



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

sante.ddg2.g.5(2016)7464934

**SUMMARY REPORT OF THE  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANTS, ANIMALS, FOOD AND FEED  
HELD IN BRUSSELS ON 07 NOVEMBER 2016  
(Section Propagating Material of Plants of Fruit Genera and Species)**

*CIRCABC Link: [Blank Link](#)*

**A.01 Marketing possibilities of fruit plant propagating material and fruit plants from 1 January 2017 onwards.**

The Commission presented an overview document distinguishing between registered/non-registered varieties and varieties marketed for the first time before/after 2012. There was discussion on the local circulation of propagating material and fruit plants that were marketed for the first time after 30 September 2012. According to a delegate it is not possible to officially register the varieties concerned. The Commission promised to look into this matter.

**A.02 Clarification concerning several provisions of Council Directive 2008/90/EC and its Implementing Directives on the marketing of fruit plant propagating material and fruit plants intended for fruit production.**

The Commission presented a document containing answers to questions from Member States regarding Directive 2008/90/EC and the Implementing Directives on labelling, registration, and certification.

The Commission informed Member States that varieties subject of an application for a national or a Community plant variety right as well as varieties legally protected by a national plant variety right or a Community plant variety right may be marketed throughout the EU without official registration of the variety concerned in one of the EU Member States. Official registration of those protected varieties is thus not mandatory but optional. However, to ensure traceability it is highly recommended to enter those protected varieties in the Fruit Reproductive Material Information System (FRUMATIS). A delegate had a question on the interpretation of Article 10(1) regarding local circulation. The Commission promised to look into this matter.

**A.03 EU variety register: Fru it Reproductive Material Information System (FRUMATIS).**

The Commission presented the state of play of the EU variety register. The EU excel template for submission of national variety registers was amended following the comments received from Member States. A Community Plant Variety Office's (CPVO) representative proposed a reduction of the number of options in field M of this excel template regarding the status of the registration of the variety. Both CPVO's representative and a delegate are in favour of including the application date in FRUMATIS as an optional field. This delegate asked in which field the information on clones should be provided. The Commission recommended including this information in the field with general comments. Several delegates asked the Commission to include a field containing information on the category of the propagating material. The Commission responded positively to the requests for changes from Member States but concluded by saying that those changes would be introduced in a next version of the FRUMATIS template. The Commission asked Member States to complete the current version of the FRUMATIS template and to submit it by 7 December 2016. On the basis of the national registers received from Member States the Commission will publish an EU register of varieties that will be available as an excel document on 1 January 2017 at [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant\\_propagation\\_material/legislation/eu\\_marketing\\_requirements\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/legislation/eu_marketing_requirements_en)

**A.04 Import of fruit propagating material and fruit plants from third countries: common EU approach.**

This point was not addressed due to lack of time.

**A.05 Existing rules on variety denomination for agricultural and vegetable species.**

This point was not addressed due to lack of time.

**A.06 EU quality pest project in collaboration with the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO).**

The Commission presented the state of play of the EPPO quality pest project. The Commission informed that EPPO is now in the process of analysing the questionnaires and that the sectorial expert working groups will meet between February and July 2017. Member States enquired if general provisions in the marketing Directives concerning freedom from harmful organisms will be affected by the outcome of the EPPO project. The Commission assured Member States that such provisions are not affected by the project as they are in the basic acts.

**A.07 Administrative information on national implementation of the harmonised certification scheme.**

This point was not addressed due to lack of time.

**B.01 Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision temporarily authorising Belgium, Czech Republic, France, and Spain to produce pre-basic mother plants and pre-basic material in the field under non-insect proof conditions for specific genera or species.**

The Commission presented the draft Decision. With respect to the duration of the authorisation, the Commission stressed that the authorisation period should be restricted to a minimum as the production conditions derogate from the requirements laid down in Directive 2014/98/EU. Member States asked for the inclusion of a reference to Article 11 regarding soil requirements and Annex IV of Directive 2014/98/EU. The Commission agreed on the inclusion of the reference to Article 11 but stated that the reference to Annex IV was most likely superfluous. A delegate asked for a better description of all propagating material and fruit plants produced from pre-basic mother plants and pre-basic material produced in the open field under non-insect proof conditions. Due to the size constraints of the label several Member States asked for the possibility to provide detailed information on the authorisation in a document accompanying the label.

There was discussion on the technical requirements laid down in the Annex of the draft Decision. In general, Member States considered the requirements to be heterogeneous. A delegate questioned the specification of an isolation distance for certain Member States and absence of any isolation distance for other Member States. For the *Prunus* species, it was finally agreed to have an isolation distance of 500 m for Belgium and Spain, and no isolation distance for France provided that France would carry out more frequent visual inspections and analyses. Belgium, Spain, and some other Member States expressed a scrutiny reservation with regard to the agreed isolation distance. Several Member States asked to copy the sampling and testing requirements of Annex IV of Directive 2014/98/EU to the Annex of the draft Decision.

**Vote postponed**