



National Seed Sector Round Table Project

Variety Registration Working Group Summary of Results



Ottawa, Ontario
January 20-21, 2005



Part 1: Introduction

The National Seed Sector Round Table (NSSRT) Project is an Agriculture and Agri-food Canada (AAFC) funded initiative designed to broaden the basis for consultation and consensus building among the diverse stakeholder groups that have an interest in the health of the Canadian seed sector and, in particular, seed sector regulatory policy.

The project is co-managed by the member organizations of the Canadian Seed Alliance, namely the Grain Growers of Canada (GGC), the Canadian Seed Growers' Association (CSGA), the Canadian Seed Trade Association (CSTA) and the Canadian Seed Institute (CSI). The project receives technical support from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA).

The purpose of the National Seed Sector Round Table (NSSRT) project is to develop a focal point for the discussion and analysis of seed issues and the provision of advice to Governments in relation to such issues. In so doing, it is meant to facilitate a predictable and timely process of seed policy and regulation development and change in response to evolving sector conditions.

The NSSRT project has sought and continues to solicit participation from the entire agri-food value chain; from varietal development, seed production, crop production and marketing to processing and end use. In this regard, particular efforts have been and are being made to ensure comprehensive producer representation on the NSSRT. To date, producer organizations invited to participate directly include the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, l'Union des Producteurs Agricoles, the National Farmers Union, the Grain Growers of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board. Discussion with other groups is ongoing.

While the structure and terms of reference of the NSSRT remain to be confirmed and will likely evolve over the two year life of the project, it is already apparent that subject specific and/or crop specific working groups will need to be established to facilitate a deeper and more

comprehensive consideration of issues than would be possible at the Round Table. It is anticipated that one of these working groups will address the subject of Variety Registration.

With this possibility in mind, the NSSRT project organized a two day workshop on Variety Registration, in Ottawa, on January 20 and 21, 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to gauge the views of a wide cross section of stakeholders on the appropriate direction and nature of change to the variety registration system, in light of past CFIA proposals and current and anticipated sector and downstream needs.

Given the highly technical nature of the subject, the assistance of the CFIA and its Advisory Committee on Variety Registration was requested and provided. CFIA staff prepared background issue briefs and made presentations on technical issues, in addition to assisting in the formulation of the questions used to help guide workshop discussion.

This report is based on the series of questions debated and assessed at the January 2005 Variety Registration workshop and constitutes an inevitably imperfect summary of the views expressed by the workshop participants. While far from definitive in its conclusions, the report is potentially helpful as a reference point for future NSSRT discussions on Variety Registration and perhaps for the CFIA in the formulation of any future policy, program or regulatory change proposals on the subject. Z

Part 2: Summary of Working Group Consultation

This section provides a summary of the ideas expressed during breakout sessions and does not necessarily represent consensus viewpoints.

The Secretariat prepared questions in collaboration with the CFIA to provide general guidance to the consultation.

1. The Variety Registration System

1a. What are the benefits of having a mandatory Variety Registration System (official recognition and/or merit) and who benefits? Conversely, what are the costs and to whom?

i. The Benefits

A mandatory variety registration system sets minimum standards and assures safety and consistency of product, constant advancement, and an assured supply of high quality seed, crops and their products.

The objectivity and consistency of the information collected through the Variety Registration system provides a high level of confidence among farmers when making their seed buying decisions. This information also plays a role in downstream purchase and marketing decisions at each stage of the value chain.

The current merit based variety registration system is meant to generate performance information. Its mandatory, co-operative character allows for sharing of costs and can be of particular assistance to breeders of small or regionalized acreage crop species.

Although mandatory, the current system is flexible enough to allow breeders to characterize plant phenotypes under different environmental conditions and to describe and recommend varieties on the basis of their performance under different conditions across different agricultural areas of Canada.

A mandatory, merit-based registration system discourages the introduction of unadapted varieties.

The quality assessment component of the mandatory merit assessment requirements provides end users with the confidence that a registered variety has met a known minimum quality standard.

The existing variety registration recommending committee structure, which itself derives from the mandatory nature of the Variety Registration System, provides an effective forum for discussion and problem resolution, including the important work of developing crop-testing protocols.

ii. The Beneficiaries

The Canadian Variety Registration System is part of a larger regulatory and private sector marketing system designed to ensure the quality of Canadian grain, oilseed and special crops and their products marketed domestically and internationally. The system is therefore seen as the whole value chain - everyone from the plant breeder through the seed grower to the farmer, the processor, and the consumer.

iii. The Costs

The Working Group determined that costs of the Variety Registration System vary from one crop kind to another and that some, but not all costs are passed down to the grower and farmer. The costs of variety registration are of two types, direct and indirect.

- Direct Costs

Direct costs of variety registration include cost recovery initiatives and service fees charged by service providers associated with variety registration, direct costs in terms of money and time to whoever develops the variety, and the costs of running the system such as staffing, recommending committees, and the cost of testing. Some felt that much of this information would develop collaboratively even if the variety registration system did not exist.

- Indirect Costs

The Working Group also identified indirect costs associated with maintaining a mandatory variety registration system, including a cost to taxpayers through government participation, a cost relating to the introduction of new germplasm unduly delayed due to extensive requirements and the unpredictability of approvals, and a cost for establishing uniqueness. There is also a perceived cost to the system for its rigidity.

Taken together, these costs can serve to restrict the number of varieties presented for registration.

Participants also identified a number of indirect costs associated with not having a merit-based registration system. Anticipated losses include the loss of markets, costs to the industry for outdated trait packages (e.g., lack of disease resistance), loss of product that customers recognize and are willing to pay for, and potential lack of officially recognized

descriptions of varieties for certification purposes.

1b. When is mandatory variety registration (official recognition) necessary and when is it not? When deemed unnecessary, what, if any, alternative and/or compensatory regulation requirements should be considered?

Mandatory registration can be important where third party assurance is required or where the market requires certain specific varietal characteristics (e.g., malt barley varieties must have malting qualities) or for widely grown crops where agronomic, disease, and quality traits are critical to the health of the industry. The need for variety registration is influenced by the buyer of the crop and is of greater importance for more complex genetic packages.

The seed certification process provides assurance of compliance with varietal standards. For many crop kinds, registration helps to satisfy international trade requirements, such as entry into the OECD and AOSCA seed certification systems by verifying the eligibility of the variety for certification.

Optimal handling of each crop kind requires flexibility in the registration process. Variety registration needs to be flexible to reflect changes in plant disease, health and safety, or quality considerations.

Determining the necessity of mandatory registration is best left to the stakeholders of each crop sector. Some would argue that crops exempt from variety registration might not have the flexibility to use the CFIA logo on tags. Furthermore, registration may not be necessary for crops where the criteria for the determination of merit for registration are difficult to define or measure (e.g., greenness in turf grass).

Participants gave some attention to the operation of alternative systems. Some felt that if the whole industry operated under contract production, there would not be a need for variety registration. On the other hand, market and industry requirements could determine a need for alternatives to variety registration. Under such circumstances, a system of self-regulating the

development of performance information collaboratively and voluntarily might suffice. The industry may wish to utilize a registration recommending committee to provide advice on whether a variety is a plant with a novel trait (PNT), although it was recognized that advice on PNT status would need to be provided well before the time of entry into Variety Registration Trials.

1c. Would the Canadian Seed Sector be better served with a system similar to the USA (where official recognition is only required for the use of official tags)?

Most felt that a USA style system would not serve the Canadian Seed Sector well. Canada can best compete based on quality or value to the end user and, therefore, a registration system is desirable.



1d. Is it necessary to regulate the exclusion of varieties with inferior agronomic, quality and/or disease characteristics for some crop kinds or could the marketplace make these decisions? If so, why?

There was significant agreement in the Working Group that it is necessary to regulate the exclusion of inferior varieties for some crops, particularly for Schedule A crop kinds where quality and disease characteristics are identified as important considerations for registration in Canada.

1e. Is there a need to protect producers from obsolete or unadapted varieties by removing old varieties from the National list? If so, what would some appropriate options for this process be?

Some participants held the opinion that regulations are not necessary to protect producers from obsolete varieties

because, for the most part, producers will not grow these varieties, although some producers may see some value in old varieties for specific uses. Others reported that they were satisfied with the status quo.

There was significant agreement that there has to be some mechanism to deregister varieties for various reasons, particularly where they would cause harm (e.g., where the variety is very disease susceptible). Some members of the Working Group felt that the sector should leave the removal of unadapted varieties to the breeder to a greater degree, but an annual maintenance fee might serve to encourage voluntary removal of unadapted varieties.

The Working Group did not reach a decision on how to address heritage variety seed needs.

2. Criteria for Placement of Crops within Schedules

2a. What are the merits of a Schedule approach (as indicated in the Proposal) relative to the status quo or any alternative?

A Schedule based system allows increased flexibility to recognize within the system that different crops, regions, and markets may have different needs.

There was consensus for a registration system that varies by crop kind. This allows process flexibility for different regional and marketplace needs. The Schedule-based approach must maintain the ability for industry stakeholders to challenge the placement of a crop kind in a particular Schedule, and for crop kinds to move between Schedules as market needs change.

2b. What is the appropriate default Schedule (A, B, C or Exempt) for commercially significant crops and why?

Under the current system, the default is registration, mandating that all crop kinds are subject to Variety Registration unless specifically exempted in the Regulations. There is some support for a Schedule C default. Clarity is required as to whether a prescribed list of species subject to Schedule C is required, or if all crop

kinds not included in Schedule A, B or E default into Schedule C.

2c. What criteria should be used to exempt a crop kind from variety registration?

Exemption should be market driven. There are two possible approaches:

- A crop kind would be exempt if no case is made for regulation, or
- All crop kinds are subject to registration unless a good case is made for exemption.

Exemption could be based on cross industry agreement for exemption, a situation analysis indicating no third party assurances are required, or where there are alternative systems agreed to by buyer and seller.

2d. What objective criteria should be used to determine whether a crop is included in Schedule A (including the subcategories of Schedule A), B or C?

A decision tree could be devised that can be used to impartially determine the placement of each crop in a schedule depending upon disease, quality, and health and safety concerns. Any system needs to retain sufficient flexibility to allow for the re-evaluation of the placement of crop kinds in Schedules to address changing needs (e.g., maturity of the industry, withdrawal of public funding). There was significant consensus that the system needs to have the flexibility to move crops between Schedules, not only down to require less testing, but up to require more testing when a crop develops to the point where this becomes necessary. The process for migrating between Schedules needs further definition.

2d(i) Schedule A

A possible criterion for Schedule A crop kinds:

- To evaluate varieties for health & safety purposes
- As a minimum standard to screen out inferior varieties (quality assurance, disease resistance)

- To prevent harm against the common good

Stakeholder expertise is available for category determination based on disease, quality, and agronomics. A broad-based recommending committee is needed even when there is only one merit criterion (e.g., Quality).

2d(ii) Schedule B

- Some viewed Schedule B as a transitional stage that might facilitate the movement of crop kinds between Schedules A and C.
- Some participants questioned the value of Schedule B and were in favour of its elimination.
- There is a sense that Schedule B is a transitional schedule that may not be required for the long term.
- There is also concern that poor quality data or inadequate data is potentially worse than no data.
- Specification of performance data information requirements is necessary.

3. Performance Information

The discussion on performance information in general drew an important distinction between:

- Trial data that is required at the time of Variety Registration (merit requirements) to exclude inferior varieties, and
- Ongoing performance testing for the life of the variety to provide information for a seed purchasing decision

3a. Does the requirement for collection of performance information in Schedule B add any overall value to the seed sector?

As discussed in response to question 2d, some participants questioned the value of Schedule B and were in favour of its elimination. By contrast, others wanted to retain Schedule B in order to have some third party performance information for some crop kinds that would not otherwise be included in Schedule A. A third perspective is that Schedule B is a transitional schedule that may not be required for the long term. A final perspective was that a Schedule B could serve as a migratory path for transition of crops from A to C and vice versa over time.

The participants see the purpose for registering varieties is to prove that different regulations are met. Schedule B can be seen as a compromise between A and C. Many participants felt that the number of Schedules could be reduced to two, A and C. However, without Schedule B, some systems (co-op system) may need to change or breeders could collaborate and form their own system. Many felt that information based on one station year of data is of very limited value for any larger acreage crop, but may be adequate for some small acreage or speciality crops.

Participants also felt that as posed in the context of this question, the term "seed sector" needs to be defined.

Some felt that the industry needs to develop a list that characterizes the disease, quality, and agronomic traits of some crop kinds.

3b. What other alternatives might there be to satisfy seed buyers' concerns over availability of impartial performance information?

The Working Group concluded that there is no single alternative. The demands of seed buyers dictate what requirements need to be met. Requirements may differ by crop kind. To date, the recommending committees have been flexible and adapted themselves to suit the needs of each crop kind.

Some alternatives discussed included:

- establishing audited private systems
- local groups organizing independently
- third party accreditation for trials and for reporting results.

The Working Group emphasized the value of public funding for performance testing of certain crop kinds. It was noted that there is a limit to the amount of performance testing can be supported by seed sales and other sources of funding need to be considered. More money and resources must be available at the provincial level to generate impartial performance information.

3c. Could/should the Seed Regulations be amended to require that sellers make performance information available to purchaser upon request? If so, would Schedule B still be required? Conversely, would Schedule C be required if Schedule B required compliance for all crops (unless in Schedule A or exempt)?

Many participants felt that regulation is not required to assure that sellers would make information available to buyers, since buyers will choose seed of varieties that best fit the agronomic conditions on their farm. If a seller will not give the buyer information, then there will be no demand for that seed. Seed sellers will provide information to satisfy customers regardless of whether there is a regulatory requirement to do so. There was agreement that some data needs to be available, but if there is a requirement for performance information, then the specific requirements must be fully explained and specified.

If Seed Regulations were amended to require seed sellers to make performance information available to purchasers upon request, it was suggested that Schedule B would not be required and Schedule B crops would fall under Schedule C. Z

3d. For crops included in Schedule B, who should conduct or oversee the development of performance data (i.e. third party, process verified companies, recognized breeders)?

Participants felt that third parties, process verified companies, or recognized plant breeders could conduct or develop performance data. The criteria for the development of performance data could be decided based on the needs of individual crop kinds.

3e. Similarly, who should pay for the collection and development of performance data?

This complex subject requires more discussion in order to clearly understand:

- the differences between performance and merit testing
- the responsibilities for production of the information
- who should pay to generate the information

For example, on the issue of cost liability, some participants felt that the breeder should pay the initial cost of developing performance data, but that this cost would eventually funnel down to the buyer (farmer/producer). Others felt that the provinces should pay for the ongoing collection of performance data, as collecting data is the responsibility of the federal and provincial governments, seed developers, and trade and grower groups. Still others felt everyone who benefits from the variety should share in paying the costs associated with performance data collection and that the need for provision of variety specific data builds the case for the use of Certified seed.

4. Registration Process and Requirements

4a. Which of the current variety registration application requirements should no longer be necessary for listing of Schedule B & C varieties? For Schedule A, should the requirements remain as status quo?

The status quo for variety registration application requirements was favoured for Schedule A varieties.

For Schedules B & C, the Working Group recommended the elimination of the requirements for supplementary data and committee recommendation for registration.

4b. Are there other options for determining distinctness of a new variety, which would still meet current regulatory requirements? If not, what regulatory changes would be required to provide flexibility to consider other options?

Normally, phenotype has determined Distinctness, not parentage. An approach would be to undertake the resolution of conflicts (i.e. the determination of the difference between the varieties) on a case-by-case basis.

The Working Group expressed concern regarding any requirement for evaluation of distinctness in previously exempt crop kinds (corn, food-grade soybeans, and turfgrass). The industry has changed significantly since these crops were subject to registration.

The Working Group recommended that CFIA continue to use the current approach for uniqueness. If the pedigree is the same, any character can be used to determine uniqueness, provided that it is repeatable and reliable (e.g., morphology, molecular characteristics, etc.).

The Working Group was virtually unanimous in its recommendation not to move to the level of detail of phenotypic information required to prove distinctness for the grant of a Plant Breeder's Right. For the determination of distinctness for varieties of crops that were previously exempt from variety registration, the provision of CSGA's Form 300 information seems workable. The requirement to provide more information with the onus on the applicant to distinguish between varieties may be excessive.

Although the Core Committee expressed their concern about a move to allow the use of DNA markers for determining variety distinctness, others felt that such a move was necessary to help differentiate between varieties, where differences may be limited to non-visual traits.

4c. If registration of a variety is refused, suspended or cancelled, should the process for appealing variety registration decisions be changed? If so, who should be involved?

Most participants felt that the existing process is adequate for dealing with appeals. However, both parties should agree upon the experts involved in the appeal. Some suggested that Canada could have a specified appeal board structure, or could access currently available appeal mechanisms for conflict resolution.

4d. Under the proposed changes to the Variety Registration system, crops listed in Schedule B & C will no longer require testing by and recommendation for registration by recommending committees. For Schedule B & C crops, if applicants were able to apply directly to the Variety Registration Office anytime throughout the year, what would the time limiting factors be between variety development and marketing that may impede innovation and competitiveness?

No time limiting factors could be identified for a registration process where the applicant can apply directly to the Variety Registration Office, providing the industry could expect a turn around time of up to a month for complete registration applications.

4e. Assuming the availability of sufficient resources, what would an appropriate service standard be for listing varieties in Schedule B and C?

The amount of work involved in the initial review of an application for registration and the processing of registration documentation would not change for crop kinds in Schedules B and C. One month seems like a reasonable performance objective during peak periods.

The Working Group Participants suggested that two weeks would be a desirable turn around time for Registration during non-peak periods.

5. Consequential Changes to Part I (Importation)

5a. Should importation of crops in Schedule A (merit required) be limited to pedigreed seed only versus seed of a registered variety? If so, why? If not, why not?

There was consensus among respondents that the importation of seed of crops in Schedule A should be limited to pedigreed seed in order to hold imported seed to the same standards as seed grown in Canada, to maintain the integrity of the variety, and to assure that the importation is of a known commodity. The perception that some trading partners may consider this a non-tariff barrier needs further review.

5b. Is the proposal to allow importation of only registered varieties for own use appropriate? If so, why? If not, why not?

Participants concluded that importation of seed should be limited to registered varieties of crop kinds in Schedule A because of the potential for harm.

6. Contract Registration

While the term CR could be used to mean different things, such as confined production, contained production, or closed loop registration, the term Contract Registration (CR) implies that it is used for situations where contracting is used. Contract Registration is currently limited to niche market varieties that may cause an adverse effect to the traditional commodity.

The Western Canada Canola/Rapeseed Recommending Committee (WCC/RRC) provided insight into their experience.

6a. Contract Registration is currently limited to niche market varieties that may cause an adverse effect to the traditional commodity. Should CR be further restricted to only varieties that may have health and safety concerns?

Although no consensus was reached, there was some

indication that Contract Registration could be useful for broader application than a niche market scenario.

Some commented that Recommending Committee evaluation of harm should not be restricted to health and safety issues only, and should have the option to consider a broader definition of harm, including market impact.

6b. Conversely, should the scope of Contract Registration be expanded to include varieties producing large acreage commodity crops? What impact would this have on the Registrant's ability to comply with a Quality Management System? Are there other alternatives?

Some participants felt that the scope of Contract Registration should remain limited to niche varieties because it is difficult to control leakage of seed from production on larger acreages. Others felt that Contract Registration need not be limited to niche varieties, but the requirements for the quality management systems should recognize the liability of risk management and associated costs. The industry can design management systems based on risk rather than acreage. Large acreages will likely increase the risk and therefore require a more stringent and costly risk management system.

If Contract Registration is to be encouraged for large acreages, the Working Group expressed concern whether the will or the capability exists to take corrective action on large acreages. A further concern related to unauthorized production outside of the closed-loop contracts.

Since the Seeds Act and Regulations do not have authority over grain production, what can be done to further facilitate the production of grain of value added varieties that require confinement or containment? It was identified that there is a need to harmonize the coordination of compliance enforcement between applicable areas within the Canada Seeds Act and the Canada Grains Act.

The Working Group recognized that some participants would like Contract Registration for Identity Preserved (IP) varieties where harm is not an issue, although there

was general agreement that this is not necessary as a regulatory requirement.

The Working Group discussed whether having a defined buyer should be a requirement for contract registration, but could not reach agreement. The recommending committees could provide advice on harm.

The Working Group felt that varieties under Contract Registration should be required to meet the other requirements of the schedule (e.g., agronomics, disease and quality). There needs to be support for enforcement programs for crops under contract registration.

Some questions relating to contract registration enforcement and violations of contract remained unresolved after discussion. Outstanding questions requiring further discussion include, what are the specific risks and consequences, how does one manage unauthorized seed and grain production, handling and processing, and can the CFIA and the CGC take action to prevent an offender from continuing to do business?

6c. Should it be a Contract Registration requirement that in order to ensure compliance with the QMS, a third party audit by a Conformity Verification Body be conducted annually at the Registrant's expense?

Participants agreed that a quality management system does require auditing. The frequency of audits could be variable and risk based. The determination of which party pays for the audit could be resolved as part of an agreement between the contracting parties.

The Working Group considered that the fees for Contract Registration could be increased to help support the auditing and enforcement of the terms and conditions of the contract registration.

Scarce government resources should be used for common good, for example health and safety issues. Z

7. Other Issues

7a. What process could the VRO use to adjust the proposal, the schedules, and the regulations as we move forward?

The Working Group participants expressed significant support for proceeding to further develop the proposed consultation process. There is need to move forward as quickly as possible to remove uncertainty. The existing infrastructure (Advisory Committee on Variety Registration, registration recommending committees, expert committees, etc.) for the sector consultation process is a good vehicle to complete the review of proposed changes, drawing on expertise from as wide an industry cross-section as possible. Afterwards, the process can use ad-hoc committees to tackle specific issues as they arise.



Individuals present expressed a need to consult with their committees/constituent groups to enhance the consultation process. A question arose as to whether this group needs to meet again in early spring (before April 15th) to process feedback from recommending committees and make decisions. In future years, an annual meeting should suffice. However, the process should use existing expert committees to provide input where possible.

Participants require sufficient time to gather input from respective committees before Working Group meetings. Any new proposals need to be circulated in October, or November so recommending committees are able to make a recommendation in February.

Some participants recommended the reduction of formal Regulations to a minimum and that most standards

should be moved to an operating manual of procedures to increase ease and flexibility of the regulatory framework.

7b. What are the ongoing roles and linkages between recommending committees?

The Working Group found that there are not a lot of linkages between recommending committees, but the SSR consultation process has been helpful in highlighting the need to maintain and develop these linkages. The Canadian Agricultural Research Council (CARC) does bring eastern and western expert committees together, and individual recommending committees report to the CFIA.

Under the new proposal, recommending committees would officially deal only with Schedule A crops – they would deal with registration of varieties and with other issues related to those crops, such as the performance testing protocol. A forum for meetings between recommending and expert committees for crops in most Schedules is needed, but would only be required when issues of mutual concern develop.

The roles and responsibilities of recommending committees under the Schedule system need clarification, particularly regarding contract registration. An annual electronic newsletter or inter-committee communication would help to communicate proposed new requirements and new approaches among committees.

The Working Group recommended that quality and disease standards should be developed by a multi-stakeholder committee.



Part 3: Conclusions

The Working Group felt the consultation process contributed to an understanding of the issues, to the formation of some key areas of consensus and identified areas for further consultative work.

Consensus Points

1. Discussion of Generic Elements of the Variety Registration System
 - a. There is a need for a “made in Canada” approach to variety registration. Neither the US nor the European systems fulfill Canadian needs
 - b. Imported seed should be held to the same standards as domestically produced seed
 - c. There is general agreement on the need for third party oversight (of what? Please specify). This can be identified according to crop kind
 - d. There is a need to move forward quickly with Variety Registration changes to provide certainty.
2. Discussion of Criteria and Issues Associated with the Scheduling Scheme
 - a. The Variety Registration System should vary by crop kind
 - b. There is some support for a Schedule “C” default for crop kinds not already listed in Schedules A, B or E
 - c. The working group emphasized the need for caution against the implementation of broad spectrum requirements without a mechanism to recognize and deal with regional and species diversity
3. Discussion of Issues Associated with Performance Information and Its Relevance to the Variety Registration System
 - a. There is a compelling appetite for performance information even though collection of this information might not be mandatory and neither the government nor the public appears to be willing to pay for this information
 - b. The Working Group emphasized the value of performance information and the need for public funding to support performance testing
- d. Variety characterization (i.e. descriptions) should remain a part of Schedules A, B and C.
- e. The Variety Registration system benefits the whole value chain but the costs can serve to restrict the number of varieties presented for registration.
- f. Move this point to Section 2
Supplementary data and committee recommendations for registration should not be required for varieties of crop kinds in Schedule B or C

- c. There are two different needs for data:
 - Data required to support seed purchasing decisions
 - Data required for registration and as a base for certification

Areas for further work and consultation

1. Developing a process for the movement of crop kinds between Schedules
2. Determining whether Schedule B is needed
3. Determining who should bear the financial responsibility for the collection and development of performance data
4. Addressing the needs of the heritage variety seed industry
5. Specifying requirements for proving Distinctness/Uniqueness in varieties – how it is undertaken and whether it is needed for Schedule C crops
6. Answering questions surrounding the scope of Contract Registration, its enforcement and potential application to identity-preserved production ⁱ