in its working program 'progress and technology in wheat'. Mr Brian Gerard was proposed by the Board to chair the Working Group. He said that the idea is simple: the WG will gather, provide and circulate information and will create a forum for discussion of the initiatives and programs around wheat. He added that people who want to participate in the WG personally or via fellows in their organization are most welcome and asked them to indicate their interest directly to him or the Secretariat.

### **8. Election of Section Board Members**

The Composition of the Section Board was next item in the agenda.

New nominations received are: Bruno Carette (France), Nigel Moore (United Kingdom), Lomo van Rensburg (South Africa). The Chairman asked the meeting to approve these new members by applause and welcomed them to the Section Board. All confirmations received (as per list 12.091) were also approved by applause. Finally Mr Amberger announced the intention to step down from his function as the Chairman of the Field Crops Section and informed that Mr Brian Gerard (USA) will be taking that position for the next period. The assembly approved with applause the new Chairman. The Section Board has two vacant vice chairmen positions, which should be filled as soon as possible. .

From the floor Mr Bernard Le Buanec on behalf of the Section thanked Mr Amberger for the work done in the last 6 years as Chairman of the Field Crops Section.

### **9. Other business**

Next meeting will be during the 2013 ISF Congress in Athens. The Board of the Section will have a mid-term meeting at the end of October 2012 in Montevideo.

### **10. Closing the meeting**

Since there were no other business to discuss, the Chairman thanked the speakers for their excellent contributions, the participants for their presence and active participation, the Secretariat for the organization of the program and called the meeting to a close at 10.15 hrs.

\* \* \*

## Report of the Meeting of the Forage and Turf Crops Section

Held on Thursday, 28 June 2012

---

Chairman: **Mr. John Gilbert** (UK)

### 1. Call to order, antitrust guidelines and adoption of the agenda

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 11.00 hrs and welcomed, according to the attendance list, 90 participants from the following 24 countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay; as well as ISF guests from APSA, ESA, SAA and ISTA, OECD, UPOV.

There were no further comments to the anti-trust guidelines. There was one request to discuss EDV in Ryegrass under 'Other business'. With that addition the agenda was adopted.

### 2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting (Belfast Congress Report, pp 26-28)

The minutes had been adopted by written procedure. There were no further comments.

### 3. Election of Section Board Members

The Chairman proposed the (re-)election of the Section Board members that had been announced in circular 12.092-a, which had been sent out to all ISF members with the congress documents. The following persons were up for (re-)election: JP Angenendt (DE), G. Dabrowski (PL), D. Dziver (CA), S. van der Heijden (NL), K. Kainuma (JP), B. Lever (ZA), J. McKenzie (NZ), I. Misselbrook (UK), G. Picasso (AR), T. Schmid (CH), C. Tabel (FR) and G. Tombolan (IT).

The Section approved these nominations unanimously through a round of applause.

### 4. The Forage and Turf Seed Industry in Brazil

The Chairman gave the floor to Mr. Francisco Dübbern de Souza who provided an overview of the Brazilian Turf and Forage Seed Industry. The estimated market value was between 100-200 million USD per year. He provided information on the cultivated pastures in Brazil, volume and value of the forage seed market, the import and export of species, seed categories and cultivar protection. As main biological constraints to the commercial seed production of tropical grasses and legumes he identified: a low seed set (grasses), the readiness to shed or dehisce, a prolonged flowering period and seed dormancy.

The main challenges for seed companies were of a legal nature though many phytosanitary requirements in the international market, the

competition from illegal seeds and lax legal standards. As financial challenges an overvalued national currency and market seasonality could be mentioned. How to promote a 'commodity', the excessive emphasis on *Brachiaria* spp. and the large market share represented by unsophisticated customers were seen as main marketing challenges.

He predicted that the future would see a reduction in the number of companies, a greater market emphasis on protected cultivars, the development of niche markets, a greater participation of international companies, a greater number of marketed species/cultivars, a greater interest in seed certification, the clients would become more discriminant and sophisticated and the sale of implanted pastures instead of seeds.

The Chairman thanked the speaker for his contribution and he was warmly applauded. He then opened the floor for questions. A question was raised what was meant with implanted pastures. This meant that instead of selling seeds, a company would go to the field and would plant with a guaranteed minimum of explants per square meter. A participant asked what the size of the illegal market in seeds was. The speaker indicated that the data he had provided on import and export were derived from the Ministry of Industry and Development, so these were real data. But he had no data for the size of the illegal market. However, he did recognize that this was an important market segment, especially in Southern Brazil.

With regards to the expectation that there would be a greater number of marketed species in the future, a participant wanted to know which other species this would concern. The presenter indicated that currently the market is too much concentrated on *Brachiaria*. In the future, species like *Paspalum*, *Cynodon* and tropical legumes will get greater importance.

### 5. Herbage seed lot size experiment

The Chairman invited Mr. Michael Muschick, Secretary-General of ISTA to the floor. He provided an update on the ISTA/ISF Experiment on Herbage Seed Lot Size by going over the general conditions of the experiment, the sampling and testing requirements and the number of tested seed lots per species. 22 company plants had participated from 4 countries and all of those had met the requirements and were approved. He also presented the proposal for a permanent regime of which the monitoring had a gradually decreasing monitoring rate provided the seed lots proved to be sufficiently homogeneous. During the last ISTA meeting the ISTA members had accepted the permanent regime with a large majority which would come into force on the 1st of July 2013. Only two countries had voted against. He did add that for a smooth international seed trade similar

conditions needed to be approved by OECD and the EU.

At the end of his presentation, he thanked Max Soepboer in his role as coordinator of the ISTA/ISF Herbage seed Lot Size Experiment and Leena Pietilä in her role as Chairperson of the ISTA Bulking and Sampling Committee. The Chairman thanked the speaker for his contribution and he was warmly applauded. He then started with a question himself asking what level of testing there is on the 10 tons seed lots to ensure that these lots are homogeneous. According to the speaker there was currently no monitoring of the homogeneity of the 10 ton lots. The Chairman then speculated that possibly the 25 ton lots were more homogeneous than the 10 ton lots. The speaker had no hard data on this. A participant from the audience added that already 25 years ago in the first experiment it was shown that the 25 tons lots were more homogeneous than the 10 ton lots.

A question was raised whether the Section could play a role in facilitating the adoption of the permanent regime in OECD. The speaker added that both countries were member of the OECD Seed Schemes and the adoption was on the agenda of the meeting of the OECD Seed Schemes which is to take place in two weeks from now. M. Bruins of the ISF Secretariat added that the two countries were Hungary and Australia, and he was aware that also New Zealand had some concerns about the proposal for a permanent regime. He added that ISF directly after the last ISTA meeting had started an outreach effort towards these three countries, hoping that this would lead to unanimous approval in the next OECD meeting.

A participant wanted to know how easy it was to add new species. The presenter replied that the proposal to add a new species could be put forward; it would then be discussed in the relevant ISTA Committee(s) and eventually be decided in the General Assembly.

#### **6. Natural turf: Why it remains the natural choice for football, sports and playing surfaces**

Gert van Straalen, chairman of the ESA Section Forage Plants and Amenity Grasses, was given the floor to make his presentation in which he underlined ESA's efforts to re-promote the use of natural turf. A recently published report which explains the differences with plastic grass and shows the benefits of natural turf was available on the ESA website. Target groups were decision makers, politicians, mayors, city council members, sporting bodies, regional authorities, press, general public and web search engines.

The brochure had resulted in quite some progress in different EU countries, such as UK, FR, DK, SE,

DE and Benelux. The ESA Working Group would continue its efforts vigorously, and would engage with national organizations in Europe. It would continue to inform the relevant decision makers and contact relevant organizations. It was also encouraging all participants to the ISF Congress to spread the message around the globe.

The participants thanked the speaker for his contribution with a round of applause, after which the Chairman opened the floor for questions. A participant underlined that artificial turf saw a higher incidence of injuries. The speaker confirmed this and added that artificial turf had certainly improved mainly through the use of rubber infill, but from different viewpoints this was certainly not a good solution.

A participant added that during the current European Soccer Championship a form of plastic grass had been sown into natural turf and wanted to know if this had worked. Indeed, in two stadiums a hybrid solution was used where artificial fiber was 'planted' in between the natural turf. In some cases it seemed to be working, but on other pitches the results had been a disaster.

In Switzerland another solution had been found by laying a thick sod over the artificial turf during the football season, and then during the summer remove the sod and organize large events such as concerts on the pitch.

The International Football Association FIFA is still supporting artificial turf, so convincing FIFA of the benefits of natural turf was still one of the aims. But so far ESA had not yet contacted FIFA.

#### **7. OECD seed certification and the need for harmonization**

The Chairman then invited Mr. Michael Ryan, Head of the OECD Seed Schemes to the floor. Mr. Ryan explained about the objectives of OECD Seed Certification which was to facilitate trade, encourage the use of high quality seed and to authorise the use of labels and certificates for seed produced and processed for international trade, according to agreed principles. This is to be done through the harmonisation of certification procedures based on varietal identity and varietal purity. The Seed Schemes also provide a set of international seed standards & rules for field inspection and certification. The main instruments were the OECD Seed Schemes Rules and Regulations 2012, the OECD List of Varieties, the Guidelines for Control Plot Tests & Field Inspection of Seed Crops and Labelling. The implementation of the Schemes is under the authority of the National Designated Authority (NDA).

58 countries are currently participating in the Seed Schemes, and there were seed schemes for 7 groups of crops, including one for Grasses and

Legumes. He then explained the different labels and the procedures for resolving disputes, which would be to first contact the NDA in the country, then (if no resolution could be found) contact the OECD Secretariat, and ultimately find a workable solution. If two or more complaints are received from NDA's about another country, the OECD can decide to launch an evaluation mission to the country concerned. All this information was also available on the OECD website. The participants thanked the speaker for his contribution with a round of applause.

The Chairman raised the question whether the certifying country is legally liable if there are financial consequences of a seed lot being wrongly approved. The speaker underlined that it would depend on the nature of the problem. It would need to be brought up to the NDA first and the problem may or may not be related to the OECD Schemes. It would need to be investigated if there is a deficiency and if the rules were applied consistently. There is a system of checks and balances in place. In case there is no satisfactory communication from the NDA the company may decide to bring it up to the OECD Secretariat who would then evaluate the information.

In most OECD countries the NDA is appointed by the government and only in a few exceptions the authority is delegated to an agency.

The Chairman then drew attention to an OECD country that was using a disclaimer on the certificate that stated that they were not liable for anything wrong and asked for the view of the OECD on this. The speaker mentions that in his recollection there was only one country using such a disclaimer. There were on-going discussions within the OECD how to solve that problem and there was a WG within the OECD Bureau looking at all aspects, incl. such legal aspects.

A proposal was made to get all 58 OECD member countries to agree to accept a variety once it is approved in one country, as currently it was costing companies a fortune to get their varieties accepted on all the different lists. The speaker explained that the system had gotten better and faster, and new varieties were now added to the electronic version of the variety list on a monthly basis.

M. Bruins then asked the speaker to expand on the possibility that the seed lot size experiment would also get approval in the OECD Seed Schemes meeting that would take place in 2 weeks' time, and what ISF can do to facilitate adoption. It was answered that an OECD WG had prepared a paper that would be up for discussion at the next OECD meeting. He reminded the audience that all decisions in OECD are by consensus, so all 58 member countries must agree. He was aware of the fact that some of the

OECD member countries had some concerns over the seed lot size experiment.

The ISF Secretariat wanted to know why in the OECD document there was a proposal to delay the finalization of the experiment from 2013 to 2015. In view of the Secretariat all companies have lived up to requirements and a large majority of the seed lots had proven to be sufficiently homogeneous. There seemed to be no scientific evidence to propose a delay.

The speaker would not like to pre-empt the discussion that would take place in two weeks from now.

## **8. Other business**

S. van der Heijden explained that a publication was in the pipeline about the results of the EDV study in ryegrass. However, the author was caught up in too much work, and had not gotten around finalizing the paper. He proposed to form a writing group and finalize this publication, and he would organize a meeting in August 2012. The intended journal was Crop Science. This was agreeable to the Section.

## **9. Closing the meeting**

With no other business to discuss, the Chairman thanked all the speakers and participants for their contributions and closed the meeting at 12.30 hrs.

\* \* \*

## **Report of the Meeting of the Seed Treatment and Environment Committee**

**Held on Thursday, 28 June 2012**

Chairman: **Mr. Greg Lamka (US)**

### **1. Call to order, antitrust statement and adoption of the agenda**

At 13.30 hrs the Chairman, Mr Greg Lamka, called the meeting to order and welcomed 104 participants representing 26 countries (Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine and United States), and guests of Regional Seed Associations (APSA, ESA) and International Organization (ISTA).

The antitrust statement that was circulated with the congress document was accepted by delegates.

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

### **2. Minutes of the Belfast Meeting Belfast Congress Report, pp 28-31)**

The minutes of previous meeting had been approved by written procedure; there were no additional remarks during this meeting.

### **3. Regulatory challenges in the Latin American region and their impact on seed treatment**

The Chairman invited Ms Arlinda Evaristo (Regulatory Manager at Syngenta Brazil) to give a presentation on “Regulatory Challenges in Latin America Region and their Impact on Seed Treatment”.

As in the rest of the world also in Latin America seed treatment falls under the category of crop protection products. Based on each country’ legislation, the regulations and approach to product registration in Latin America can be categorized: as medium-high, medium-low or low stringency. The time required for approval of a new compound varies broadly: some nations can do it in a year whilst others, like Brazil, may take up to 4 years. Since 1934 Brazil has a regulation for pesticides; it was updated in July 1989 and now encompasses research, experimentation, classification, production, packing and labeling, transportation, storage, commercialization, commercial advertising, utilization, importation, exportation, final destination of residues and packages. Three Ministries are involved in approval and authorization of products: ANVISA (the National Agency for Health, government area of the Ministry of Health) performs the toxicological evaluation, classification, issues Label’s Health Precautions and publishes the active ingredient monographs including MRLs; the Ministry of Agriculture is in charge of efficacy evaluations and approval of uses recommendations; IBAMA (Brazilian Environmental Institute of Natural Renewable Resources, government area of the Ministry of Environment) runs environmental evaluation, classification and issues environmental recommendations for labelling. Registration is granted only after all 3 evaluations processes have been completed.

In December 2011 a new regulation has been issued: the Normative Instruction NI42. It covers efficacy trials and the control on research centres, ranging from accreditation of R&D stations, to field trials inspection. The new regulation main changes include requirements for reporting efficacy trials, which now include yield improvement, and new criteria for seed safety and seedlings when the product is used as seed treatment. The timeline of registration of a new active ingredient (a.i.) has been increased. A new regulation from ANVISA, which is under discussion, increases the complexity for new a.i.’s approval, incorporating cut-off criteria, which are based on precautionary principle application rather than science.

The increased complexity of the protocols and requirements puts Brazil as one of the more challenging regulatory systems impacting new a.i. registration approval and banning many of the already registered ones.

Concluding her presentation the speaker mentioned that due to the complexity involving communication of science and political aspects, the negotiations and strategic views are critical to deal with the regulations and to demonstrate the scientific sides and benefits of crop protection and seed treatment products.

After Ms. Evaristo’s presentation the floor was open for questions.

A participant asked if in Latin America there are any efforts to harmonize requirements across countries. The speaker replied that there are countries implementing similar systems aimed at harmonization, others that want to remain unique like Brazil.

Since it was mentioned that Brazil followed the example from EU, another delegate wanted to know how that happened: was it a result of structural dialog, of observation of what has been done or coincidence? The answer was that possibly it was all of them, mainly communication and information availability.

### **4. Summary report on seed treatment use in world regions**

The next section of the program was an update on Seed Treatment in the world regions.

- Mr Roland Gallow (Bayer CropScience-Germany) was invited to give an overview of new products that his company has developed and is launching.

The speaker told about a new seed treatment that was just introduced for use in field crops. From the floor it was asked what are the efforts developing the use of these products for vegetable crops; the speaker answered that at the moment focus is mainly on field crops.

- Mr Christian Schlatter (Syngenta Crop Protection-Switzerland) was then given the floor.

He said that his company was working hard to provide the right tools for crop establishment; it had a strong current portfolio and many new items in the pipeline. These products fall in all crop protection categories: seed applied fungicides, insecticides and nematocides.

### **5. The new Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com)**

The Chairman reported to participants about the new Seed Applied Technologies Committee for which the acronym SAT-Com has been proposed.

The seed industry is seeing new and interesting seed applied products coming to the market

adding significant functionality to the germplasm. These components (germplasm, traits, & seed applied technologies) come together in-the-bag as an integrated or holistic product approach for the seed industry.

This is why in the past year there had been an effort to move the STEC to a standing committee, renaming it Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com). The members were very excited about the new opportunity to have more visibility and to work on important projects; the Chairman would have a seat on the ISF Board of Directors and providing an opportunity to gain additional support. The selection process for membership of the new committee had been a challenge: there were 32 nominations for 15 seats; this being a great signal of the interest that the seed industry has in this sector.

During the last meeting of the STEC the members had proposed to begin with the new Committee identifying areas of interest and creating several Working Groups. The first suggestions were:

1-Seed treatment technologies - this will be addressing application, stewardship, agronomy; in short the technical part of this activity.

2-Regulatory environment - looking at ai registration and harmonization; looking at other ways allowing products coming to market quickly; labeling of Treated Seed (in some countries this is product by product)

3-Stakeholders management - internal/external communication to people interested and impacted; provide sustainability information; promotion to the public directly or through other organizations, for example the food industry.

The STEC would be disbanded during the General Assembly following this meeting and the new SAT-Com and its new membership would be officially approved.

As a Chairman Mr Lamka said that he would like to get this new committee off and running as quickly as possible: teleconference sessions would be organized soon to formalize the working groups and identify individuals to chair them. He added that participation in the working groups would be beyond the membership of the Committee and those interested in volunteering time and resources were invited to contact the Committee.

The Chairman discussed a current outreach project with the Gates Foundation, who is interested in expanding Seed Applied Technology in the developing world like areas of Africa. A global meeting is being planned and the Foundation has asked the ISF to help identify key stakeholders. In the field of education and information, the STEC has organized seminars in the past: Chile, India, Czech Republic and Zambia.

The APSA has expressed an interest in organizing an educational seminar in its region; the SAT-Com will continue this as well.

## **6. Composition of the new Standing Committee**

The names of the 15 members were proposed on screen as per document 12.093. They represent all sectors of the Committee scope: 6 from the seed industry, 5 from Crop Protection and 4 from technologies and application; almost all world regions are represented.

A participant asked why the environment is not anymore in the name and maybe in the scope of the committee since it was a good signal to the public. The answer was that environment meant a lot of different things to people; for this reason the suggestion was to drop it.

## **7. Other business**

Dimitri Pauwels, Head Seed Care EAME for Syngenta, was asked by STEC to present and discuss the situation of seed treatment based on chloronicotinyl insecticides (CNIs) in the EU.

In June the French Agriculture Minister announced that he considers withdrawing the authorization of use of Cruiser OSR in oilseed rape in France after a study published by INRA apparently showed behavioural effects on bees. Following this announcement there has been public comment, but unfortunately not much scientific information brought forth.

Reaction from the European Commission (EC) DG Sanco was to request EFSA with a technical evaluation to investigate the use of CNIs and assess the potential impact on bees. The study is expected to report back an evaluation and recommendations by the end of 2012. The European Union (EU) and its Members States will have to consider the findings of the EFSA study. The speaker pointed out that currently CNIs are the only efficacious insecticide alternative growers have, especially for oil seed rape where 95% of seed in Europe is today treated with these products. The message should be that scientific evidence is in favour of seed applied technologies and the Crop Protection Industry is implementing the right stewardship and cooperation with regulators.

A participant added a couple of points: the importance of good data supplied to the EC and good socio economic data is helpful when the signs are not clear. It has been also clear that if the scientific findings suggest some problem with the products all social data will not prevail. One further comment about the work that European Seed Association (ESA) did to create and establish the "European Seed Treatment Assurance" accreditation scheme (ESTA): the way

products are being used is key; this is beyond Europe; we heard that Brazil is looking at EU legislation, so other countries may also. The speaker commented that we need to realize this is a challenge we all face, all industry, whatever can be done to help the seed industry is welcome. It is utmost important to have a joined team effort rather than rely on a couple of organizations to make things happen.

The Chairman added that the answer is high quality seed, clean seed, good treatment application, good practices. It is not only a manufacturing responsibility but of the entire seed distribution channel.

## 8. Closing the meeting

There being no other business the Chairman thanked the speakers, the delegates and the Secretariat and called the meeting to a close.

\* \* \*

## ISF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**Held on Thursday, 28 June 2012**

Chairman: **Mr. Truels Damsgaard** (DK), President ISF.

### 1. Call to order, antitrust statement, roll call

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 15.30 hrs.

He reminded the audience of the ISF Antitrust Guidelines, circulated with the Congress documents.

The Chairman made the roll call. 153 participants attended the meeting.

The following members were present or represented by proxy:

**Ordinary members:** Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Poland, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

**Associate members:** France: Bayer CropScience, Groupe Limagrain; Germany: KWS Saat; Luxemburg: Barenbrug Semences; Netherlands: Monsanto Holland; Russia: Agrofirma Gavrish; Switzerland: Monsanto International, Syngenta Seeds; Tunisia: Agriprotec; United States: Monsanto, Pioneer Hi-Bred International; Zambia: Zambia Seed Co. Ltd.

The number of votes present or represented was 194 for Ordinary members and 41 for Associate members, making a total of 235 or 64.4%. As the total of votes for the Federation was 365, with a

required quorum of one third, the General Assembly was validly constituted.

### 2. Adoption of the agenda

There were no additional comments to the agenda circulated with the Congress documents. The agenda was unanimously adopted.

### 3. Comments from the Sections/Committees further to their meetings

There were no comments to the meetings of the Sections and Committees.

### 4. ISF membership

#### 4.1 *Election of new ISF members*

The Chairman referred to the list of applications 12.094 and 12.094-a circulated with the Congress documents and shown on screen.

There were no additional comments. No opposition was voiced.

The General Assembly unanimously elected the following members with warm applause:

**Ordinary members:** Afghanistan National Seed Organization (ANSOR), Afghanistan; Seed Association of Ukraine, Ukraine; Ukrainian Seed Partnership Association, Ukraine.

**Associate members:** Bahar Agricultural & Seeds Co. Ltd, Afghanistan; Golden Field, Algeria; Wolf Seed do Brazil, Brazil; Global Seeds Inc, India; Ayesha Bazar Delta, Iran; Hamon Bazar, Iran; Zarin Daneh Keshtzar, Iran; Auriga Seed Corporation, Pakistan; Agrofirma Sedek Ltd, Russia; Green Carpet Co Ltd, Russia; Intersemillas, Spain; Hancock Seed Company, United States.

**Affiliate members:** Trandos Hydroponic Growers, Australia; GSP Crop Science Pvt Ltd, India; Darui Keshavarz, Iran; Rahrovane Rooyeshe Sabz Co, Iran; ASM Advance Sorting Machine, Italy; Akyurek Technology, Turkey.

**Tree & Shrub Seed Group:** Su International Forest Tree Seeds, Turkey; Mistletoe-Carter Seeds, United States.

**Observer Ordinary members for two years:** National Seed Council of Sudan, Sudan.

#### 4.2 *Discontinuation of membership*

The Chairman explained that some memberships would be discontinued, as per list 12.095 circulated prior to the Congress, for reasons of resignation or non-payment for two years as follows:

**Associate members:** Agriset, Spain; Rossiyskie Semena, Russia; Trade House Vassma, Ukraine.

**Tree and Shrub Seed Group members:** Intersemillas, Spain; Beck to Nature Co, United States; Ets. M. Ivanov, Bulgaria; Pastoral Engineering and Trading Co Ltd, Turkey.

**Observer Ordinary members after two years:** Gambia Agrochemical and Seed Trade Association, the Gambia; Sudan Seed Trade Association, Sudan.

The General Assembly took note and did not add any comments.

## 5. Adoption of the revised ISF Rules and Usages for the Trade in Seeds for Sowing Purposes

The Chairman gave the floor to Huib Ghijsen, Chairman of the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee (TARC), who reported on the outcome of the open meeting of the Committee held the previous day.

The document 12.103-a shown on screen was presented without the comments in blue sent by Bernard Le Buanec, Those comments had been withdrawn by B. Le Buanec, as they had been meant only to the attention of TARC and not to be discussed in this meeting.

Huib Ghijsen explained that he would go through each proposal received from members three weeks before the congress and discussed by the TARC and then the floor would be open for discussion.

Article 1.1: the TARC had fully agreed with the proposal (by Limagrain) to replace 'unless otherwise' with 'when expressly' agreed by the parties.

Article 2.2: the proposal was mainly a change of language and the TARC had accepted to replace 'is excluded' with 'does not apply' under these Rules.

Article 4.1: the TARC had accepted to use only the word 'quotation' and to list it further down in Annex 1, the glossary of terms.

Article 7.1: the TARC had approved the editorial improvement 'A statement made by or other conduct of the Offeree indicating assent to an offer is an acceptance' instead of 'A statement made by the Offeree or other conduct of him indicating assent to an offer is an acceptance'.

Article 15.1: the TARC had not accepted to add 'or seed liter', but to use the term 'volume' instead, as many companies were used to selling by volume instead of weight or count.

Article 16.1: the TARC had accepted the proposal to replace 'more or less' with '+/-', as in article 15.2.

Article 25.1: the TARC had rejected the proposal to use 'at least 100%' instead of 110%. As 110% were used by the Incoterms®, it was left unchanged.

Articles 32.1 and 32.2: the proposed change (by Plantum) was mainly editorial and the TARC had accepted to define the references more clearly and

to replace 'for a predefined quantity' with 'according to 31.2(c)', in order to match the references in article 32.1.

Article 47.1: the TARC has approved the correct reference to article 44 instead of 51.

Articles 66, 70.2 and 84.3: the TARC had accepted the editorial change to replace 'and free access to them by the Buyer' with 'and provided that the Buyer is able to access the seed'.

Article 76: the TARC had accepted the proposal (by CSTA) to add '90 days for forage and turf seed and' 180 days for other crops.

Article 84.5: the TARC had agreed to delete the second sentence which was not appropriate in the general rules.

Article 87.1: the TARC had proposed to delete 'but can always be settled' and to add 'or' by binding arbitration.

Article 87.3: the TARC had not accepted the proposal (by Plantum) to move article 12.2 into 87.3.

Part C, Section I, par 1: the TARC had accepted the correct references to the articles 20 and 21 instead of 35 and 34.

Annex 1: Seller. The TARC had decided to leave the sentence in the annex instead of moving it to the general rules.

Annex 1: Visual appearance (of seed). As the sentence was not very clear, the TARC had improved the meaning to 'an initial indication of seed quality only and is not quantifiable'.

The Chairman thanked Huib Ghijsen for his competent introduction to the document. He asked the audience if there were any questions or if further explanations were needed. This was not the case.

The Chairman asked the General Assembly to vote and to adopt the revised Trade Rules. There was no vote against and no abstention. The revised ISF Rules and Usages for the Trade in Seeds for Sowing Purposes were unanimously approved by warm applause.

The Chairman thanked the TARC for the huge revision undertaken in the last two years. On behalf of the TARC and the Board of Directors, he was very pleased to see the final approval of the revised Trade Rules.

A participant asked when the new Trade Rules would become effective. Huib Ghijsen took the floor and explained that in the past the revised rules would take effect one month after the approval by the General Assembly. He therefore proposed the date of 1 August 2012. Huib Ghijsen also announced that the TARC had discussed the possibility to organize an event during the next ISF congress in order to explain the Trade Rules to

ISF members, especially to seeds people using the rules.

A participant commented that it would not be suitable to adopt the new rules in the middle of a trading season. The Chairman proposed to give members enough time to adjust to the new rules and to set the date of 1 January 2013. This date was unanimously approved by the General Assembly.

## 6. Adoption of position papers

### 6.1 Position paper "ISF View on Intellectual Property"

The Chairman gave the floor to Jean-Christophe Gouache, Chairman of the Breeders Committee and asked him to update the audience on document 12.101-a circulated three weeks before the Congress.

JC Gouache explained that the Breeders Committee meeting had allowed the approval of all the amendments listed in categories 1 and 2, as shown on screen. However, as some of the proposed amendments in category 3 were contradictory to each other or going into different directions, it had been decided to consult the four members who had proposed those amendments. At the end of the BC meeting, one member had proposed to withdraw its amendments if the other members also withdrew their proposals. This had led to very lengthy 'corridor' discussions after the BC meeting.

JC Gouache went on to explain the procedure that would be proposed to voting members in order to adopt the position paper during the General Assembly.

- In a first step, the voting members would be asked to adopt the amendments proposed in categories 1 and 2. These amendments pertained mainly to improvement of language and clarification.
- In a second step, paragraph 2.4.2 the following amendments would be proposed to vote: 'in the following context' instead of 'under the following' and 'can' instead of 'should'.
- In a third step, the four members would be asked if they agreed to withdraw their comments in category 3.

The Chairman asked the participants whether they could agree with the amendments proposed in category 1 and category 2. There were no votes against and no abstentions.

With regards to the small proposal for revision on § 2.4.2, there were no votes against and only one abstention (Pioneer).

With regards to the amendments in category 3, Barenbrug and BDP withdrew their amendments. Plantum stated that they were willing to withdraw, not because they agreed with the current text, but

to help the proceeding of the adoption. Pioneer stated that they still had concerns on the chapter on patents, but for the sake of adoption was willing to withdraw its amendments.

The Chairman then put the entire paper to the vote. There were no votes against, and Plantum and Pioneer abstained. The paper was adopted by a very large majority with warm applause. He mentioned that this was a very important paper for the Federation, and thanked all the parties for the great amount of work they had put in it.

After the General Assembly voted to adopt the paper, a question from the floor noted that ISF had previously been operating under two position papers on Intellectual Property and asked whether the adoption of this paper superseded both prior papers. The Chairman confirmed that the newly adopted paper superseded both prior documents.

### 6.2 Position paper on a single access and benefit sharing regime

The Chairman explained that the document had been prepared by the SAC, and one member had suggested a few amendments which had been circulated three weeks before the Congress. The paper and the amendments had been discussed in the meeting of the Breeders Committee earlier during the Congress. In that meeting there was agreement to take on board all those changes. The last sentence of the second paragraph contained twice a reference to the Nagoya Protocol and the proposal of the BC was to delete one of those two references. He then put the paper plus amendments to the vote. There were no votes against and no abstentions. The paper was unanimously approved.

## 7. New Standing Committee – Seed Applied Technologies (SAT-Com)

### 7.1 Proposals for a revision of the ISF Articles of Association and Internal Regulations

M. Bruins of the Secretariat explained the background of the proposed changes. These were necessary to allow for the erstwhile STEC to be transformed into a regular Standing committee of ISF. There were no further questions or comments.

### 7.2 Election of members to the new SAT-Com

M. Bruins explained that a call for interest had gone out. There had been many nominations and the STEC-Chairman and the Secretariat had made a pre-selection of names. This had been discussed and approved by the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, respectively. There were no further questions or comments.

### 7.3 The Board of Directors (BoD) proposes approval of the rules change and the new composition

The Chairman put the amendments to the Articles of Association and Internal Regulations and the composition of the new SAT-Com to the vote as a block. There were no votes against and no abstentions. The proposals and election were adopted unanimously by warm applause.

## 8. Financial matters

### 8.1 Adoption of the 2011 accounts

The Chairman gave the floor to the Treasurer, Mr. Walter Tschirren, who presented the 2011 closed accounts as circulated in document 12.097 and shown on screen.

The results showed a profit after Congress benefit sharing thanks to the successful 2011 Congress in Belfast. He thanked BSPB, the UK-NOC and specifically John and Sarah Gilbert for their hard work. He also thanked M. Bruins and the ISF Secretariat for the good financial housekeeping. The reserves were perfectly in line with the thresholds as set by the Board of Directors. There were no questions or comments on the 2011 accounts.

### 8.2 Auditor's Report

The Treasurer referred to document 12.098 which was the review report made by the auditor CTR Audit and Conseil SA who had reviewed the financial statements of ISF and had found that the results of operations were in accordance with the law and the company's articles of incorporation.

### 8.3 Nomination of the Auditor: The proposal is to renew the mandate of CTR Audit and Conseil SA

The Treasurer indicated that the cooperation with the auditor had been good and on behalf of the Board of Directors he was proposing to renew the mandate. There were no further questions from the audience. There were no votes against and no abstentions. The General Assembly unanimously agreed to renew the mandate of CTR Audit and Conseil SA.

### 8.4 Discharge to the Board of Directors and the Secretary General

The Chairman asked the members if they agreed to give quitus to the Board of Directors and the Secretary General. There was no opposition, no abstention. The General Assembly unanimously approved the 2011 accounts and discharge was given to the Board of Directors and the Secretary General accordingly.

### 8.5 Approval 2012 budget and 2013 provisional budget

The Treasurer commented on document 12.099 circulated with the Congress documents. The budget for 2012 had already been approved by the Board of Directors in the midterm meeting in Oct.

2011. It was now up for approval by the ISF membership. He explained the ISF was using a fixed budget. Once it had been approved, it would not change anymore for the rest of the year.

On the 2013 provisional budget he explained that it was quite similar to the 2012 budget. There were slight increase in both income and expenses. The reserves would still be in line with the set thresholds. The General Assembly unanimously adopted the 2012 budget and the 2013 provisional budget.

### 8.6 Fees: The Board of Directors proposes to keep the base fee unchanged for 2013 at CHF 3150

The Chairman explained that considering the current financial situation of ISF, there was no need to raise the base fee. The General Assembly unanimously agreed to keep the base fee unchanged at CHF 3150 for the upcoming year 2013.

## 9. Future Congresses - The Board of Directors proposes Australia for 2018

The General Assembly unanimously adopted the proposal of Australia with warm applause. The Chairman congratulated the representative of the Australian Seed Federation present in the room.

## 10. Elections

### 10.1 Election of members of the Board of Directors: The BoD proposes waiving the 6-year maximum term for Karol Marciniak

The Chairman referred to document 12.100-a shown on screen, with 4 new members nominated this year for election: Eduard **Fito** (Spain), Arpad **Pavelka** (Hungary), Pablo **Vaquero** (Argentina), **Zhang Wei** (China); as well as 7 members nominated for re-election: Christoph **Amberger** (Germany); John **McKenzie** (New Zealand); George **Pontikas** (Greece); Hiroshi **Sakata** (Japan); Azariah **Soi** (Kenya); Mauro **Urbini** (Italy); Archie **Wilson** (Canada).

The Chairman explained that the 6-year maximum term would have to be waived for Karol **Marciniak** from Poland, because the congress would take place in Poland in 2015.

The General Assembly unanimously elected the proposed members with warm applause.

### 10.2 Election of Section and Standing Committee Chairpersons

The Chairman proposed to the General Assembly that the following chairpersons be elected/re-elected: Bryan **Gerard** (United States), Chairman of the Field Crop Section; John **Gilbert** (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Forage & Turf Crop Section; Jean-Christophe **Gouache** (France),

Chairman of the Breeders Committee; Roeland **Kapsenberg** (United States), Chairman of the Phytosanitary Committee; Greg **Lamka** (United States), Chairman of the Seed Applied Technologies Committee; Huib **Ghijzen** (Belgium), Chairman of the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee.

The General Assembly unanimously elected the proposed members with warm applause.

10.3 Treasurer: The BoD proposes electing Vincent Vuille as the new Treasurer of ISF

The Chairman explained that Walter Tschirren had decided to retire after a term of six years as Treasurer. **Vincent Vuille** had been nominated as new Treasurer. He was introduced to the audience and was warmly applauded by the General Assembly.

10.4 ISF Vice-President: The BoD proposes electing Alvaro Eyzaguirre, currently Second Vice-President, as First Vice-President

The General Assembly unanimously elected **Alvaro Eyzaguirre** as First Vice-President

10.5 ISF President: The BoD proposes electing Tim Johnson, currently First Vice-President, as ISF President

The General Assembly unanimously elected **Tim Johnson** as new President of ISF for a term of two years.

## 11. Closing speech by the outgoing President

“Firstly, I would like to thank Walter Tschirren for an excellent and very competent Treasurer role in ISF over the last six years. You were dedicated to ISF and worked in good collaboration with Marcel and the office in Nyon and we are very thankful for your support. When we got to know you six years ago we immediately respected your financial capacity. We also got to know you as a gentleman with quite a dry but very good sense of humor. By the way I was a little afraid you would raise the fees this year on your way out, but you were good to us. Thank you for leaving ISF with healthy accounts.

And I also thank Vincent Vuille for accepting to become our new Treasurer. It is a very important role in ISF. It is in our statutes that the Treasurer comes from Switzerland, that is a given. We are very happy to welcome you in that role.

As you know, my two-year term as President of ISF has come to an end. I have done two years and one month. So, Tim is up for quite a short period as President (laughter).

I would like to say that it has been two very exciting years. I am extremely pleased that the General Assembly has today approved the new Trade Rules and adopted the new position paper on Intellectual Property. It was not ‘my hard work’

that led to these adoptions; rather it has been the competent and very good work in the Intellectual Property Committee, the Breeders Committee and the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee. Nevertheless, as President, I am very pleased that we have accomplished those two missions.

One of the things that makes this job very nice is that one gets to work with very competent, dedicated people, who do not always agree, I would say even, not at all. ISF members are quite ready for good discussions all the time, but I must say it always takes place in a very good atmosphere. I would like to ask you to make sure this good atmosphere continues. This is what produces good results in ISF. We are able to disagree, but it always takes place in good, sober discussions and I think this is very important.

I am happy to hand over the task to Tim Johnson. I am confident that you will be in good hands with Tim as new President of ISF. We can all be very pleased with that.

Finally I would also like to thank Marcel and his team in the office in Nyon. You really do a great job for the President and to the Association. It has been good working with you, I felt confident all the way and in good hands, you have really supported a lot. Thank you for that.

And this is the end of my speech. Thank you all for your confidence in the last two years.”

Truels Damsgaard was thanked with long applause.

## 12. Acceptance speech by the incoming President

“Well, first I want to say thank you Truels for a wonderful job and what a great opportunity to really learn from you over the last number of years. In the United States we say it’s very hard to fill somebody like Truels’ shoes and if you’ve seen his feet, it will be very hard to fill his shoes.

I truly look forward to working with the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, the staff of the Secretariat, but most importantly all the members. This is what makes ISF such a great organization to participate in. Seed is Life and my kids think at times that my life is seed. They’re probably right.

I have really used three guiding principles in my seed life. I’m going to try to guide the International Seed Federation with those three guiding principles.

Find the win-win  
Make money  
and  
Have fun.

Find the win-win for all the members of the International Seed Federation. There are issues for all of our members from alfalfa to zucchini, from

small companies to multinational companies, from organic to biotech. These are the issues. Global movement of seed affects all of us and we have to work hard to make sure that seed gets moved to all the people around the world. Good consistent IP laws to support innovation in the seed industry. We can then create greater innovation that will help feed the world, create fibers and fuel and feed for all. Seed is Life. I ask all of you to work with me on these issues together in the next two years and move the seed industry forward at a pace that we have to support this globe.

Make money. Never been bashful about that. That's why we're in business. ISF needs to support policy so all of our members have the opportunity to make money. And by the way, if seed companies are making money they will invest in the future for all of us to be successful. If companies are profitable, they will invest in supporting national seed associations, the regional seed associations and the International Seed Federation. I will also let you know that I will work very hard with the Secretariat to keep the International Seed Federation in good financial order in these challenging times.

Have fun. Now Truels, as he started this meeting, made sure we were having fun. I take that responsibility very seriously for the seed industry. I've had a lot of fun in learning from all of you. It's important that I continue to learn from you when I become your President. I want to give a special thanks to Bernard. He keeps telling all of us that this is going to be his last congress. And somewhere around the world we're going to sneak him in, just to prove him wrong. But Bernard, thank you very much. You've taught me a lot, I've learned a lot. I know I have not always appreciated it, but it's really great seeing you in the audience when I take on the presidency. I will give you my phone number and my email so if you hear I'm screwing up please contact me so I keep this thing on track.

I really appreciate and will work hard with all of you to find solutions that are good for this industry and good for the world. It's important that we smile, we laugh and we have fun! You guys & gals are all volunteers. You work hard. Not only your day jobs, but also for this Federation and for the things that are right for the seed industry. If we're going to work the kind of hours that we're all working, let's have fun at it. So we're going to work hard on doing that.

I'm truly honored to be your President and I know I'm going to make mistakes, but believe me, those mistakes will be overcome by the type of General Assembly that we have here today. So let's move this industry forward, help me to continue to learn and let's all be the driver of a successful seed industry.

Now let's go have fun tonight and then wake up tomorrow morning, get back on it and drive this industry forward. Because it is everybody in this room that makes that happen. I thank you very much for the opportunity to serve all of you and I will do my best to accomplish our Goals."

Tim Johnson was warmly applauded.

### **13. Closing the General Assembly**

The Chairman thanked the participants and declared the General Assembly closed at 17.00 hrs.

\* \* \*

### 28th ISF Golf Championship

The 28th ISF Golf Championship took place at Itanhanga Golf Course.

23 players participated in the competition.

The winners were:

**Mrs. Eleanor Hancock** for the ladies' score and **Mr. Enrique Reina** for the gentlemen's score.

\* \* \*

Host Countries of Future Congresses					
2013	GREECE	2015	POLAND	2017	HUNGARY
2014	CHINA	2016	URUGUAY	2018	AUSTRALIA

\* \* \*

Countries represented, Number of Delegates and (Accompanying Persons)								
Afghanistan	1	(0)	India	25	(3)	Portugal	1	(0)
Algeria	1	(0)	Iran	18	(1)	Russian Fed	8	(1)
Argentina	35	(4)	Ireland	3	(0)	Serbia	1	(0)
Australia	25	(3)	Israel	17	(0)	Singapore	1	(0)
Austria	4	(0)	Italy	36	(6)	South Africa	22	(5)
Belgium	6	(1)	Japan	22	(0)	Spain	9	(1)
Brazil	89	(11)	Jordan	3	(0)	Sudan	1	(0)
Canada	11	(0)	Kenya	10	(2)	Sweden	2	(2)
Chile	31	(1)	Korea, Rep of	6	(0)	Switzerland	16	(4)
China	39	(0)	Lebanon	5	(0)	Syria	1	(0)
China Hong Kong	3	(0)	Libya	1	(0)	Thailand	6	(0)
China Taiwan	1	(0)	Lithuania	2	(0)	Tunisia	3	(2)
Colombia	2	(2)	Mexico	5	(2)	Turkey	5	(0)
Czech Republic	7	(0)	Morocco	1	(1)	Ukraine	7	(0)
Denmark	15	(3)	Netherlands	64	(9)	United Kingdom	8	(1)
Ecuador	3	(1)	New Zealand	18	(1)	United States	108	(17)
Egypt	4	(0)	Pakistan	4	(0)	Uruguay	22	(2)
France	65	(7)	Paraguay	2	(0)	Venezuela	1	(0)
Germany	46	(4)	Peru	2	(2)	Zambia	1	(0)
Greece	8	(0)	Philippines	1	(1)	Zimbabwe	2	(1)
Hungary	1	(1)	Poland	1	(0)			
						<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>868</b>	<b>(102)</b>
(Additional participants in the exhibit booths: <b>50</b> )								

## ISF BODIES AND PERSONALITIES 2012-2013

As per elections in Rio, June 2012

For up-to-date lists, please contact the Secretariat

## Board of Directors

(\*) The figures indicate the years of election and re-election

(m.a.l. means member-at-large)

President

**1 Tim Johnson** 2012  
Illinois Foundation Seeds, Inc. 2007 (m.a.l.)  
25 Executive Drive, Suite F  
LAFAYETTE, Indiana 47905 USA

First Vice-President

**2 Alvaro Eyzaguirre** 2012  
Semillas Pioneer Chile Ltda. 2008-2010 (m.a.l.)  
Av. El Bosque Norte 500, Of. 1102  
6650185 SANTIAGO Chile

Immediate Past-President

**3 Truels Damsgaard** 2012  
DLF-Trifolium 2002 (m.a.l.)  
Ny Oestergade 9  
4000 ROSKILDE Denmark

Treasurer

**4 Vincent Vuille** 2012  
Otto Hauenstein Seeds  
Bahnhofstrasse 92  
8197 RAFZ Switzerland

Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Section

**5 Anton van Doornmalen** 2005-07-09-2011  
Rijk Zwaan  
P.O. Box 40  
2678 ZG DE LIER Netherlands

Forage and Turf Crops Section

**6 John Gilbert** 2008-10-2012  
Germinal Holdings Ltd. 2002-04-06 (m.a.l.)  
Commercial Road  
BANBRIDGE BT32 3ES United Kingdom

Field Crops Section

**7 Bryan Gerard** 2012  
JGL, Inc.  
3540 South US 231  
GREENCASTLE, Indiana 46135 USA

Breeders Committee

**8 Jean-Christophe Gouache** 2010-2012  
Groupe Limagrain 2009 (m.a.l.)  
B.P. 1  
63270 CHAPPES France

Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee

Invited Guest: Huib Ghijsen 2010-2012  
Semzabel Belgium

Phytosanitary Committee

**9 Roeland Kapsenberg** 2012  
DLF-International Seeds  
175 W. H Street  
P.O. Box 229  
HALSEY, Oregon 97348 USA

Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com)

**10 Greg Lamka** 2012  
Dupont Pioneer  
7100 NW 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue  
P.O. Box 1150  
JOHNSTON, Iowa 50131 USA

Members-at-large (m.a.l.)

**11-Christoph Amberger** 2012  
KWS SAAT AG 2008-2012 (FC Chair)  
Postfach 1463 2006 (m.a.l.)  
37555 EINBECK Germany

**12 Winston Davies** 2011

Yalfin S.A.  
Cuaro 3085 P1  
11800 Montevideo Uruguay

**13 Eduard Fito** 2012

Semillas Fito SA  
Calle Selva de Mar, 111  
08019 BARCELONA Spain

**14 Karol Marciniak** 2006-08-10-2012

Danko Hodowla Roslin Ltd  
Choryn 27  
64-000 KOSCIAN Poland

**15 John McKenzie** 2008-10-2012

PGG Wrightson Seeds  
55 Waterloo Road  
P.O. Box 939  
CHRISTCHURCH New Zealand

**16 Arpad Pavelka** 2012

ZKI – Zöldségtermesztési Kutató Intézet Rt.  
Meszöly Gyula u. 6  
6000 KECSKEMET Hungary

**17 Silmar Peske** 2009-2011

Agropastoril Jotabasso  
Etr. São João Km 24  
C.P. 314  
79 900-000 PONTA PORÃ, MS Brazil

**18 George Pontikas** 2010-2012

Syngenta Hellas  
Anthoussas Avenue  
ANTHOUSSA, Attikis 153 49 Greece

**19 Hiroshi Sakata** 2010-2012

Sakata Seed Corporation 2-7-1, Nakamachidai, Tsuzuki-Ku 244-0041 YOKOHAMA	Japan		
<b>20 Azariah Soi</b> Simlaw Seeds Company Ltd P.O. Box 40042 NAIROBI 00100	Kenya	2010-2012	
<b>21 Mauro Urbini</b> Anseme S.r.l. – Vegetable Seeds Production Via Cipro, 60 47023 CESENA (FC)	Italy	2008-10-2012	
<b>22 Pablo Vaquero</b> Monsanto Argentina Maipu 1210, 11th Floor 1006 BUENOS AIRES	Argentina	2012	
<b>23 Archie Wilson</b> C&M Seeds RR #3, 6180 Line Minto 5 PALMERSTON, Ontario N0G 2P0	Canada	2010-2012	
<b>24 Zhang Wei</b> China National Seed Group Corp. 15/F Sinochem Tower, A2, Fuxingmenwai Street BEIJING 100 045	China	2012	
			* * *
<b><u>Tree and Shrub Seed Group</u></b>			
<b>Joëlle Schmitt</b> Semillas Montaraz S.A. C/Duquestra de Castrejon 9 28033 MADRID	Spain	2011	
			* * *
<b><u>ISF HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS</u></b>			
<b>Niccolò Morelli</b> 39, via Curtatone e Montanara 50053 EMPOLI/FIRENZE	Italy	1985	
<b>Antonio Calvelo</b> BIOSEM Av. Corrientes 127, 6° Piso, Of. 606 1043 BUENOS AIRES	Argentina	1990	
<b>Badrinarayan Barwale</b> Maharashtra Hybrid Seeds Co. Ltd. Resham Bhawan, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor 78 Veer Nariman Road MUMBAI 400 020	India	1996	
<b>Gilbert Gouin</b> Sodisem 69 rue d'Alleray 75015 PARIS	France	1996	
<b>Paul King</b> New Agriventures, Inc. P.O. Box 164 PAIN COURT, Ontario N0P 1Z0	Canada	1996	
<b>Owen J. Newlin</b> 3524 Grand Avenue #401 DES MOINES, Iowa 50312-4341	USA	1996	
<b>Lucien Matton</b> Clovis Matton S.A Kaaistraat 5 8581 Avelgem-Kerkhove	Belgium	1998	
<b>Leif Nielsen</b> Humlegaard Hovedvejen 128 4720 PRAESTÖ	Denmark	1998	
<b>Jean-Louis Duval</b> 15, rue de Dagny 77240 CESSON	France	2000	
<b>Jürg Hauenstein</b> Schluchebärg 8197 RAFZ	Switzerland	2000	
<b>Gisbert Kley</b> Im Heidekamp 2 59555 LIPPSTADT	Germany	2002	
<b>Peter Lange</b> Tiedexer Tor 2 37574 EINBECK	Germany	2002	
<b>Manmohan Attavar</b> Indo-American Hybrid Seeds (India) Pvt. Ltd. 7 <sup>th</sup> km, Banashankari-Kengeri Link Road Channasandra Village BANGALORE 560 061	India	2003	
<b>Dietrich Schmidt</b> Golden West Seed Research Co. Inc. 12052 Linda Flora Drive OJAI, CA 93023	USA	2004	
<b>Christopher Ahrens</b> Lundsford Farm Lundsford House ETCHINGHAM, East Sussex TN19 7QH	United Kingdom	2006	
<b>Bernard Le Buanec</b> 24, Rue Treiz-an-Douric 29100 DOUARNENEZ	France	2006	
<b>Selwyn Manning</b> 24B Crosdale Place CHRISTCHURCH 8042	New Zealand	2007	
<b>Orlando de Ponti</b> Gen. Foulkesweg 68E 6703 BW WAGENINGEN	Netherlands	2012	

(\* )The figures indicate the year of election

MEMBERS OF SECTION BOARDS						
Field Crops Section				Vegetable and Ornamental Crops Section		
	Bryan Gerard, Chair	2012	US	Anton van Doornmalen, Chair	2005-2011	NL
1	Christoph Amberger	2012	DE	1	Lorena Basso	2012 AR
2	Johannes Peter Angenendt	2012	DE	2	Franck Berger	2012 FR
3	Gerardo Bartolome	2011	AR	3	Fabrizio Ceccarelli	2012 IT
4	Huub Beelen	2012	NL	4	Peter Dawson	2011 UK
5	Pablo Bergada	2011	AR	5	Amnon Eshet	2012 IL
6	Eugenie A.C. van de Bilt	2012	NL	6	Matthew Kramer	2011 US
7	Bruno Carette	2012	FR	7	David Malan	2012 ZA
8	Alvaro Eyzaguirre*	2011	CL	8	Andreas Mueller	2011 DE
9	Jerry Flint	2012	US	9	Vicente Navarro	2012 ES
10	Eugenio Gonzalez	2011	ES	10	Arpad Pavelka	2012 HU
11	Kurt Hjortsholm	2012	DK	11	Michael Piil Andersen	2011 DK
12	Pavel Horcicka	2012	CZ	12	Hiroshi Sakata	2012 JP
13	Carlo Invernizzi	2012	IT	13	Mary Ann Sayoc	2012 PH
14	Jean-Paul Krattiger	2011	CH	14	John Schoenecker	2012 US
15	Karol Marciniak	2011	PL	15	Weihong Tian	2012 CN
16	Nigel Moore	2012	UK	<i>President – Ex officio</i>		
17	Malin Nilsson	2012	SE	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President – Ex officio</i>		
18	Lomo van Rensburg	2012	ZA	Jan de Rond: link to SAT-Com 2012 NL		
19	Wolf von Rhade	2012	DE	<i>To be nominated: link to Breeders Committee</i>		
20	Claude Tabel	2011	FR			
21	Ann Vandecruys	2012	BE			
22	Archie Wilson	2012	CA			
23	Yusuf Yormazoglu	2011	TR			
24	(Vacancy 1)					
25	(Vacancy 2)					
<i>President – Ex officio</i>						
<i>1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President – Ex officio</i>						
* Alvaro Eyzaguirre: link to SAT-Com						
<i>To be nominated: link to Breeders Committee</i>						
Forage and Turf Crops Section						
	John Gilbert, Chair	2008-10-12	UK			
1	Darrell Dziver, Vice-Chair	2012	CA			
2	Johannes Peter Angenendt	2012	DE			
3	Adger Banken	2011	NL			
4	Jiri Barta	2011	CZ			
5	Grzegorz Dabrowski	2012	PL			
6	Paul Frey	2011	US			
7	Stefan van der Heijden*	2012	NL			
8	Kooshi Kainuma	2012	JP			
9	Brian Lever	2012	ZA			
10	John McKenzie	2012	NZ			
11	Ian Misselbrook	2012	UK			
12	Gustavo Picasso	2012	AR			
13	Tobias Schmid	2012	CH			
14	Claude Tabel	2012	FR			
15	Giuseppe Tombolan	2012	IT			
<i>President – Ex officio</i>						
<i>1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President – Ex officio</i>						
Soeren Halbye: link to SAT-Com 2012 DK						
* S van der Heijden: link to Breeders Committee						
<b>For up-to-date lists, please contact the Secretariat</b>						



<b>MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/SUBSECTION</b>			
<b>Sustainable Agriculture</b>		<b>Intellectual Property</b>	
1	Anke van den Hurk, Chair	NL	
2	Mikolaj Aleksandrowicz	PL	
3	Miguel Alvarez Arancedo	AR	
4	Fulya Batur	TR	
5	Reinhard von Broock	DE	
6	Christiane Duchene	FR	
7	Jerry Flint	US	
8	Bill Leask / <i>Erin Armstrong (2013 onwards)</i>	CA	
9	Thomas Nickson	US	
10	Rajvir Rathi	IN	
11	Bernice Slutsky	US	
12	<i>(Vacancy 1)</i>		
13	<i>(Vacancy 2)</i>		
14	<i>(Vacancy 3)</i>		
15	<i>(Vacancy 4)</i>		
<b>Sugar and Fodder Beet Subsection</b>			
1	Peter Hofmann, Chair	GB	
2	Phillip von dem Bussche	CH	
3	François Desprez	FR	
4	Niels Mikkelsen	DK	
5	Philippe Rousseau	SE	
6	Sina Strube	DE	
7	Ioana Tudor	US	
8	Bruno Vandamme	BE	
9	Rob van Tetering	NL	
<b><i>For up-to-date lists, please contact the Secretariat</i></b>			

#### **STAFF AT THE ISF SECRETARIAT**

Marcel Bruins	Secretary General
Radha Ranganathan	Director, Technical Affairs
Piero Sismondo	Director, Seed Technology and Trade
Nathalie Huguenin	Event Manager
Mariette Perey	Administrative Assistant
Christine Marti	Secretary-Accountant
Verena Duracoski	Office Worker

## LIST OF PRESENTATIONS MADE DURING THE RIO CONGRESS

(Available at the Secretariat on request)

---

### ❖ **Opening Ceremony**

- Geraldo Berger: Seed and Sustainable Agriculture in Brazil
- Marcel Bruins: Progress report of the ISF Secretariat

### ❖ **Open Meeting of the Breeders Committee**

- Dirk Jan Kennes: Impact of trait vs germplasm development
- Radha Ranganathan: Access to genetic resources and benefit sharing: why ISF wants a single regime
- Anke van den Hurk/Niels Louwaars: New breeding techniques: Update Europe

### ❖ **Open Meeting of the Trade and Arbitration Rules Committee**

- Bernard Le Buanec: History of ISF Trade Rules and their objectives

### ❖ **Open Meeting of the Phytosanitary Committee**

- Roeland Kapsenberg: An overview of activities undertaken by ISF
- Cosam Coutinho: Brazil's quarantine system for seed – regulations and infrastructure
- Radha Ranganathan: The seed industry's view on Brazil's new Normative Instruction
- Bill Fuller: PSTVd and import restrictions on tomato seed

### ❖ **Vegetable & Ornamental Crops Section**

- Anton van Doornmalen: Think Vegetables
- Steve Udsen: The vegetable seed industry in Brazil
- Gerard Meijerink: An approach to harmonize phytosanitary requirements
- Bruno Carette: ISF's database of genetically modified events in vegetable crops
- Arvind Kapur: Tomato hybrids – market trends in Asia
- Marcel Bruins: Guidelines for Handling a Dispute over the Use of a Proprietary Parent Line in a Tomato Hybrid
- Radha Ranganathan: Definition of the Terms Describing the Reaction of Plants to Pests and Abiotic Stresses for the Vegetable Seed Industry
- Matt Kramer: Looking forward - the ornamental sector in ISF
- Bernard Le Buanec: Evolution of the tomato and broccoli cases: possible direct and indirect impacts on the vegetable seed industry
- Phyllis Himmel: Biological and microbial pesticide seed treatments: what the future holds for vegetable crops

### ❖ **Field Crops Section**

- Andrès Savino: Field crops and doing business in Brazil
- Ricardo Blohm Bendzius: Rice in Brazil: research development and cultivation
- Rodolfo Rossi: Soybeans in South America
- Grégoire Berthe: Update on international programs and initiatives on wheat
- Frank Curtis: Conclusive report of the Working Group on Royalty Collection

### ❖ **Forage & Turf Crops Section**

- Francisco Dübbern de Souza: The forage and turf seed industry in Brazil
- Michael Muschick: Herbage seed lot size experiment
- Gert van Straalen: Natural turf: Why it remains the natural choice for football, sports and playing surfaces
- Michael Ryan: OECD seed certification and the need for harmonization

### ❖ **Open Meeting of the Seed Treatment & Environment Committee**

- Arlinda Evaristo/Rose Rodrigues: Regulatory challenges in the Latin American region and their impact on seed treatment
- Greg Lamka: The new Seed Applied Technologies Committee (SAT-Com)

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS ADOPTED DURING THE RIO CONGRESS****Adopted by the General Assembly**

- ISF Rules and Usages for the Trade in Seeds for Sowing Purposes  
*The adopted ISF Trade Rules and Usages will become effective on 1st January 2013 and will be made available on the ISF website at <http://www.worldseed.org>*
- ISF View on Intellectual Property  
*Document available on the ISF website at <http://www.worldseed.org>*
- ISF supports a single international regime to govern the development of rules and regulations concerning access to all genetic resources for plant breeding  
*Document available on the ISF website at <http://www.worldseed.org>*
- ISF Articles of Association  
*The adopted Articles of Association were circulated to all ISF members after the Congress. They are available to ISF members on request.*

**Adopted by the Vegetable & Ornamental Crops Section**

- Definition of the Terms Describing the Reaction of Plants to Pests and Abiotic Stresses for the Vegetable Seed Industry  
*Document available on the ISF website at <http://www.worldseed.org>*

**Adopted by the Field Crops Section**

- Collection systems for royalties in wheat: an international study  
*Document to be published in 'Bio-Science law revue' and to be made available on the ISF website at a later stage*

\* \* \*

